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Learning Objectives

• Integrated Permanent Supportive Housing Approaches

• Overview of Section 811 PRA

• Update on FY 12 Section 811 PRA implementation and FY 13 NOFA
TAC Project Goal

• What can be learned from innovative Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) initiatives to inform future State ELI financing policy?

• Assess cost-effective ELI approaches:
  – Improve understanding of recent innovations in capital and unit subsidy financing
  – Advocate for broad spectrum of ELI need (e.g. 20% of AMI and below)
  – Promote effective mixed income ELI-PSH models
  – Inform future state National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) strategies.

• Section 811 Project-Based Rental Assistance Resource Overview
ELI Innovation: Integrated Permanent Supportive Housing

- PSH: Evidence-based housing approach for people with most significant and long term disabilities
  - Deep subsidies
  - Voluntary long-term services
- PSH is ELI: Most PSH tenants have SSI = 19% AMI (national average)
- State Housing Agency innovation/partnerships create integrated PSH units through LIHTC platform
- TAC “testing” 3-4 State PSH financing models
  - Illustrate potential for replication with NHTF
  - Increase ELI-PSH “buy in” from states
- Draft -- State Housing Agencies now reviewing TAC case studies
Environmental Factors/State Goals

- Barrier: Steep cuts in HUD capital and subsidy resources
- Imperative: Increasing state demand for integrated PSH units (e.g. Olmstead)
- A few pioneering states “pushing the ELI envelop” below 30% of AMI using innovative capital/subsidy approaches
- Strong partnerships with State HHS/Medicaid agencies to build PSH outreach and referral “infrastructure” (now required for Section 811 PRA program)
- Result: Shift from high debt/high subsidy to more capital intensive model with lower cost subsidy
- Potential compatibility with National Housing Trust Fund program
Evolution of ELI-PSH

- State Housing Finance Agencies (HFAs)
- Systems approach with LIHTC program as platform
- Variety of QAP policies
- Traditional HFA PSH model
  - Relatively high debt/high subsidy cost
  - Project-based subsidies (S+C, VASH, PBV)
  - Tenant-based subsidies (marketing requirements)
  - Both single site PSH and scattered-site
  - High rent subsidy cost (e.g. 110 percent rents) to cover debt service
- No “net” increase in ELI supply
ELI-PSH Phase I

- **HFA ELI innovation:**
  - **Goal:** Achieve deeper targeting in LIHTC properties (ELI w/o PBV)
  - **Strategy:** Mixed income integrated model with lower-debt/cross-subsidy approach
  - QAP policies benefitting special needs groups, including increasing supply of integrated accessible units and PSH units
  - LIHTC equity/gap financing to achieve 30% AMI rents
- **Outcomes:**
  - Strong developer participation
  - Difficulty reaching ELI populations below 30% of AMI
  - Higher vacancy rates
- **Stimulated effort to “get below 30% AMI”** through non-traditional financing
State ELI-PSH Phase II

- ELI-PSH Housing Finance Innovations
  - North Carolina: Shallow state subsidy
  - Pennsylvania: Enhanced LIHTC developer fee capitalizes rent reserve
  - Maryland and Illinois: “Post-underwriting” capital grant

- Potential replication using NHTF
  - Final NHTF rules?
  - Potential waiver strategies?
North Carolina Housing Finance Agency

• Integrated PSH program using LIHTC portfolio since 2002
• State appropriated Key Program (project-based) finances up to 10 year subsidy commitment (2,200+ PSH units)
  – QAP mandatory 10% LIHTC set-aside for PSH units
  – Tenant rent in PSH unit = 30% of tenant income
  – Voluntary owner participation in Key Program
  – State-wide payment standard approach (1 BR = $490)
  – Historical average subsidy payment of $205 monthly (2006-2013). Recently raised to average of $270 for 1 BR

• Outcomes:
  – Highly successful “shallow subsidy stream” for ELI units
  – Added approximately 200 PSH units to state supply per year
Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency

