

**CREATION
OF A
NATIONAL PRESERVATION
DATA INFRASTRUCTURE**

**FINAL REPORT
APPENDICES**

September 2007

**Prepared by Florida Housing Finance Corporation
and The Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing**

**With support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's
Window of Opportunity: Preserving Affordable Rental Housing Initiative**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Affordable Housing Preservation: Building a National Data Infrastructure	1
National Preservation Data Infrastructure Meeting Agenda	29
National Preservation Data Infrastructure Meeting Participants	31
Preservation Risk Analysis Presentation – Typical Risk Variables	34

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRESERVATION:
BUILDING A NATIONAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Prepared by
Anne Ray
Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing
M.E. Rinker, Sr. School of Building Construction
College of Design, Construction, and Planning
University of Florida**

April 2007

*A project of the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing and
Florida Housing Finance Corporation, with support from the John
D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Window of
Opportunity: Preserving Affordable Rental Housing Initiative*

Acknowledgements

The Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing and Florida Housing Finance Corporation undertook this project to explore a national preservation data infrastructure with support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation *Window of Opportunity: Preserving Affordable Rental Housing* initiative. We appreciate the assistance of Debra Schwartz in initiating the project and the continuing leadership of Erika Poethig, both of the MacArthur Foundation.

This project is overseen by a team consisting of Nancy Muller and Susan Parks of the Florida Housing Finance Corporation and Bill O’Dell, Anne Ray, Patricia Roset-Zuppa, and Marc Smith of the Shimberg Center. A national advisory committee for the project provided invaluable assistance in determining the focus of the research and reviewing findings:

- Joe Beldon, Housing Assistance Council
- Michael Bodaken, National Housing Trust
- Sheila Crowley, National Low Income Housing Coalition
- Toby Halliday, Local Initiatives Support Corporation
- Jennifer Lavorel, Stewards for Affordable Housing in the Future
- Todd Nedwick, National Housing Trust
- Vincent O'Donnell, Local Initiatives Support Corporation
- Danilo Pelletiere, National Low Income Housing Coalition
- Leslie Strauss, Housing Assistance Council
- Michael Torrens, Corporation for Enterprise Development
- Keith Wardrip, National Low Income Housing Coalition

Sheila Freaney of Florida Housing Finance Corporation provided logistic support for the advisory committee.

The Florida Survey Research Center performed the survey of housing organizations. Diep Nguyen and Patricia Roset-Zuppa of the Shimberg Center assisted in compiling the results of the surveys. Douglas White of the Shimberg Center prepared the national infrastructure map.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iv
Introduction	1
I. Survey Results: The Current State of Data Collection.....	5
II. Data Organization: Extensive vs. Intensive Data Collection	8
III. Building a National Preservation Data Infrastructure.....	10
IV. Recommendations and Areas for Further Discussion.....	14
Appendix 1. MacArthur Housing Preservation Data Project Summary	19
Appendix 2. Survey Respondents.....	21

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing at the University of Florida and the Florida Housing Finance Corporation, with support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation’s *Window of Opportunity: Preserving Affordable Rental Housing* program, have launched an initiative to improve data collection and analysis related to the preservation of assisted rental housing.

As a first step, the Shimberg Center conducted research into the current state of preservation-related data collection throughout the country. Through surveys of 67 housing-related organizations and in-depth interviews with 18 preservation experts, we examined what data are being collected and by whom; the data elements that those involved in preservation feel *should* be collected; the gaps between the ideal data set and actual data collection; and how these gaps could be bridged.

I. Survey Results: The Current State of Data Collection

Survey respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of 35 preservation-related variables for which they might collect property-level data. The list included variables related to properties’ affordability period, unit characteristics, tenant characteristics, financing and property performance, owner and management characteristics, and market and neighborhood characteristics. Respondents also were asked which of these variables they include in their databases.

While respondents gave high ratings to a wide variety of variables, those that provide direct clues to affordability restrictions were particularly highly valued. Examples included the presence of project-based rental subsidies, the period of affordability, and end dates for rent subsidies.

Five variables were rated highly by most respondents but were actually included in less than half of databases: 1) Date of eligibility for opt-out or mortgage prepayment, 2) Notice of opt-out or termination provided to tenants or funder, 3) Average rent in surrounding market, 4) Extent of capital needs, and 5) Owners with an interest in selling properties. Most frequently, survey respondents cited the lack of availability of data from their sources when explaining why they did not collect a variable they deemed important.

About half of data collectors indicated that their databases were open to the public. Most of the other data collectors restrict access to select organizational employees or members, with a few providing access to all agency employees or to select external groups.

II. Data Organization: Extensive vs. Intensive Data Collection

When asked how agencies use data to facilitate preservation, interviewees identified two types of data collection efforts: extensive and intensive. *Extensive* collection of basic data on a whole portfolio helps agencies narrow down a list of subsidized properties to those most likely to be

lost to the affordable housing inventory, usually by identifying those with imminent opt-out or subsidy expiration dates. Funders, developers, and advocates perform extensive data collection in order to identify target properties for preservation, set subsidy allocation priorities, and characterize the scope of preservation needs in a local area or state.

Intensive data collection and analysis on an individual property enables agencies to determine the complete set of factors that might affect the potential for market-rate conversion or loss through deterioration. This requires collection of detailed information, including loan documents and state and local land use restrictions on the property, previous refinancing and any associated preservation-related restrictions, and the property’s capital needs and financial condition. Intensive data collection helps public agencies to allocate appropriate levels of subsidy, preservation-focused developers to acquire at-risk properties, and tenants and their advocates to determine whether legal restrictions prevent properties from removal from the affordable housing inventory.

III. Building a National Preservation Data Infrastructure

A *national preservation data infrastructure* would consist of the collection by multiple organizations of a standard set of variables on assisted properties for the purpose of understanding preservation needs. We recommend that the national preservation data infrastructure be based on a standard set of variables used in extensive data collection.

Specifically, we recommend that data collectors create a national infrastructure by collecting these standard data elements for all assisted housing properties:

- For-profit versus non-profit ownership
- Unit mix
- Types and years of funding
- Presence or absence of rent subsidies
- Key dates, including mortgage maturity dates, expiration of Land Use Restriction Agreements or Extended Use Agreements, rent subsidy contract expiration, and dates of eligibility for mortgage prepayment or opt-out
- Whether the owner has submitted a notice of opt-out or termination to tenants or funders
- Number of assisted units
- Demographic served
- Property rents
- Average rents in the surrounding area
- Summary measure of capital needs

By mapping the extent to which data collectors in each state include these items in their databases (see page 12), we determined that a strong base of preservation-related information exists upon which to build a standard data collection effort. Half of the states have most data elements in place, and most agencies collect data on both federally-funded and state-funded properties. In some cases, entities collect data expressly to support preservation. In many others, agencies collect data on properties for other purposes, such as compliance monitoring. These data also could be used to facilitate preservation.

IV. Recommendations and Areas for Further Discussion

In addition to our recommendations for uniform collection of data elements, we offer the following suggestions based on survey responses and interviewees' suggestions:

- Develop standard, feasible methods to collect data elements that are highly rated but less frequently collected: average market rents, opt-out and termination notices submitted, extent of capital needs, opt-out and prepayment eligibility dates, and owners' interest in selling properties.
- Make HUD data available on a more systematic basis to all data collectors.
- Make comprehensive data on RD-funded properties available to the public.
- Where possible, provide public, on-line access to property documents to facilitate intensive data collection.
- Develop consensus on the content and procedures for the national data infrastructure. Interested parties will need to agree on the list of uniform data elements, methods by which data collectors will integrate information collected from multiple sources, the extent to which data gathered will be available and accessible to the public, and the composition of the network of organizations that will carry out the creation of the infrastructure.

