PROPOSAL
Crescent Street
Affordable Housing & Playground Expansion

All information for this proposal is being posted on the CPC's webpage for this project, which is organized chronologically:

www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/crescent.asp

documents in this file, for independent consultant analysis commissioned by the CPC (reverse chronological order):

- 28 May 2018, consultant final report
- 20 April-9 May 2018, project team responses to consultant questions
- 12 March 2018, consultant's proposal and qualifications
- 22 February 2018, CPC request for quotations and scope of work

See also separate file with consultant follow-up, including executive summary and suggested alternative project approach.

Joseph Development Inc.

Report to the

City of Newton Community Preservation Committee

Regarding

CPC Funding Request for

Crescent Street Affordable Housing

May 28, 2018

1410 Ingraham St NW, Washington, DC 20011 202-829-1251 gjoseph@josephdev.com

Introduction

The City of Newton is proposing to repurpose the former Parks and Recreation Department administrative offices and maintenance facility at 70 Crescent Street as a mixed used property, which will include the expansion of the existing Reverend Ford Playground and the development of an 8-unit mixed income rental apartment building. The housing will be developed and owned by the City of Newton directly. The Community Preservation Committee of the City of Newton is evaluating a request for an investment of $2,935,000 in CPC funding in the project ($1,635,000 for housing and $1,300,000 for the Playground). The CPC has hired Joseph Development Inc. to assist them in evaluating the housing component of the proposal by performing the following scope of work:

a. Provide financial analysis of the proposal budgets submitted by the City of Newton to the Newton CPC dated March 6-22, 2018 including an evaluation of the completeness, feasibility/achievability, and economic risk level of the operating budgets, development budgets and terms for a non-City property manager;
b. Within the terms of the 2015 re-use order from the Newton City Council, recommend any feasible options for strengthening the economic feasibility and ratio of public benefits to public costs in this project's housing component, including but not limited to revisions in income/unit mix, funding sources, balance of debt to direct financing, and arrangements for property management.

Financial Analysis

Development Budget

Construction Cost - A detailed review of the construction plans and budget were excluded from this scope of work. While the costs appear to be excessively high in comparison to comparable affordable housing developments, a definitive judgement on this would require a detailed third-party review of the design plans and cost estimates. We have reviewed the commentary received by the CPC regarding the issue of costs. We concur with the overall sentiment that the construction costs for this project significantly exceed the typical costs on a per unit and per square foot basis for other new-construction affordable housing development currently being built in the greater Boston area. This assessment has been confirmed through anecdotal commentary from housing practitioners. It is clear also that the reason for the high cost is due to affirmative decisions and priorities established by the City, including:

- Low density – limiting the development to 8 units

- Larger than typical unit sizes and types - all large 2-and 3-bedroom units
- Inclusion of an elevator and individual entrances for each unit
- Inclusion of some market-rate units (for households at up to 120% of the Area Median Income), thereby requiring budgeting for a higher level of finishes
- Added procurement and prevailing wage costs associated with City-managed construction and City ownership

Appliances – Cost appears to be reasonable.

Utilities – This analysis assumes the estimated cost is correct. The high per-unit cost is due to the low density of the development.

Demolition and Hazmat Abatement – Costs should be proportionately split between Housing and Playground to fairly and properly quantify TDC (total development cost). Based on construction cost, 79% should be added to the Housing cost ($177,182 increase in total housing cost).

OPM (Owner's Project Manager) and Housing Consultant – Costs seem reasonable given the scope of work. It might actually might be light if the fee includes construction management and oversight.

Design and Engineering – Costs seem reasonable given the scope of work.

HERS (energy consultants) – Cost is high on a per-unit basis due to the project's low density.

Hazmat –Cost looks reasonable, though $18,000 allocated to "Other" should be split proportionately between Housing and Playground ($14,238 increase in total housing cost).

Survey, Geotech, Utility Back Charges, Admin and Printing, Non- GC Construction Work, Affordable Monitoring – Costs all seem reasonable. The cost per unit is high due to the project's low density.

Marketing/Initial Rent up - Assuming that an Affirmative Fair Marketing Plan must be followed for marketing and tenant selection, this line item seems very light. It should be at least $25,000 for advertising, staff time, selection lottery, etc.