- Ten year initiative targeted primarily to people with disabilities
- Uses capitalized development funding from increased developers fee (generally from 15% to 20%) through QAP
- Utilizes 30% basis boost in Qualified Census Tracts
- Fills gap between 50% of AMI unit and 20% of AMI through a 15 year internal rent subsidy reserve
- Tenants pay the 20% AMI rent
- PHFA approves escrow agreement (including disbursement schedule) between developer and third party (typically a bank)
- Examples: 1 BR rent is $297 in Philadelphia and $244 in Pittsburgh
Weinberg Foundation

- Long history of support for housing for people with disabilities
- Pioneering shift to integrated ELI-PSH model
- Evolving approach (small scale): Maryland, Illinois and possibly Pennsylvania
- Utilizes capital grant to lower debt on first mortgage (post-underwriting)
- Capital Cost for 50% AMI unit = $180K-$190K
- Produces 15% of AMI rents for 30 years
- Potential to replicate with other private funding sources
- Efficient in terms of no ongoing admin. support required
Brief Section 811 History

• HUD’s first supportive housing program – provided capital grants and operating subsidy to non-profit housing/services groups

• In mid-1990s, Section 811 produced 3,000+ units per year

• Problems:
  – Inefficient “boutique” program
  – Extremely high per-unit cost
  – Rigid model created “disability only” housing
  – No linkages to state affordable housing/disability policy
  – Demand and appropriations declined
  – Only 600-800 units created annually between 2007-2010

• Section 811 needed to be reformed
Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2010

• Authorized major reforms to Section 811
• Project Rental Assistance (PRA) option:
  – A long-term supply of project-based permanent supportive housing (30 year use restriction)
  – Integrated housing: No more than 25% of units in a property with Section 811 PRA funds can have occupancy preferences for people with disabilities/supportive housing
  – State-driven supportive housing policies and partnerships through PRA Agreement between State Housing Agency, State HHS, and State Medicaid Agency
  – More cost effective and efficient model
## Supportive Housing Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>• HFA</td>
<td>• Low Income Housing Tax Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State or local govt.</td>
<td>• Bonds/Trust Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Private foundation</td>
<td>• HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Foundation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Subsidy</td>
<td>• HUD</td>
<td>• Section 811 PRA Demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>• State Medicaid Agency</td>
<td>• Money Follows Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State HHS Agency</td>
<td>• Medicaid Home and Community-Based Service (HCBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Medicaid Rehab option services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• State-funded services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 811 PRA: How Does It Work?

- Section 811 PRA provides competitive long-term project rental assistance funding – 30 year use restriction.
- State Housing Agencies are the primary applicant.
- Required: Formal PRA Agreement between State Housing Agency and State HHS/Medicaid agencies which:
  - Identifies target population(s) to be assisted;
  - Describes methods of outreach and referral to PHA units;
  - Includes state commitments of Medicaid and possibly other funding for supportive services for PRA tenants.
Section 811 PRA: How Does It Work?

• State Housing Agency policies create PRA units (i.e. using Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), bond financing, existing housing, etc.)
• PRA tenants offered voluntary long-term care services (Medicaid and state-financed)
• States create referral and tracking system to link individuals in the PRA target population to PRA units and services offered by state Medicaid/HHS agency
• Services must include housing support/retention
• Goal: Sustainable state-driven strategies to systematically expand supportive housing
Examples of Section 811 PRA Unit Strategies

- Developer of 100 unit affordable rental property agrees to include 5 Section 811 PRA units as a condition of receiving LIHTC from State Housing Agency.
- Non-profit developer agrees to include 12 Section 811 PRA units in a 50 unit project.
- State Housing Agency uses RFP process to identify owners willing to commit existing units for Section 811 PRA
- Looking forward: States commit Section 811 PRA subsidies to properties financed with National Housing Trust Fund resources
Section 811 PRA NOFAs

- FY 12 NOFA
  - Published 5/15/12
  - 35 States plus District of Columbia applied
  - 13 States awarded $98 million in PRA funding
  - Total of 3,530 new PRA units to be created