Introduction

Throughout the country, thousands of privately owned, publicly subsidized rental housing units are at risk of loss to the affordable housing inventory due to expiring affordability periods, opt-outs from subsidy programs, and deteriorating physical and financial conditions. While the potential loss of HUD-subsidized housing has received the most attention, properties receiving other federal, state, and local subsidies are also at risk. These include more recently funded properties such as Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects that have begun to reach their fifteenth year in service.

Accordingly, government agencies, advocacy organizations, housing developers and syndicators have launched efforts to preserve at-risk affordable housing. Preservation methods include offering incentives to current owners to keep properties in the affordable inventory, transferring properties to owners with an interest in maintaining the housing as affordable, and providing funding for rehabilitation and financial stabilization. However, efforts to preserve properties and to formulate policies are hampered by the lack of comprehensive data about the subsidized housing stock. In the absence of this information, governments and others often make ad hoc decisions about preservation of properties that have reached a crisis stage, rather than systematically allocating resources to the types of properties most at risk and that provide the most cost-effective and needed types of housing. Moreover, cities and states cannot gain a clear picture of the housing that has been lost to the inventory over time, and success in preserving such housing is difficult to measure.

To remedy this lack of information, the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing at the University of Florida and the Florida Housing Finance Corporation, with support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's *Window of Opportunity: Preserving Affordable Rental Housing* program, have launched an initiative to improve data collection and analysis related to the preservation of assisted rental housing. A key objective of this initiative is:

*To develop a national consensus on a preservation data infrastructure that will allow data to be aggregated at the state and national level, in order to prioritize and track preservation efforts over time.*¹

As a first step, the Shimberg Center conducted research into the current state of preservation-related data collection throughout the country. We examined what data are being collected and by whom; the data elements that those involved in preservation feel *should* be collected; the gaps between the ideal data set and actual data collection; and how these gaps could be bridged. This report summarizes these findings.

Research Methods

To determine how agencies collect preservation-related data, the Shimberg Center contracted with the Florida Survey Research Center to conduct a phone survey of representatives of public, private, and non-profit agencies involved in preservation. Interviewers attempted to contact 89 organizations, including representatives of 50 state housing finance agencies, 16 advocacy- and policy-related organizations, nine intermediary organizations, six large non-profit developers,

and ten other agencies, including private consulting firms, local agencies, housing locator services, and universities. Of these, 67 responded to the survey, for a response rate of 75 percent. A list of survey respondents is included as Appendix 2.

The phone survey was designed to determine which data elements respondents thought would be most helpful to support preservation work, as well as which data, if any, their organizations actually collect. The survey asked about variables falling into six categories: affordability period, unit characteristics, tenant characteristics, financing and property performance, owner/management characteristics, and market/neighborhood characteristics. Figure 1 on the following page lists the variables discussed in the survey. The survey also asked how and to whom the agencies provided access to preservation-related data and whether the agencies had used data to create a risk assessment tool to flag at-risk properties.

Of the 67 agencies surveyed, 53 were “data collectors”; that is, they maintain a database with information about assisted housing properties. We classified the remaining 14 as “data users” who do not themselves collect data on assisted properties.

Next, Anne Ray of the Shimberg Center conducted follow-up interviews with 18 of the survey respondents to explore the question of on-the-ground use of data to advance preservation efforts. The interviews included questions about the use of data in preservation practice, any difficulties in obtaining needed data, and any data elements the interviewees wished were available that currently are not.

Figure 1. Preservation-Related Data Variables

Affordability Period	Unit Characteristics	Tenant Characteristics	Financing and Property Performance	Owner/ Management Characteristics	Market/ Neighborhood Characteristics
Period of affordability	Current unit rents	Targeted tenant incomes	Project-based rental assistance (yes/no)	Type of owner (for-profit, non-profit, limited dividend corporation)	Average rent in surrounding market
Mortgage maturity date	Unit mix (number of bedrooms)	Tenant target population (e.g. elderly, disabled, family)	Types and years of funding	Name of management company	HUD FMR in surrounding market
Rent subsidy contract end date		Tenant economic characteristics (e.g. employment rates, public assistance use)	Occupancy rate	Contact information for owner	Section 8 utilization or turn-back rates for market
Date of eligibility for mortgage prepayment or opt-out		Tenant demographic characteristics (e.g. household size, race, ethnicity)	Debt level	Owners with interest in selling properties	Area crime rate
Request for rent subsidy contract renewal submitted to HUD			Operating expense ratio or net operating income		Area poverty level
Notice of opt-out or termination provided to tenants or funder			Operating reserve level		Proximity to other affordable rental properties
			Construction and rehabilitation history		
			Market value of property		
			Tax benefits accruing to owner		
			Exit tax or phantom income concerns		
			Extent of capital needs and deferred maintenance		
			Replacement reserve level		
			OMHAR, REAC, or Mark-to-Market status for HUD properties; C or D rating for RD properties		

Report Organization

This report is organized into four sections:

1. Survey Results: The Current State of Data Collection
2. Data Organization: Extensive vs. Intensive Data Collection
3. Building a National Data Infrastructure
4. Recommendations and Areas For Further Discussion

I. Survey Results: The Current State of Data Collection

Data Variables: Importance and Collection Rates

In order to determine which data elements might be most important to support preservation, survey respondents were asked to rate 35 variables on a 1-5 scale, where 1 equaled “Not useful at all” and 5 equaled “Essential.” To determine the extent to which the most useful data elements are actually collected, data collectors also were asked which of these variables they include in their databases.

In response, those surveyed gave high ratings to a wide variety of data variables; average ratings for every variable fell between 3 and 4. Nevertheless, some variables were deemed essential more often than others, with about a third receiving a “5” rating from the majority of respondents. Variables that provide direct clues to affordability restrictions—the presence of project-based rental subsidies, the period of affordability, and end dates for rent subsidies, for example—were particularly highly valued.

Figure 2 below shows the percentage of respondents rating each variable as essential and the percentage of organizations with databases that actually collect each variable.

Figure 2. Ratings and Collection of Variables

Variable	Percentage of Respondents Rating “5”	Percentage of Organizations Collecting (Data Collectors Only)
Project-based rental assistance	82%	57%
Rent subsidy contract end date	82%	62%
Period of affordability	81%	79%
Current unit rents	72%	57%
Date of eligibility for opt-out or mortgage prepayment	66%	47%
Notice of opt-out or termination provided to tenants or funder	64%	32%
Mortgage maturity date	58%	57%
Types and years of funding	57%	60%
Contact information for owner	55%	87%
Average rent in surrounding market	54%	8%
Extent of capital needs	54%	23%
Owners with an interest in selling properties	54%	17%
Unit mix	54%	83%
Type of owner (for-profit vs. non-profit)	46%	75%
Request for rent subsidy contract renewal submitted to HUD	45%	23%
Targeted tenant incomes	45%	43%
Operating expense ratio	42%	43%
Tenant target population	40%	55%
Debt level	39%	42%
HUD FMR in surrounding market	39%	11%
Market value of the property	37%	13%

Variable	Percentage of Respondents Rating “5”	Percentage of Organizations Collecting (Data Collectors Only)
OMHAR, REAC or Mark-to-Market status/C or D rating	37%	25%
Replacement reserve level	37%	40%
Occupancy rate	36%	38%
Exit tax or phantom income concerns	31%	2%
Name of management company	31%	85%
Proximity to other affordable rental properties	28%	8%
Construction and rehabilitation history	25%	26%
Operating reserve level	25%	42%
Tenant economic characteristics	25%	25%
Section 8 utilization rates	22%	6%
Tax benefits accruing to owner	22%	6%
Tenant demographic characteristics	22%	32%
Area poverty rate	16%	4%
Area crime rate	7%	2%

Figure 2 shows that in most cases, the variables deemed essential by a majority of survey respondents are collected by the majority of data collectors. However, five variables were rated highly but are included in less than half of databases: 1) Date of eligibility for opt-out or mortgage prepayment, 2) Notice of opt-out or termination provided to tenants or funder, 3) Average rent in surrounding market, 4) Extent of capital needs, and 5) Owners with an interest in selling properties.