<u>Missing Items</u>

Construction Period Interest – In the Standalone option, there is a $984,932 bond included as a source of funds. Even though this loan is backed by the good faith and credit of the City of Newton, this is a cost that will be incurred (even if it does not need to be paid) during construction and should be recognized and accounted for as a real expense. Assuming the full principal amount will be outstanding for an average of 9 months @ 3.75% interest, the estimated added cost would be $27,701.

Insurance During Construction – Since the City intends to self- insure, this is an in-kind cost.

Permits – Since the City intends to waive building permit fees, this is an in-kind cost.

Appraisal – If financing is going to backed by the City and not the real estate, an appraisal will not be required.

Legal – No legal costs are included in the budget. The City intends to utilize its in-house counsel for all legal services: document preparation and review, contract review, and, relative to the Standalone option, loan document review and closing. The estimated value of this in-kind cost is $50,000.

Title and recording – The City reports no title or recording will be necessary, as the property will continue to be owned by the City of Newton.

Capitalized Reserves – Typically development budgets include an initial capitalization of an operating/debt service reserve (usually equal to at least 3 months of operating expenses and debt service) and a replacement reserve. There is a note in the operating proforma indicating that reserves will be capitalized to the tune of $50,000 out of net cash flow. Draws on operating reserves most often occur during the early years of a project due to lease up problems or operating expenses that end up being under budgeted. Replacement reserves are most appropriately capitalized and funded by a fairly standard capital needs analysis, which will evaluate the useful life of all major physical elements of the property and project out the likely cost and timing of replacement for each element. Based on such an analysis, a determination can be made as to whether it is advisable and necessary to establish an initial capitalization of the replacement reserve account. If the City intends to be the ultimate safety net for this project, then perhaps the capitalization of the reserve accounts may be unnecessary. If that is not the case, I would recommend an additional $50,000 be included in the development budget for replacement and operating reserves.

FF&E – There is no line item for FF&E. Typically, this line item covers items such as common area furniture and decorations, maintenance and office equipment. This may prove to be a very small item assuming third party off-site property management and maintenance, but an allowance for some costs in this regard would be prudent ($16,000)

Sources of Funds

Given the small-scale nature of the project and the mandate that the project be developed and owned by the City itself, the opportunities to secure external funding for this project are extremely limited. The projected costs per unit are far in excess of the cost limits that have been established for most affordable housing resources that are available through the Commonwealth. Most state programs presume a for profit or non-profit developer, not a municipality, and a single-purpose ownership entity. Nevertheless, given the size of the investment being made by the City directly it would be worth the effort to see if, through some redesign of the project coupled with some potential flexibility on the part of the Commonwealth, some level of funding could be secured from the state. The programs which might warrant pursuit include the Community Scale Housing Initiative, the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and the Mass Housing Workforce Housing Program.

Community Scale Housing could provide up to a million dollars of funding for the project. This program's guidelines, however, call for a TDC cap of $350,000 per unit and a single-purpose ownership entity.

Variance between "Affordable Housing" Option and "Standalone" Option

Both optional financing plans assume $1,635,000 of CPA funds, an investment of over $200,000 per unit and over $270,000 per affordable unit.

Both options also assume $750,000 in inclusionary zoning funds, another $125,000 per affordable unit.

Beyond this, the two options take two very different approaches. The Affordable Housing Option essentially assumes that 100% of the remainder of funding needed would come from City resources through the Rainy-Day Fund and Health Holiday Fund – nearly $390,000 per affordable unit and approximately $290,000 per unit for the total number of units. While this is an almost unprecedented level of local government investment in housing on a per-unit basis, it does represent a more secure approach to financing this project than the Standalone approach represents. Without any debt involved, the City would have the flexibility of increasing the project's level of affordability, for example by swapping out the two 120% of AMI units for two additional 80% of AMI units. The change would reduce the NOI (net operating income) by $21,331 per year but, with no debt to service, the tradeoff would not impact feasibility and would allow for an improved level of public benefit in relation to the public investment. Further, there is market risk associated with the 120% of AMI units. In our opinion, the 80% of AMI units would generate far more demand and would be far more stable in terms of keeping them rented.