- Outcomes:
  - Higher than expected demand from states for new program
  - 35 States developed PRA Partnership Agreements for application
  - 400% increase in units, at 30% of the cost (compared to former Section 811 models)
  - Supportive housing units created “at scale” using mainstream federal housing programs and policies
## States that Applied in FY 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13 States Funded FY 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Housing Agency</th>
<th># of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Housing Finance Agency</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware State Housing Authority</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Housing Finance Authority</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Housing Development Authority</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Housing Corporation</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Dept. of Housing Community Development</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Dept. of Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Housing Agency</th>
<th># of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Housing Finance Agency</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Dept. of Commerce</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Housing Finance Agency</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Dept. of Housing &amp; Community Affairs</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Dept. of Commerce</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,530</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Update on FY 12 Awards

• New Program = New HUD policies including:
  – New HUD guidance (H 2013-24) issued 8-23-13
  – New HUD documents: Cooperative Agreement, Program Guidelines, Contracts Use Agreement, Model Lease
• “Where the rubber meets the road.” States now starting implementation
  – How to “operationalize” the PRA Agreement
    • How will outreach and referral really work?
    • Will Medicaid commitments cover all the services needed by PRA tenants?
    • How responsive will owners/developers be to State Housing Agency policies to procure PRA units?
      – Qualified Allocation Plan changes?
      – RFPs for existing units?
FY 12 Target Populations

- Must be between 18-61 per Section 811 statute
- Emphasis on ADA compliance consistent with U.S. Supreme Court’s 1999 *Olmstead* decision
  - States targeted people covered by State Olmstead Settlement Agreements (Illinois, Georgia, Delaware, North Carolina) including:
    - People in institutional settings (nursing homes, board and care facilities, public mental health/IDD institutions)
    - People who are homeless
    - People at-risk of institutionalization and/or homelessness
  - State Money Follows the Person (MFP) programs
  - Chronically homeless people who meet Section 811 criteria for long-term disability
FY13 Section 811 PRA NOFA

- Combined FY 2013 & FY 2014 appropriations in one NOFA
- $120 M in new Section 811 PRA funding for State Applicants
- 3,000 - 4,500 new supportive housing units*
- NOFA specifies...“The primary purpose of this program is to identify, stimulate, and support innovative state-level strategies that will transform and increase housing for extremely low-income persons with disabilities while also making available appropriate support and services.”
- Linkage to State Medicaid community-based long-term care services and supports
- Deadline for applications was May 14th
- HUD currently reviewing applications; expects award notification end of 2014 or early 2015

* Actual number of units funded will depend on state applications selected.
FY 13 Applications

• 34 State + DC applied

• 8 “new” state applied (new= states that did not apply in FY12)
  – Alabama, Arizona, Kentucky, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia

• 43 of 50 states or 86% of states applied in one or both rounds
States that Applied in FY 13

- Alabama (Huntsville HA)
- Alaska
- Arizona
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Georgia
- Hawaii
- Illinois
- Kentucky
- Maine
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Missouri
- Nevada
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Vermont
- Virginia
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin
- Washington, DC
What You Can Do

- Advocate for Section 811 PRA approach in your state
- Identify/engage state officials working on implementation (13 states)
- Learn if your state applied under either NOFA
- **Advocate with Congress for $235 million in Section 811 funding for FY 2015**
- Emphasize importance of providing National Housing Trust Fund resources to help create ELI – PRA units.
Examples of Integrated Supportive Housing Projects
The Franklin and Eleanor Apartments
Allegan County Supportive Housing Initiative
Commonwealth Apartments
Crane Ordway – Integrated Housing

- St. Paul, MN
- 70 affordable Units, 14 for people who are chronically homeless
- Harm reduction service model
For More Information on Supportive Housing Visit CSH’s Website at www.csh.org

Katrina Van Valkenburgh
Katrina.van@csh.org
Contact Us

Technical Assistance Collaborative, Inc. – TAC

@TACIncBoston

Visit us on the web: www.tacinc.org