Most frequently, survey respondents cited the lack of availability of data from their sources when explaining why they did not collect a variable they deemed important. We discuss the question of finding sources of data for these highly valued, less frequently collected variables in the “Recommendations and Areas for Further Discussion” section.

Frequency of Updates

Information about property conditions can become dated quickly if it is not updated regularly. In particular, properties’ financing and associated affordability restrictions can change quickly, greatly affecting their likelihood of remaining in the affordable housing inventory. Many experts interviewed believed that finding the money and staff time to keep property data current is one of the greatest challenges in compiling a useful preservation database.

Of data collectors surveyed, 30 percent said that they update their data less than one time per year, including agencies who do not update the data on a regular basis at all. Those who perform more frequent updates usually do so on a quarterly or monthly basis, depending on the data source, with a smaller number updating once or twice per year.

Public Access to Data

While many agencies collect highly detailed information about properties, they often use this information internally and limit public access that would allow others to analyze preservation

risks. For example, housing finance agencies may keep detailed financial data on properties that they fund or monitor; non-profit organizations may collect data on at-risk properties to help them acquire properties or advocate for tenants. Thus, a third question under review in the survey was the extent to which data are available to the public.

In the survey, about half of data collectors indicated that their databases were open to the public. Most of the other data collectors restrict access to select organizational employees or members, with a few providing access to all agency employees or to select external groups. Some interviewees noted that they do not make their full databases public but do provide information or summary reports upon request.

II. Data Organization: Extensive vs. Intensive Data Collection

When asked how agencies use data to facilitate preservation, interviewees identified two types of data collection efforts: 1) *extensive* collection of basic data on a whole portfolio to identify at-risk properties, and 2) *intensive* collection and analysis of information on individual properties to determine the complete set of factors that might affect the potential for market-rate conversion or loss through deterioration. Figure 3 below summarizes the characteristics of each type of data collection.

Figure 3. Extensive vs. Intensive Data Collection

	Extensive	Intensive
Potential Use of Data for Preservation	Identify potential at-risk properties	Conduct informed advocacy, property transaction or subsidy allocation activities
Universe	Portfolio-wide	Individual at-risk properties
Types of Data Collected	Funding programs, affordability period and opt-out dates, rent subsidy contract presence/absence and dates, non-profit vs. for-profit owner; occasionally neighborhood market data	Affordability period and other legal restrictions from loan documents, local and state land use restrictions, capital needs, financial position, area market conditions, owner's intent
Potential for National Standardization	High; could identify standard data elements to be collected for all properties and aggregated nationally	Too property-specific for uniform data collection, but guidelines for sources and types of data would be helpful

Extensive Data Collection

Extensive data collection helps agencies narrow down a list of subsidized properties to those most likely to be lost to the affordable housing inventory, usually by identifying those with imminent opt-out or subsidy expiration dates. The portfolio for which data are collected might consist of federally subsidized properties in a city, metropolitan area, or state; assisted properties funded or monitored by a single entity, such as a state housing finance agency; assisted properties owned by a single entity; or some combination of these. Using this type of database as the basis for analysis, agencies can address preservation needs systematically rather than waiting for crises to arise involving individual properties.

Extensive data collection helps funders, developers, and advocacy organizations identify potential preservation targets. Summary data from an extensive database help public agencies understand which types of properties have the greatest preservation needs, enabling them to set subsidy allocation priorities. It also enables interested parties to characterize the scope of the problem in a state or local area in order to advocate for increased governmental attention and funding.

In most cases, agencies collect and analyze data on these factors for each property:

- Funding programs involved, to determine broadly each property's affordability restrictions;

- Key dates: start and end of affordability period, mortgage maturity, mortgage prepayment eligibility and expiration of rent subsidy contracts, to determine when the property might be at risk of loss of affordability; and
- Non-profit versus for-profit ownership, to determine at a broad level whether the owner has a mission to keep the housing affordable.

Many agencies collect extensive data specifically to assess the risk of loss of affordable housing. Of the 53 data collectors surveyed, 27 have developed tools using data to flag at-risk properties. In many other cases, however, agencies perform portfolio-wide data collection for other purposes: to monitor compliance with funding requirements, to track properties they themselves own, or to inform the public about affordable rental housing options, for example. These other data collection efforts provide a rich source of additional data that could be used to assess preservation needs.

Intensive Data Collection

Once an agency has narrowed down the number of at-risk properties, it can perform a close examination of the financial, physical, and legal status of each property to determine the full extent of risk of loss. This requires collection of detailed information, including loan documents and state and local land use restrictions on the property, previous refinancing and any associated preservation-related restrictions, and the property's capital needs and financial condition. The intensive phase may not necessarily follow extensive data collection for a whole portfolio; preservation entities also often perform intensive data collection on a case-by-case basis in response to concerns raised by tenants or advocacy groups.

Information gathered in the intensive phase helps all actors understand exactly what an owner can and cannot do with a property. In some cases, preservation advocates discover loan-related or land use restrictions specific to a property that prevent the property from being removed from the affordable housing inventory. Where this is not the case, a full understanding of the property helps public agencies to allocate appropriate levels of subsidy and preservation-focused developers to enter into negotiations for acquisition.

III. Building a National Preservation Data Infrastructure

The information collected by data collectors can serve as the foundation for a *national preservation data infrastructure*; that is, the collection by multiple organizations of a standard set of variables on assisted properties for the purpose of understanding preservation needs.

Establishing a national data infrastructure would expand the collection of data to all properties and geographic areas while standardizing the content of the data. This would enable interested parties in all parts of the country to assess the risks to their affordable housing inventories. It also would allow the aggregation of data at the state or national level to create a larger picture of preservation needs and track preservation efforts over time.

We recommend that the national preservation data infrastructure be based on a standard set of variables used in *extensive* data collection. The hallmark of extensive data collection is the use of a small number of straightforward, easily measured factors that apply to all properties. Thus, the extensive data collection phase is well suited to standardization across agencies and geographic areas.

Unlike in the extensive data phase, the factors relevant to the intensive analysis of an individual property cannot be standardized easily. For example, data collection for a property at risk of deterioration might focus on physical inspection of the property, while examination of a property at risk of market-rate conversion might focus on the content of original loan documents and land use restrictions. Local and state land use restrictions and funding programs, often the linchpin for determining the full legal options for terminating affordability, vary widely. Rather than identifying intensive data collection element that would be part of the national infrastructure, therefore, we simply suggest the types of data that might be relevant in the analyses of individual properties.