On the other hand, if the bond financing is perceived as an additional source of City funding for the project (which in actuality it is), rather than a source that is secured and financed based on the real estate, these concerns might be unfounded.

In the Standalone option, it is assumed that $350,000 of HOME and $1,000,000 of CDBG funds would be invested in the project. Assuming these funds are available out of the City's federal funding allocations, these funds bring some additional complications to the project that would need to be addressed, including:

HOME – As a general rule, the HOME program requires the City to target 20% of HOME assisted units to tenants at incomes less than 50% of AMI. It is our understanding that this that does not necessarily have to be met on a project by project basis, but this should be confirmed with HUD. There are also cost limits on a per-unit basis for HOME assisted units that need to be complied with. Given the high cost of the Crescent Street apartments, this requirement might prove challenging to meet.

CDBG – The use of CDBG funds for new construction is prohibited. It might be possible to use CDBG funds for demolition, site preparation and site utilities, but it does not appear that there are $1,000,000 in potentially CDBG-eligible costs in the development budgets provided. It is recommended that confirmation from HUD be sought to be sure that site preparation and infrastructure costs incurred to prepare a site for new housing construction are indeed eligible uses of CDBG funds. To meet the CDBG eligibility requirements, at least 51% of the units in the development need to be set aside for households with incomes of less than 80% of AMI, but the current proposed unit mix would comply with this requirement.

Debt Financing – It appears that the rationale for including market (120% of AMI) rents in the project is to generate sufficient net operating income to support the repayment of principal and interest for bond financing. Conceptually this makes sense if the expectation is that the bond is to be underwritten and fully supported by the real estate. If, however, the financing is a general obligation bond backed by the good faith and credit of the City of Newton, then essentially the funds should be recognized as another source of City funding, in lieu of drawing funds from the Rainy Day or Healthy Holiday funds.

If the expectation is that the real estate will fully support the debt, there are what we believe to be formidable risks associated with debt financing and the associated market rents that would be required to service the debt. As will be elaborated upon later in this report, we believe that the 120% of AMI rents are essentially market rents. These target rents place this project in direct competition with conventional market-rate housing in the area. Someone with the ability to pay in excess of $2500 per month in rent (plus utilities) would have many options in that price range in the local market for properties with much higher levels of amenities, in locations that are potentially more desirable. It might seem that filling only two units at this rent level should not be very problematic. However, the impact of not being able to achieve that rent level could be significant if the City is counting on the revenue to pay the debt service on the bonds.

<u>Operating Budget</u>

We reviewed the projected operating budget for the Crescent Street Apartments by cost category and compared it to a sampling of other properties in the market area that we were able to identify, as well as the information provided by the Mass Housing Partnership based upon similar properties in their portfolio. For the most part the proposed operating budget appears to be more than sufficient, and it is generally at the high end of the spectrum.

Specific Cost Categories

	Crescent Street budget per unit	**MHP Data Base per unit**	**JDI sample data per unit**
Management Fee and Administrative Costs	$3,430	$2,113	$ 3,456
Maintenance costs	$3,580	$2,777	$,2854
Insurance	$451	$ 600	$ 374
Common Utilities	$982	not available	$ 786
Capital reserves	$1,077	not available	$ 374

As can be seen above, the Crescent Street budget is comparable or significantly higher than the comparative samples in all categories except for insurance, where Crescent does appear to be somewhat under budget. Note also that included in the Crescent operating budget is a $1077 per-unit contribution to operating reserves (in additional to the capital reserve). Most rental properties do not make annual contributions to an operating reserve. Instead, operating reserves are capitalized from the development budget. In this case, the annual contributions represent an added cushion in the operations of the property.

At over $10,500 per unit per year, with no real estate taxes, the proposed operating budget appears to be more than adequate. DHCD has reported that for underwriting purposes for their funding they look for operating budgets (including taxes) not to exceed $9500 per unit per year. We would urge the City to engage a professional property management firm as early as possible in the development process to better flush out this budget. Given the small size of the project, it may be prudent to anticipate that the operating costs will potentially be significantly higher than other affordable rental properties on a per-unit basis. There is no scale to the project to spread or absorb any unforeseen costs that inevitably may occur. However, if it can be reasonably expected that the property's operating costs will be lower, it opens the potential of either reducing rents or generating more net operating income to recover some of the City's expected capital investment in the project.