Recommended Data Elements for Collection

Based on our research, we suggest the items in Figure 4 below as the content of each stage of data collection. The list of data elements in the “Extensive” column would make up the content of the national data infrastructure.

The extensive data elements include most of those identified in the survey as essential by the majority of respondents. The list of intensive elements reflects recommendations from experts who were interviewed, as well as the remaining two variables, owner contact information and owner interest in selling properties, that were rated as essential by most survey respondents. Both lists also include suggested elements based on Florida Housing Finance Corporation’s and the Shimberg Center’s own experiences in collecting and using data to analyze preservation needs.¹

¹ As a next step in our broader preservation project (outlined in Appendix 1), the Shimberg Center will be developing and testing a model assessment tool for portfolio-wide analysis of properties at risk of loss to the affordable inventory. Shimberg researchers may be able to suggest additional data elements or different emphases in extensive data collection based on the results of this stage of the project.

Figure 4. Data Elements for Extensive and Intensive Collection

Subject Category	Extensive/National Infrastructure	Intensive
Owner/Management Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-profit vs. for-profit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company history • Contact information • Owner interest in selling
Housing Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit mix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building type
Financial History/Affordability Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types & years of funding • Presence/absence of rent subsidies • Key dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mortgage maturity ○ Expiration of Land Use Restriction Agreement (LURA) or Extended Use Agreement (EUA) ○ Rent subsidy contract expiration ○ Eligibility for opt-out or mortgage prepayment • Notice of opt-out or termination submitted • Number of assisted units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial structure detail • Content of original LURA and EUA • Content of original loan documents • State or local restrictive covenants on land use
Tenant Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic served: elders, families, homeless, special needs, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenant incomes
Market Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property rents • Average rents in surrounding area 	
Physical Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of extent of capital needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full extent of capital needs • Construction/rehab history

National Data Infrastructure Map

To measure the extent to which this infrastructure is already in place, we created a “national data infrastructure map” based on survey results. The map shows:


- The extent to which the recommended extensive data elements are collected in each state by surveyed agencies, as indicated by color;
- The types of agencies collecting data in each state, represented by icons; and
- Whether the agency or agencies in each state collect data for federally-funded properties only (“F”), defined as properties subsidized by HUD or RD; for state-funded properties (“S”), including direct state financing plus subsidies allocated by the state such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit and tax-exempt bond financing; or both (“F/S”).

The tables following the map show the names of the data collectors in each state, the types of properties for which they collect data, who has access to the data collected, and which of the recommended data elements they collect.

Note that within a state, all data elements identified as included may not be collected for all types of properties. This is particularly true in states with more than one data collector, whose databases likely differ both in the variables and types of properties.

The data infrastructure map is a work in progress, reflecting the survey responses received. In some cases, we did not receive a survey response from an agency that may indeed collect data for a state. In others, we may not have identified all of the agencies that collect preservation-related data. We encourage additional input so that we can continue to develop a full picture of the current state of data collection throughout the nation.

Figure 5. United States Preservation Data Infrastructure Map



In addition to state-level data collection efforts, a number of organizations collect information for all states. The National Housing Trust’s database is the most extensive and includes the type of owner, unit mix, mortgage maturity date, affordability period, rent subsidy contract end date, current rents, and unit mix for HUD- and RD-funded properties. Data are available online by state and funding program.

The infrastructure map shows that a strong base of preservation-related information exists upon which to build a standard data collection effort. Half of the states have most data elements in place, and most agencies collect data on both federally-funded and state-funded properties. The map also shows that state housing finance agencies are the data collectors identified for most locations. Their contribution to the preservation data infrastructure will be critical.

IV. Recommendations and Areas for Further Discussion

In addition to our recommendations for uniform collection of data elements, we offer the following suggestions based on survey responses and interviewees’ suggestions.

Develop standard, feasible methods to collect data elements that are highly rated but less frequently collected.

As noted earlier, five data elements were rated highly by survey respondents but are included in less than half of databases: 1) average rent in surrounding market, 2) notice of opt-out or termination provided to tenants or funder, 3) extent of capital needs, 4) date of eligibility for opt-out or mortgage prepayment, and 5) owners with an interest in selling properties. The first four of these appear in the recommended extensive data collection set; the fifth appears in the recommended content for intensive data collection.

Developing standard measures of these data elements would help agencies target at-risk properties in a more accurate and nuanced way. The discussion below lists examples of agencies that have been able to record this information for at least a portion of their subsidized portfolios. Their collection methods may be feasible for other agencies.

First, 53% of survey respondents identified “average rent in surrounding market” as essential, but only 8% of databases include it. Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA), for example, employs a market analyst who provides quarterly analyses of market rents, largely based on data from a local real estate research firm. Other data come from annual inspections of properties receiving MHFA first mortgages and from data collected by a statewide tenant organization. Another state agency, Kansas Housing Resource Corporation, will be compiling data on tax credit property rents through new compliance software. While not a comprehensive review, this will provide a good indicator of overall prevailing rents in many smaller towns.

HUD Fair Market Rents (FMR) may provide a proxy for market rents. In fact, a recent study prepared for HUD found that a property’s rent level relative to the local FMR was the most important factor in determining whether an owner would opt out of a Section 8 contract,

controlling for other property, program, and location characteristics.² However, some interviewees expressed concern that HUD FMRs are not sufficiently helpful, either because they do not accurately reflect actual rents or because they cover too wide a geographic area.

Second, 64% of respondents identified “notice of termination or opt-outs from mortgages or rent subsidy programs” as essential, but only 32% of databases include it. For example, South Dakota Housing Development Authority (SDHDA) receives notification from the local Rural Development office when an owner is interested in prepaying a mortgage or selling a property. SDHDA also has signed up for a weekly list of properties that have applied for prepayment or to sell by e-mailing mfhpreservation@wdc.usda.gov. This list is available to nonprofit and public entities through the Preservation Information Exchange (PIX) website of the Office of Rental Housing Preservation of the Rural Housing Service (<https://pix.sc.egov.usda.gov/index.html>).

Laws requiring termination notice to those other than tenants also help data collectors to find out about owners that have given notice. California, for example, has a strong notice law that requires owners to notify potential preservation buyers, known as “qualified entities,” as well as tenants and public agencies about opt-outs and prepayments. California Housing Partnership Corporation has registered with the state as a qualified entity and tracks these notices in its database. See <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/tech/presrv/>.³

Third, 53% of respondents rated “extent of capital needs” as essential, but only 23% of databases include it. Some state HFAs do track capital needs through inspections. For example, Delaware State Housing Authority conducts annual inspections of the 60 sites it oversees (30 bond-financed Section 8 New Construction projects, 30 HUD-insured sites for which it is the Performance-Based Contract Administrator).

In areas with weaker rental markets, the risk of loss of assisted housing properties due to poor physical and financial conditions far exceeds the risk of loss due to conversion to market-rate rents. Poor conditions may lead funders to foreclose on subsidized mortgages or cancel rent subsidy contracts, local governments to cite or condemn a property due to code violations, or owners to cease operating because cash flow is insufficient to continue business operations. In other cases, a property might continue to operate, but under conditions that pose a health or safety threat to residents. Therefore, while developing a standard summary measure of physical conditions might be difficult, it would be highly worthwhile. Doing so would allow identification of many at-risk properties that are now missed by analyses of subsidy expiration dates and rental market conditions alone.

For HUD-subsidized properties, a number of interviewees suggested making REAC inspection scores uniformly available to the public.

² Abt. Associates, Inc. and Econometrica, Inc., *Multifamily Properties: Opting In, Opting Out and Remaining Affordable* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2006), pp. 33-36.

³ Interviewees noted that for properties with federally subsidized or insured mortgages anywhere in the United States, owners must give notice to HUD, state and local government, and tenants prior to termination or prepayment under Wellstone Notice requirements.

Fourth, 66% of respondents rated “date of eligibility for opt-out or mortgage prepayment” as essential, but only 47% of databases include it. Methods for tracking opt-out or prepayment dates depend on the funding programs associated with the properties:

- Some state housing finance agencies track owners’ options to terminate affordability restrictions for early LIHTC properties by adding one year, the “option year,” past the date the owner requests that the state find a qualified buyer for the property. Owners are eligible to make this request in the fifteenth year.⁴
- For properties with Section 8 rent subsidies, data collectors track the contract expiration date to determine the owner’s opt-out date.
- For properties with HUD mortgages, tracking prepayment eligibility dates is more complicated. The prepayment date itself is not included in HUD’s databases. Some data collectors extrapolate prepayment dates from the date of the original mortgage, depending on the programs under which each property was financed. This analysis is time-consuming and requires extensive knowledge of HUD financing programs.

Finally, 54% of respondents rated “owners with an interest in selling properties” as essential, but only 17% of databases include it. One way to collect this information and to make it available to interested parties is to create a clearinghouse linking owners and potential buyers. For example, South Dakota Housing Development Authority and Kansas Housing Resource Corporation use their Web sites to post lists of owners interested in selling LIHTC properties coming to the end of their initial 15-year compliance periods. South Dakota’s site also lists potential buyers. Similarly, Washington State Housing Finance Commission (WSHFC) has a partnership with Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle (FHLB). WSHFC collects data on affordable properties whose owners are interested in selling. FHLB disseminates the list to its member banks, mailing list, and other interested parties.

Make HUD data available on a more systematic basis to all data collectors.

Interviewees generally were able to obtain pertinent data on HUD-subsidized properties. However, a number of interviewees cited personal relationships with contacts in local HUD offices as their conduits for information that would be difficult for most people to obtain. Interviewees also noted that they used HUD’s databases for information on projects, but that tracking individual properties can be difficult and time-consuming because information must be merged from several HUD databases, including those with information about Section 8 contracts, Section 8 properties, FHA mortgages, Mark-to-Market, and terminated mortgages.

Interviewees recommended merging the HUD databases into a single, more user-friendly database. They also recommended making the following data items widely and systematically available: REAC scores, properties with project-based Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers,

⁴ Most agencies that allocate tax credits now require longer affordability periods than the 15 years originally imposed by the program.

properties in the foreclosure process, properties with Flexible Subsidy Assistance, preservation of a property under ELIHPA vs. LIHPRHA, and, where relevant, the HUD option under which a Section 8 contract was renewed.

Make comprehensive data on RD-funded properties available to the public.

Interviewees cited difficulties obtaining information from RD, with RD sometimes citing proprietary information concerns about data that HUD readily releases. Interviewees would like to see ownership information, accurate addresses, financing information, rent subsidy data, and rent limits available from RD.

Where possible, provide public, on-line access to property documents to facilitate intensive data collection.

Providing property documents on-line can greatly reduce the time necessary to perform intensive analysis. For example, New York City's ACRIS system provides publicly available, on-line access to documents for all properties in the city by block and lot number. ACRIS includes most, although not all, documents relevant to housing preservation. For example, it does not include HUD mortgage notes or IRP agreements. See <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dof/html/jump/acris.shtml>.

Develop consensus on the content and procedures for the national data infrastructure.

In order to develop a national data infrastructure, interested parties will need to come to consensus around a number of parameters.

First, we will need consensus around the content of the infrastructure. Is the list of data elements for extensive data collection suggested in this report correct? How can agencies obtain the data that have been difficult to find thus far?

Second, this network will need to find ways to integrate information across housing programs and data collectors. Are there standard data collection practices that can help individual data collectors to integrate information about a single property from different sources, such as assigning a unique identifier to each property? How can multiple data collectors in a single geographic area integrate their information? More broadly, how can agencies integrate data that might be collected for another purpose, such as compliance monitoring, into a preservation-related data infrastructure?

Third, interested parties will need to come to consensus about access to information. To what extent should the data collected be available and accessible to the public? How can tenants, developers, government officials, advocates and others who are not themselves data collectors gain access to information that can lead to preservation? If full public access is the goal, how can information be provided in a useful and user-friendly way?

Finally, we will need to develop the network of organizations that will carry out the creation of this infrastructure. Should one or more entities oversee the development of this infrastructure?

Finally, we will need to develop the network of organizations that will carry out the creation of this infrastructure. Should one or more entities oversee the development of this infrastructure? How will those involved communicate with each other and with numerous data collectors? Where will data collectors need to be added to ensure full geographic coverage, and who should these entities be?⁵ How will contributors to the national data infrastructure find the funding and staff necessary to collect information and to keep it current?

Conversations with preservation data experts revealed a strong interest in a continued national discussion of the use of data to support affordable housing preservation. By building on existing data collection efforts and expertise, we can create an infrastructure of timely, relevant, and user-friendly information that will help interested parties to take maximum advantage of preservation opportunities and to tell the preservation story in their communities.

⁵ The National Low Income Housing Coalition is currently studying the feasibility of a national “preservation catalog,” or inventory, of all assisted housing properties. To date, the research has shown that this catalog is best developed through cooperation between national-level and state- or local-level organizations. A national organization working alone would have difficulty gaining information about the many funding sources outside of the HUD and RD funding streams; these are best understood by those with relationships with state and local funders. At the same time, NLIHC found that its contacts with the central HUD office gave it access to information that might have been difficult for local organizations to obtain. From Keith Wardrip, *NLIHC Preservation Catalog*, presentation to NLIHC Board, 2006.

Appendix 1. MacArthur Housing Preservation Data Project Summary

In April 2006, the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing at the University of Florida and Florida Housing Finance Corporation made a proposal to the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation through its *Window of Opportunity: Preserving Affordable Rental Housing* initiative to fund a project to improve national data collection and analysis related to the preservation of subsidized rental housing. In June, the MacArthur Foundation agreed to fund this proposal.

Over the next 19 months, the Shimberg Center and Florida Housing will implement the following objectives to complete this project—

Develop a national consensus on the design of a normalized, national preservation data infrastructure that will allow data to be aggregated at the state and national level for purposes of prioritizing and tracking preservation efforts over time.

The objective here is to convene a centrally located meeting of thirty to fifty preservation experts from local, state and national levels from around the country to address the following issues:

- To reach a common understanding of the national preservation data infrastructure, identifying where data are available and where information is lacking;
- To understand the accessibility and usefulness of each data resource;
- To identify best practices in preservation-related data collection;
- To discuss factors that impact an owner’s decision in favor or against preservation of subsidized units;
- To develop consensus on the usefulness of a scorecard to measure success of preservation efforts, indicators to be measured, and how such a scorecard would be produced; and
- To develop consensus on the minimum data requirements necessary to support preservation efforts.

Identify the data on subsidized properties that provide the most useful information for policy decisions and program delivery, with a particular focus on the factors that flag an individual property as a potential loss to the subsidized housing inventory; and develop tools that use these data to help policymakers and housing professionals identify properties most at risk of loss to the inventory.