Rents

Based on a review of the rent calculation worksheet provided by the City, it appears that the rents have been set at the maximum level within each income category. For example, the 60% of AMI 2- bedroom rent is set at $1,152. This rent was calculated as follows:

> 60% of AMI income for 3-person household = $55,860
>
> $55,860/12 =$ 4,655 monthly income
>
> $4,655 times 30% = maximum gross rent -$1,397
>
> $1,397 minus utility allowance of $245 = net rent of **$1,152**

In calculating the rent this way, there is not a “band of income” for tenants who both income qualify at the 60% level and for whom the rent would be no more than 30% of their income – families with incomes less than the 60% of the AMI maximum would have to have housing expenses greater than 30% of their income. They could in fact pay more than 30% of their income and rent the unit, but most affordable housing developers and investors like to see rents set at levels that are at least 5% to 10% below the maximum allowable for each income category. This insures that the property has a “wider band” of income-eligible applicants to draw upon in the marketing and rent up of units.

Note that the City has calculated the projected rents based on the 2017 (HUD Income Limits). The published rents limits for 2018 are higher than 2017, so there would be a somewhat wider income band if the proposed rents can be held constant.

120% AMI Market Rents

Based on the information available to us, it is difficult to see the advisability of the 120% of AMI units that are included in the plan. It appears the motivation for the 120% of AMI units is principally to increase revenue so as to generate a higher level of operating income to “service” the bond debt. We believe this is an unwise approach for the following reasons:

1) Given the rent levels of these units, they are effectively competing with market-rate units in the area.

2) Whereas the affordable units should have virtually insatiable demand, these units will be the most difficult to keep rented.

3) While the rents are at the lower end of the scale of market units, the competition appears to have many more amenities that would be attractive to tenants who have the financial ability to choose – fitness centers, high end finishes, swimming pools, business centers, etc.

4) Paradoxically, the inclusion of these units actually increases the project's level of risk.

5) Given the extremely high level of local investment in this project, it would seem that the desired outcome would be to maximize the public benefit by increasing the degree of affordability of the project. The focus should be on providing more housing opportunities to people who want or need to live in Newton (teachers, police officers, etc.) but are unable to afford it.

Vacancy

The 10% vacancy rate being used in the budget is higher than typical. Affordable housing vacancy rates are usually underwritten at a 5-7% rate. However, given the size of the property, it is prudent to carry a higher than normal vacancy rate. At 10%, the property is budgeting only 10 vacant unit -months per year.

Terms of Proposed Property Management Contract

We have reviewed the scope of work included in the RFP for the prospective Property Management Firm for the project in conjunction with a firm that was invited to apply but declined to respond. Their feedback was that the scope of work being requested appeared to be complete, generally reasonable and for the most part typical for third party management contracts. However, there are a number of provisions in the sample Owner-Manager Agreement that appear onerous and out of the ordinary. These include:

- Management contract being subject to appropriation, potentially can be terminated if appropriations are not made
- Selection of tenants based on "merit" (not sure what is meant by this, but this could be a violation of affirmative fair housing requirements)
- Language referencing the signing of bond lodgments and refunds (what are these?)
- Inspections of units every 4 months (usually limited to once a year)
- Warranty language relative to the work of the Manager
- Indemnification language

Overall, the Contract form that was included in the RFP does not seem to be appropriate or typical for a typical owner-property manager agreement for residential real estate. We believe it creates confusion for a potential responder and likely contributed to the lack of response that was received when the RFP was issued.

In addition, the comment was made that the Insurance requirements listed in the RFP are excessive for a property of this size and could likely only be met by a large management company.