In this case the objective is to develop and evaluate a list of factors that may affect multifamily property owners’ decisions to retain or terminate affordability restrictions and develop an assessment tool that can be used nationwide to identify individual properties at risk of loss of affordability to assist in targeting preservation efforts. For example, these factors might include the age and physical condition of the property, the level of market rents versus project rents, ownership status, and marketability and area vacancy rates.

Collect these data for subsidized properties in Florida localities and provide public access to this information through the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse.

The objective of this data collection and maintenance activity is to enhance the Clearinghouse's Assisted Housing Inventory (AHI) and to develop methods for data collection and routine data maintenance with a particular focus on preservation-related information. The purposes for building this expanded database include:

- To provide end-users such as the public, developers, administrators, and state and local policymakers with more comprehensive data for each assisted property and for the overall affordable stock in Florida through a web-based database;
- To enable assessment of the risk of loss of affordability for Florida properties, and to enable targeting of resources for preservation;
- To collect other data, such as tenant characteristics, that are useful in formulating housing policy; and
- To share the methods for data collection, maintenance, and dissemination with state and local policymakers and housing professionals across the country.

Anticipated Outcomes of this Project

- A report and a map based on survey responses of the current national preservation infrastructure, identifying available data resources and gaps, prepared for the national meeting;
- A national meeting to discuss the development of a national preservation data infrastructure;
- A report of the national preservation data infrastructure meeting, including recommendations related to the creation of a national scorecard on preservation successes/losses;
- A list of indicators of the potential for loss of affordable housing from the rental inventory;
- A tool to identify individual properties at risk of loss of affordability;
- A model preservation data set for the state of Florida;
- A method for data collection, data maintenance and dissemination; and
- Statewide and national dissemination of these results.

Appendix 2. Survey Respondents

- Emily Achtenberg, Consultant*
- Randy Archuleta, Arizona Department of Housing/HFA
- David Bartlett, Georgia Department of Community Affairs
- Fred Bentley, Kansas Housing Resources Corporation*
- Anne Berman, Rhode Island Housing and Finance Corporation
- Bruce Bokony, Arkansas Development Finance Authority*
- Linda Bridge, New Mexico Mortgage Finance Authority
- Gayle Brownlee, Wyoming Community Development Authority
- David Dandenfelzer, Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs
- Dan DeLong, Illinois Housing Development Authority
- Susan Eliason, Delaware State Housing Authority*
- Chuck Elsesser, Florida Legal Services
- Sam Falzone, Vermont Housing Finance Agency
- Stan Fitterman, Florida Housing Coalition
- Stephanie Green, West Side Federation for Senior & Supported Housing*
- Jim Grow, National Housing Law Project
- Ethan Handelman, Recapitalization Advisors Inc.*
- Roger Herzog, Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation*
- Rachel Johnston, Chicago Rehab Network*
- Dave Keene, Mass Housing*
- Robin Kemker, Utah Housing Corporation
- Julie LaSota, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency*
- Jennifer Lavorel, Stewards for Affordable Housing for the Future
- Dina Levy, Urban Homesteading Assistance Board*
- Jim Liska, California Housing Finance Agency
- Bart Lloyd, Preservation of Affordable Housing Inc. (POAH)*
- Donna McMillan, Michigan State Housing Development Authority

* Individuals marked with a (*) participated in in-depth interviews as well as the initial survey. Toby Halliday of LISC, Bill Brauner of Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation, Bob Carter of Mass Housing, and Laura Zajac and Maura Weber of Connecticut Housing Finance Authority also participated in in-depth interviews.

- Barry Merchant, Virginia Housing Development Authority*
- Paul Mittleman, Hispanic Housing Development Corporation
- Kathleen Moran, New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority
- John Murray, New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency
- Eileen Murray, New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal
- Todd Nedwick, National Housing Trust*
- Laura Nicholson, South Carolina State Housing Finance and Development Authority
- Michelle Norris, National Church Residences
- Colleen O'Brien, HousingLink
- Vincent O'Donnell, Local Initiatives Support Corporation - LISC
- Mark Offerman, Kentucky Housing Corporation
- Rae Ellen Packard, Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority*
- Rita Parise, Ohio Housing Finance Agency
- Susan Parks, Florida Housing Finance Corporation
- Ed Pauls, District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency
- Elyse Perry, California Housing Partnership Corporation*
- Lorraine Polak, South Dakota Housing Development Authority*
- Carla Pope, Iowa Finance Authority
- Shane Rock, Washington Low Income Housing Alliance
- Molly Rogers, Housing Development Center
- Sandy Rollins, Texas Tenants Union
- Mark Romick, Alaska Housing Finance Corporation
- Patricia Roset-Zuppa, Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing
- Mat Rude, Montana Board of Housing/Housing Division
- Mark Shelburne, North Carolina Housing Finance Agency
- Brian Shull, Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency
- Tim Sovold, Washington State Housing Finance Commission
- Leslie Strauss, Housing Assistance Council
- Peter Tatian, Urban Institute
- Jim Thackaberry, District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development

- Tim Thompson, Housing Preservation Project
- Jenell Thomy, Missouri Housing Development Commission
- Michael Torrens, Corporation for Enterprise Development
- Dawn Voelker, Oregon Housing and Community Services
- Barbara Wallace, Alabama Housing Finance Authority
- Michael Ward, Connecticut Housing Finance Authority*
- Keith Wardrip, National Low Income Housing Coalition
- Tom Waters, Community Service Society
- Spencer Wells, Coalition on Homelessness and Housing in Ohio
- Ed Yandell, Tennessee Housing Development Agency

NATIONAL PRESERVATION DATA INFRASTRUCTURE MEETING

MAY 17 – 18, 2007 ❖ FT. LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

AGENDA

Objective: As government agencies and advocacy groups launch efforts to preserve at-risk affordable rental housing, many find they are hampered by a lack of comprehensive data about the assisted housing stock: the numbers and locations of subsidized properties, opt-out dates, property conditions, and other critical information. This meeting will be a preliminary national conversation about the creation of a “national preservation data infrastructure” to meet this need.

Thursday, May 17th	
Noon – 12:30 p.m.	Lunch Buffet
12:30 – 1:00 p.m.	Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.	The National Preservation Data Landscape <i>“Making the case for access to preservation data – to ensure that conference participants have a broad understanding of the national preservation data landscape.”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Setting the stage – a panel discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rae Ellen Packard – Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority - Rachel Johnston – Chicago Rehab Network - Danilo Pelletiere – National Low Income Housing Coalition - Todd Nedwick – National Housing Trust - Larry Anderson – USDA Rural Development ▪ Overview of the current state of the art of preservation data
3:00 – 3:15 p.m.	Break
3:15 – 4:45 p.m.	Data Needed for Preservation Efforts <i>“To develop a common understanding of the data being collected and begin to develop an understanding of the data needed.”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of data elements ▪ Best practices presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elyse Perry – California Housing Partnership Corporation - Bill Brauner – Community Economic Assistance Development Corporation
4:45 – 5:45 p.m.	Setting National Data Standards <i>“What can I do to make my database useful for policy and financial decision-making on preservation? – An understanding of issues relating to content and procedures for a national preservation data inventory.”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of content and procedures for a national preservation data inventory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anne Ray – Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing ▪ Integrating datasets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keith Wardrip – National Low Income Housing Coalition ▪ Standardizing content – data fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethan Handelman – Recap Advisors ▪ Frequency of updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vince O'Donnell – Local Initiative Support Corporation ▪ Standard of public access to preservation information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Todd Nedwick – National Housing Trust

5:45 – 6:30 p.m.	Break
Thursday, May 17th (Continued)	
6:15 p.m.	Dinner Buffet Begins
6:30 – 8:30 p.m.	Measuring Preservation Success <i>“What constitutes a successful preservation effort? How could a scorecard assist us in measuring success or loss of units?”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview ▪ What is the purpose of a preservation scorecard? ▪ How do we measure preservation success and/or loss of units? ▪ Discussion
8:30 p.m.	Adjourn

Friday, May 18th	
8:15 a.m.	Continental Breakfast Opens
8:30 – 9:30 a.m.	Preservation Risk Analysis Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Patricia Roset-Zuppa – Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing - Marc Smith – University of Wisconsin
9:30 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	Building Consensus on the Creation of a National Preservation Data Infrastructure
10:15 – 10:30 a.m.	Break
10:30 a.m. – Noon	Building Consensus on Data Needed for Preservation Efforts at the National Level <i>“Prioritize data elements to be used based on the level of infrastructure that the group selects”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify vital data elements that are rarely collected ▪ Reach consensus on data element definitions ▪ Identify any additional elements to be added ▪ Rank data for inclusion in the infrastructure
Noon – 12:30 p.m.	Break and Lunch Buffet
12:30 – 1:45 p.m.	Developing a National Preservation Data Infrastructure Strategy
1:45 – 2:00 p.m.	Break
2:00 – 3:15 p.m.	Recommendations and Next Steps – Implementing the Strategy
3:15 – 3:30 p.m.	Closure/Housekeeping
3:30 p.m.	Adjourn

NATIONAL PRESERVATION DATA INFRASTRUCTURE MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Position	Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone	E-Mail
Ann Norton	Senior Staff Attorney	Housing Preservation Project	570 Asbury Street, Suite 105	St. Paul	MN	55104	651-642-0102	anorton@hppinc.org
Anne Ray	Consultant	Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing	P.O. Box 115703	Gainesville	FL	32611	352-335-8001	pres_project@cox.net
Barry Merchant	Policy Analyst	Virginia Housing Development Authority	601 South Belvidere Street	Richmond	VA	23220	804-343-5730	barry.merchant@vhda.com
Bill O'Dell	Manager, Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse	Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing	P.O. Box 115703	Gainesville	FL	32611	352-273-1171	billou@ufl.edu
Brian L. Shull	Senior Development Officer	Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency	P.O. Box 8029	Harrisburg	PA	17105	717-780-3909	bshull@phfa.org
Colleen O'Brien	President	HousingLink	600 18th Avenue N.	Minneapolis	MN	55311	612-520-9221	cgobrien@housinglink.org
Dan Garcia-Diaz	Assistant Director	U.S. Government Accountability Office	441 G Street, NW, Room 2440B	Washington	DC	20548	202-512-4529	garciadiaz@gao.gov
Danilo Pelletiere	Research Director	National Low Income Housing Coalition	727 15th St, NW	Washington	DC	20002	202-662-1530	danilo@nlihc.org
David E. Chase	Deputy Director, Program Monitoring & Research Division	U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development	451 Seventh Street, SW, Room 8148	Washington	DC	20410	202-402-5733	david_e._chase@hud.gov
David L. Keene	Manager, Preservation and Technical Services	Mass Housing	One Beacon Street	Boston	MA	02108	617-854-1124	dkeene@masshousing.com
Diep Nguyen	Computer Coordinator	Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing	P.O. Box 115703	Gainesville	FL	32611	352-273-1194	diep@dcp.ufl.edu
Dina Levy	Director of Organizing and Policy	Urban Homesteading Assistance Board	120 Wall Street	New York	NY	10005	212-479-3302	levy@uhab.org
Donna McMillan	Director, Office of Asset Management	Michigan State Housing Development Authority	P.O. Box 30044	Lansing	MI	48909	313-456-3579	mcmillando@michigan.gov
Edward Duval	Chief Operations Research & System Development Branch	USDA Rural Development	1400 Independence Ave., SW, Room 1235	Washington	DC	20250	202-720-1627	ed.duval@wdc.usda.gov
Elyse Perry	Preservation Project Coordinator	California Housing Partnership	369 Pine Street, Suite 300	San Francisco	CA	94104	415-433-6804	eperry@chpc.net

		Corporation						
Emily Achtenberg	Housing Policy and Development Consultant		47 Halifax Street	Boston	MA	02130	617-524-3982	ejpa@aol.com
Erika Poethig	Program Officer	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	140 South Dearborn Street, Ste 1200	Chicago	IL	60603	312-920-6240	epoethig@macfound.org

NATIONAL PRESERVATION DATA INFRASTRUCTURE MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Position	Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone	E-Mail
Ethan Handelman	Vice President	Recapitalization Advisors, Inc.	20 Winthrop Square, 4th Floor	Boston	MA	02110-1229	617-338-9484	ehandelman@recapadvisors.com
Gene Moreno	Director of Policy	Chicago Rehab Network	53 W. Jackson, #739	Chicago	IL	60604	312-663-3936	gene@chicagorehab.org
Janet Smith	Co-Director and Associate Professor	University of Illinois at Chicago, Nathalie P. Voorhees Center	400 S. Peoria Street (MC345)	Chicago	IL	60607	312-996-8083	janets@uic.edu
Jeffrey Oakman	Associate	Recapitalization Advisors, Inc.	20 Winthrop Square, 4th Floor	Boston	MA	02110-1229	617-338-9484	joakman@recapadvisors.com
Jennifer Lavorel	Policy Director	Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future	4801 Crescent Street	Bethesda	MD	20816	301-263-0517	jennifer.lavorel@sahfnet.org
Jill Khadduri	Principal Associate	Abt Associates, Inc.	4550 Montgomery Avenue	Bethesda	MD	20814	301-634-1745	jill_khadduri@abtassoc.com
Joe Belden	Deputy Executive Director	Housing Assistance Council	1025 Vermont Avenue NW	Washington	DC	20005	202-842-8600	joe@ruralhome.org
John Maneval	Deputy Director - Multifamily Housing	Maryland Dept of Housing & Community Development	100 Community Place	Crownsville	MD	21032	410-514-7446	maneval@mdhousing.org
Julie LaSota	Housing Development Specialist	Minnesota Housing Finance Agency	400 Sibley Street, Suite 300	St. Paul	MN	55101	651-296-9827	julie.lasota@state.mn.us
Keith Wardrip	Research Analyst	National Low Income Housing Coalition	727 15th St, NW, 6th Floor	Washington	DC	20005	202-662-1530	keith@nlihc.org
Kevin Merrill	Housing Management Officer	South Dakota Housing Development Authority	P.O. Box 891	Pierre	SD	57501	605-773-3181	kevin@sdhda.org
Larry Anderson	Assistant Deputy Administrator	USDA Rural Development	Room 5045-S, Mail Stop 3201, 1400	Washington	DC	20250	202-720-3773	laurence.anderson@wdc.usda.gov