The problems cited with the RFP and the reasons for not responding included the following:

1) Inefficiency of managing a property with only 8 units – unless a management company is managing other properties in close proximity to Crescent Street, the management operation would be extremely inefficient and costly.
2) Anticipation that the property could not afford to pay a management fee to the management company commensurate with the effort required.
3) The limit of the proposed term of the contract to 1 year, plus two optional extensions of one year each. The scope of work includes a considerable period of service during the predevelopment period - most likely at least 6-12 months for initial organizational work, initial rent up and market. It is unclear if that is part of the initial contract term.
4) The RFP submission requirements themselves are onerous and burdensome given the size of the contract. The time and effort involved in responding is not seen as worth it given the size of the property.
5) Potential burden and confusion relative to the municipal government being the direct owner of the property.

Conclusions

The costs of this project are indeed significantly higher than those of most other affordable housing properties currently being developed in the greater Boston area.

The higher costs are a result of the objectives and constraints that the City has imposed on itself for this project: low density; large unit sizes; inclusion of an elevator; integration with the Playground; and City ownership.

Without a major redesign of the project, there are likely no alternative ways to finance the project that could involve non-municipal resources.

If in the City's perspective, this is a public-purpose project backed by the good faith and credit of the City, the objective should be to maximize the public benefit rather than artificially trying to recover costs through the servicing of the bond.

Several costs in the development budget need to be revisited as they appear to be missing or under budgeted. These include: marketing and rent-up; FF&E; and Capitalized Reserves. For budgeting purposes, it is common practice to include capitalized reserves in the development budget. Alternatively, the City could go without reserves and assume that it will appropriate additional funds as needed to cover any operating deficits or needed capital improvements.

In addition, in order for the City to have a full appreciation of the scale and value of the investment it would be making in this project, in-kind or contributed costs from the City should be quantified as well. These include: the value of contributed land; the proportional cost of demolition and hazmat abatement; interest expense on bonds accrued during construction (assuming bond financing is utilized); waived building permit fees; contributed legal services; the value of self-insurance during construction; as well as an estimate of the value of contributed staff time invested in the management of the development process.

The operating budget appears to be adequate. The only question we have relative to the operating budget is whether or not a professional management company can be procured for this project at a management fee that can be covered within the management and administrative cost categories

The RFP that was issued to solicit the services of a Property Management Company was confusing and burdensome given the scale of the assignment.

The proposed rents are all set at the maximum level for each income tier. This will potentially create difficulty in filling units because the band of affordability for each unit type will be very small.

Recommendations

- Forgo the 120% of AMI units and replace them with additional units at 80% of AMI or below.
- Review the design and construction scope of work to determine where it might be cut back in light of eliminating the 120% of AMI units.
- Adjust rents to at least 5% below the maximum rent per unit type/income level.
- Unless the City is willing to consider a major revision of the project in terms of physical design and ownership structure, the realization needs to be made that the project is going to essentially be 100% self-funded but for any HOME or CDBG funds that could be invested.
- If the City desires to utilize general obligation bonds to fund the project, these bonds should be viewed as funding sources for the City, not funds that will necessarily be recovered over time out of the property. The entire cost of the project would be covered through whatever combination of CPA funds, Inclusionary Zoning Funds, Rainy Day Funds, Health Holiday Funds, Home Funds, CDBG Funds and/or general obligation bonding that the City can develop a consensus for.
- Regarding property management, the difficulty in procuring a property management firm appears to be a by -product of the City's direct ownership of the property. The public procurement and contracting requirements, compounded by the small size of the project, may make it very difficult to secure the services of a qualified professional management firm. One option to explore would be to delegate the management responsibility to the Newton Housing Authority rather than the City directly. It is possible that they would be able to handle the relationship in a way that is more consistent with a

typical Owner-Manager relationship. Additionally, the RFP needs to be streamlined and made easier to respond to. The RFP's attached sample Owner-Manager Agreement needs to be revised or replaced with a more standard form of contract. The focus should be on identifying smaller local managers (perhaps local non-profits) that could potentially manage this in conjunction with other properties in the vicinity.

Commentary

The biggest challenges involved in producing affordable housing are finding sites, raising capital and securing local approval – a three-legged stool. The Crescent Street project has all three of these elements in place, but at a significant cost relative to the scale of the project. The debate over this project appears to be not over whether or not building this housing is a good idea, but over whether or not the objective could be accomplished more cost effectively and with a higher level of return on investment in terms of production of affordable units.

The greater Boston area has a national reputation as a repository of high-quality and accomplished for-profit and non-profit affordable housing developers and operators. In addition, Massachusetts is in the top tier of states in the country in terms of investing financial resources in the production and preservation of affordable housing.

The City of Newton should be commended for making the effort to produce affordable housing through the development of the Crescent Street site. The amount of local funds that the City is potentially going to invest in this project is significant and perhaps unprecedented in the Commonwealth.

However, in choosing to do this project on its own, Newton may be being short-sighted in not taking advantage of the resources available. Historically, local investment in affordable housing by a municipality is typically leveraged many times over with other public and private resources.

As outside consultants to the CPC, we are certainly not fully appreciative of the process and politics that have brought the Crescent Street project to where it is today. Given the combination of site, capital and local support that has evolved for Crescent Street, perhaps there are no reasonable alternatives to what has evolved as a development plan. However, it is certainly worth speculating about the scale, leverage of resources and level of affordability in the housing that might result if the City made in excess of $5 million in capital and in-kind contributions available to potential housing developers.

<u>Appendix attached by CPC staff:</u>

Crescent Street Project Team Responses to Consultant Questions, 9 May 2018 (5 p.)

appendix to final consultant report
submitted 28 May 2018

PROPOSAL
Crescent Street
Affordable Housing & Playground Expansion

recent responses to questions & information requests from consultant or the CPC:

- rent & utility calculations (3 pp)
- answers to consultant questions about cost & revenue assumptions (1 p)

All public information submitted to the CPC,
including the consultant scope of work & qualifications
and the proposal's updated budgets/funding plans from March 2018,
is posted on this webpage:
www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/crescent.asp

1 Bedroom Units Affordable Rents

AMI		Monthly Income	Maximum Rent (30% of Monthly Income)	Maximum Rent (Less Utility Allowance, $334)
50%	$ 41,400	$ 3,450	$ 1,035	$ 864
60%	$ 49,680	$ 4,140	$ 1,242	$ 1,071
70%	$ 57,960	$ 4,830	$ 1,449	$ 1,278
80%	$ 62,550	$ 5,213	$ 1,564	$ 1,393
85%	$ 70,380	$ 5,865	$ 1,760	$ 1,589
90%	$ 74,520	$ 6,210	$ 1,863	$ 1,692
95%	$ 78,660	$ 6,555	$ 1,967	$ 1,796
99%	$ 81,972	$ 6,831	$ 2,049	$ 1,878
110%	$ 91,080	$ 7,590	$ 2,277	$ 2,106
120%	$ 99,360	$ 8,280	$ 2,484	$ 2,313

2 Bedroom Units Affordable Rents

AMI		Monthly Income	Maximum Rent (30% of Monthly Income)	Maximum Rent (less Utility Allowance, $245)
50%	$ 46,550	$ 3,879	$ 1,164	$ 919
60%	$ 55,860	$ 4,655	$ 1,397	$ 1,152
70%	$ 65,170	$ 5,431	$ 1,629	$ 1,384
80%	$ 70,350	$ 5,863	$ 1,759	$ 1,514
85%	$ 79,135	$ 6,595	$ 1,978	$ 1,733
90%	$ 83,790	$ 6,983	$ 2,095	$ 1,850
95%	$ 88,445	$ 7,370	$ 2,211	$ 1,966
99%	$ 92,169	$ 7,681	$ 2,304	$ 2,059
110%	$ 102,410	$ 8,534	$ 2,560	$ 2,315
120%	$ 111,720	$ 9,310	$ 2,793	$ 2,548