			Independence Avenue SW					
Marc Smith	Associate Professor	University of Wisconsin	1300 Linden Drive	Madison	WI	53706	608-262-2831	mtsmith4@wisc.edu
Mark H. Egger	Senior Computer Specialist	U.S. Government Accountability Office	200 W. Adams St., Suite 700	Chicago	IL	60606	312-220-7712	eggerm@gao.gov
Mark H. Shelburne	Counsel and Policy Coordinator	North Carolina Housing Finance Agency	3508 Bush Street	Raleigh	NC	27609	919-877-5645	mshelburne@nchfa.com
Michael Torrens	Director, Applied Research and Innovation	Corporation for Enterprise Development	1345E 100S	Logan	UT	84321	202-207-0115	mtorrens@cfed.org
Mike Boice	Business Applications Manager	Virginia Housing Development Authority	601 South Belvidere Street	Richmond	VA	23220	804-343-5935	mike.boice@vhda.com

NATIONAL PRESERVATION DATA INFRASTRUCTURE MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Position	Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone	E-Mail
Molly Park	Director – Resource Planning and Analyst	New York City Housing Preservation and Development	100 Gold Street, #5-211	New York	NY	10038	212-863-5095	parkm@hpd.nyc.gov
Nancy Muller	Policy Director	Florida Housing Finance Corporation	227 North Bronough St., Suite 5000	Tallahassee	FL	32301	850-488-4197	nancy.muller@floridahousing.org
Patricia Conley	Assistant Housing Finance Administrator	Delaware State Housing Authority	26 The Green	Dover	DE	19901	302-739-7416	tricia@destatehousing.com
Patricia Roset-Zuppa	Research Analyst	Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing	P.O. Box 115703	Gainesville	FL	32611	352-273-1195	roset@dcp.ufl.edu
Patrick Silver	Program Center Director, Florida Multifamily Housing Division	U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development	909 SE 1st Avenue, Suite 500	Miami	FL	33131	305-536-4498	patrick_f._silver@hud.gov
Paul Henkel	Assistant Director of Research, Planning & Technical Services	Tennessee Housing Development Agency	404 James Robertson Pkwy, Suite 1114	Nashville	TN	37027	615-741-9658	paul.henkel@state.tn.us
Peter Kasabach	Chief of Policy and Community Development	New Jersey Housing & Mortgage Finance Agency	P.O. Box 18550	Trenton	NJ	08650-2085	609-278-7457	pkasabach@njhmf.state.nj.us
Rachel Johnston	Director of Operations	Chicago Rehab Network	53 W. Jackson, #739	Chicago	IL	60604	312-663-3936	rachel@chicagorehab.org

Rae Ellen Packard	Director – Multifamily Housing Group	Wisconsin Housing & Economic Development Authority (WHEDA)	201 W. Washington Ave., Suite 700, P.O. Box 1728	Madison	WI	53701	608-266-6622	rae_ellen.packard@wheda.com
Rebecca Koepnick	Senior Project Manager	New York City Housing Preservation and Development	100 Gold Street, #5-211	New York	NY	10038	212-863-5134	koepnicr@hpd.nyc.gov
Ron LaFollette	Manager, Tax Credit Allocation	Colorado Housing & Finance Authority	1981 Blake Street	Denver	CO	80202	303-297-7331	ronl@colohfa.org
Sandy Rollins	Executive Director	Texas Tenants' Union	4228 Main Street	Dallas	TX	75226	214-823-3846	ttu@ont.com
Susan Parks	Chief Information Officer	Florida Housing Finance Corporation	227 North Bronough St., Suite 5000	Tallahassee	FL	32301	850-488-4197	susan.parks@floridahousing.org
Susanne Cannon	Douglas and Cynthia Crocker Endowed Director	DePaul University	1 E. Jackson Blvd.	Chicago	IL	60604	312-362-5905	scannon@depaul.edu
Todd Nedwick	Assistant Director, National Preservation Initiative	National Housing Trust	1101 30th Street, NW, Suite 400	Washington	DC	20007	202-333-8931	tnedwick@nhtinc.org
Tom Waters	Housing Policy Analyst	Community Service Society of New York	105 E. 22nd Street	New York	NY	10010	212-614-5366	twaters@cssny.org
Vincent O'Donnell	Vice President – Affordable Housing Preservation	Local Initiatives Support Corp (LISC)	95 Berkeley St., Suite 202	Boston	MA	02116	617-338-5173	vodonnell@lisc.org
William Brauner	Senior Project Manager	Community Economic Development Assistance Corp.	One Center Plaza, Suite 350	Boston	MA	02108	617-727-5944	bbrauner@isp.com

National Preservation Data Infrastructure Meeting, May 17-18, 2007
 Preservation Risk Analysis Presentation, Dr. Marc Smith and Patricia Roset-Zuppa

TYPICAL RISK VARIABLES

Extensive Risk Assessment	Intensive Risk Assessment
Year of subsidy termination: rental assistance contract expiration, mortgage maturity, prepayment eligibility or end of affordability restriction	
Type of ownership: non-profit, for-profit	
Strength of local market: project rent to Fair Market Rent; median home price appreciation rate; county median income to state-wide median income; metropolitan location; gentrifying market; and/or area poverty rate	
	Rental revenues and operating expenses
	Loan-to-value ratio
	Debt coverage ratio
	Economic occupancy: income from rented units divided by income if all units were occupied
	Conversion potential: current return from operating compared to estimated return after conversion
	Physical condition of property: e.g. REAC scores
	Capital needs and availability of reserves
	Exit tax liability, cash needs upon exit and cash availability
	Other existing funding and restrictions
	Target population
	Number of assisted units

RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES

	Extensive Risk Assessment ➤ <i>Use of public datasets</i>		Intensive Risk Assessment ➤ <i>Use of restricted datasets</i>	
Output: Property Level Data	TARGET INVENTORY AND RISK RATINGS		INDICATORS FOR FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION	
	<i>One-time Analysis</i>	<i>Regular Updates</i>	<i>One-time Analysis</i>	<i>Regular Updates</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Housing Partnership Corp. – LIHTC, 2001 ▪ Southern California Assoc. of Governments – HUD MF, 2000 ▪ Housing Development Center, Oregon – LIHTC, 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Economic Dev. Assistance Corp. – HUD & Local MF, 2007 ▪ Chicago Rehab Network – Sect.8, 2003 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GAO, national – HUD MF, 2004 ▪ Wisconsin Task Force for Preservation – Federal & State MF, 2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vermont HFA – Sect.8, 1988
Output: Aggregate Data	AGGREGATE AT-RISK PROPERTIES		STATISTICAL ANALYSIS: CROSS-TABULATIONS AND REGRESSION ANALYSIS	
	<i>One-time Analysis</i>	<i>Regular Updates</i>	<i>One-time Analysis</i>	<i>Regular Updates</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LISC Florida – HUD & RD MF, 2005 	---	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Econometrica/Abt for HUD, national – HUD MF, 2006 	---
	TARGET INVENTORY AND RISK RATINGS		INDICATORS FOR FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION	
	<i>One-time Analysis</i>	<i>Regular Updates</i>	<i>One-time Analysis</i>	<i>Regular Updates</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recap Advisors for Cook County – Federal & State & unregulated MF, 2002 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Housing Partnership Corp. – Federal MF, 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GAO, national – HUD MF, 2004 	---	

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- What has been your experience with developing and using a risk assessment method?
- Has it been a useful tool to identify properties at risk and to target preservation resources? Why or why not?
- Do you track properties and compare the risk assessment to what actually happened to the affordability?
- What has been the outcome of the risk assessment method? For example, number of units preserved?