3 Bedroom Units Affordable Rents

AMI		Monthly Income	Maximum Rent (30% of Monthly Income)	Maximum Rent (less Utility Allowance, $334)
50%	$ 51,700	$ 4,308	$ 1,293	$ 959
60%	$ 62,040	$ 5,170	$ 1,551	$ 1,217
70%	$ 72,380	$ 6,032	$ 1,810	$ 1,476
80%	$ 78,150	$ 6,513	$ 1,954	$ 1,620
85%	$ 87,890	$ 7,324	$ 2,197	$ 1,863
90%	$ 93,060	$ 7,755	$ 2,327	$ 1,993
95%	$ 98,230	$ 8,186	$ 2,456	$ 2,122
99%	$ 102,366	$ 8,531	$ 2,559	$ 2,225
110%	$ 113,740	$ 9,478	$ 2,844	$ 2,510
120%	$ 124,080	$ 10,340	$ 3,102	$ 2,768

*Income derived from MHP 2017 Income Limits for Affordable Units

* Newton City (Boston MSA) Median Income: $103,400

Newton Housing Authority *		
Section 8 Utility Allowances		
	Utility Allowances	**Notes**
1-bedroom	$ 171	Natural gas system assumed for heating
2-bedroom	$ 245	Natural gas system assumed for heating
3-bedroom	$ 334	Natural gas system assumed for heating

* Requested from Newton Housing Authority on 6/1/2017

Allowances for Tenant-Furnished Utilities and Other Services

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing

Locality	Unit Type	Date
Newton, Massachusetts	High Rise [Top and Bottom]	October 1, 2016

Utility or Service		Monthly Dollar Allowance						
		EFF	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR	6 BR
Heating:	a. Natural Gas	29	39	53	65	79	92	
	b. Bottle Gas							
	c. Oil/Electric	51/44	69/67	94/92	115/112	140/137	163/159	
	d. Coal/Other							
Cooking:	a. Natural Gas	6	7	8	10	12	14	
	b. Bottle Gas							
	c. Electric	6	8	9	13	19	26	
	d. Coal/Other							
Other Electric		34	41	58	65	77	85	
Air Conditioning								
Water Heat:	a. Natural Gas	11	15	18	21	24	28	
	b. Bottle Gas							
	c. Oil/Electric	19/30	27/43	35/49	43/61	55/67	62/80	
	d. Coal/Other							
Water		10	20	29	61	84	106	
Sewer		15	30	59	91	122	153	
Trash Collection								
Range / Microwave								
Refrigerator		3	3	3	3	4	4	
Natural Gas Customer Charge		9	9	9	9	9	9	

ACTUAL FAMILY ALLOWANCE be used by family to compute allowances. Complete below for actual unit rented.

Name of Family

Address of Unit

Number of Bedrooms

Utility or Service	Per Month Cost
Heating	$
Cooking	
Other Electric	
Air Conditioning	
Water Heating	
Water	
Sewer	
Trash Collection	
Range/Microwave	
Refrigerator	
Other	

Costs:

- **What are the assumptions about the quality of finishes - flooring, cabinets, appliances, etc.?**
  At this point we are carrying sufficient funds to allow for flexibility in finishes like countertops, appliances, and cabinets. Flooring is assumed to be ceramic tile in the bathrooms, and vct /carpet in the rest of the spaces. Although our cost estimates are based on these types of finishes, we are carrying a figure that allows for some flexibility throughout the spaces. We are not carrying funds for "high end" finishes.

- **Will the project be self-insured by the City, both during and after construction?**
  The contractor will be required to have bonds and insurance throughout the construction phase of the project. After that the city will assume the insurance responsibilities for the asset itself, while renters will be responsible for renters' insurance for the contents. The City's projected insurance costs have been included in the pro-forma.

- **Will City building permit fees be waived?**
  Yes

- **Will the property be transferred to a new entity or will it be held in title by the City? Any need for recording costs or title insurance?**
  The property will be held in title by the City of Newton. The City will cover any costs associated with any recordings and/or title issues.

- **Is no appraisal needed, if the project is funded partly through bonding?**
  No appraisal is needed regardless of funding mechanism.

- **Will the City cover these costs: legal services, any bond payments due during construction (before the project is generating revenue), and any capital costs or operating deficits that precede or exceed the capitalization of the capital & replacement reserves from project revenue?**
  The city has staff counsel so there will be no additional legal costs incurred. No bond payments are expected to be due during construction. The City of Newton does accept and acknowledge the fiduciary risks associated with this project, and we will not allow a deficit of any kind to occur.

Funding:

- **Are the funding sources included in the two options interchangeable? For example, can the Rainy Day Fund or the Heath Holiday Fund be used in the Standalone option as well as the Affordable Housing option?**
  For the purposes of this evaluation, we would ask that the scenarios be analyzed as presented. Funding mechanisms are fluid, and can be structured in a multitude of ways. That said, we would be open to suggestions should the review find that a hybrid funding structure is optimal.

- **Has the city confirmed with HUD that the use of HOME or CDBG funds for this project would be an eligible use of funds?**
  There are significant elements within this project that would be eligible for these funds. We understand that these funds could not, and would not, be used for the new construction portion of this project. Demolition, site preparation, utilities, and other eligible costs may be submitted when this project moves forward.

PROPOSAL
Crescent Street
Affordable Housing & Playground Expansion

Background for
Independent Consultant Analysis of Project Financials
Commissioned by Community Preservation Committee

- **CPC Request for Quotations/Scope of Work** (22 February 2018)
- **Selected Consultant's Proposal & Qualifications** (12 March 2018)

All information for this proposal is being posted on the CPC's webpage for this project, which is organized chronologically:

www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/crescent.asp

City of Newton

Ruthanne Fuller
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts

Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Barney S. Heath
Director

Community Preservation Committee

Request for Quotations: Affordable Housing Proposal Financial Analysis

22 February 2018

Background: The City of Newton is expanding the Reverend Louis Ford Playground and developing 8 new units of mixed-income rental housing on City-owned property at 70 Crescent Street, just south of the Massachusetts Turnpike in Newton's West Newton/Auburndale neighborhood. The 2015 Board of Aldermen/City Council order governing the reuse of this property requires a maximum of 8 housing units, with at least 4 affordable, and requires the City itself to develop and own both the housing and the site as a whole.

To date, $360,000 of Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds and $398,500 of City, non-CPA funds have been appropriated for site assessments, site cleanup, initial design and feasibility planning, including work by the City's Public Buildings, Parks & Recreation and Planning & Development departments; by City Point Partners and the Ciccolo Group as Owner's Project Managers; and by Abacus Architects + Planners and Crosby|Schlesinger|Smallridge as designers.

Consultant Scope of Work: To inform its deliberations on the additional $1,479,930 in CPA funds requested for final design and construction of this project's housing component, the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) is seeking a consultant with experience in the financing and development of affordable housing to review the following documents for the housing component only:

1. 10- and 20-year projected operating budgets, including rents for both income-restricted and unrestricted units
2. development budget, including both uses and sources
3. proposed terms for a non-City property manager

The CPC would like this review to

a. evaluate the completeness, feasibility/achievability, and economic risk level of the documents above, including their financial projections and assumptions

b. within the terms of the 2015 re-use order, recommend any feasible options for strengthening the economic viability and ratio of public benefits to public costs in this project's housing component, including but not limited to revisions in income/unit mix, funding sources, balance of debt to direct financing, and arrangements for property management

Price quotations should include two additional tasks, for which travel costs will be reimbursed separately at current federal rates:

- **a site visit, which the CPC strongly recommends;** please include time for this in your price quotation
- **discussion of the analysis in person with the CPC at one public meeting in Newton;** since the CPC may or may not request this, please quote it separately, as an hourly rate

Submission Instructions & Timeline (continued on page 2)**:**

If the projected timeline below is not feasible for you but you are otherwise willing to provide this analysis, please submit your minimum feasible timeline along with your price quotation.

Submission Instructions & Timeline (continued from page 1)**:**

- By 2 March 2018, please submit to Community Preservation Program Manager Alice Ingerson at aingerson@newtonma.gov a written price quotation for this analysis, along with a brief resume or summary of experience addressing the qualifications listed below.
- To assist the CPC in meeting public procurement requirements, if you are not available or for other reasons prefer not to submit a price quotation, please send us a brief email stating that.

If the CPC receives the required number of written quotes and responses by 2 March 2018**,**

- By 6 March 2018, the CPC will confirm in writing its choice of consultant and agreement to proceed and will provide updated project documents for the consultant's review.
- By 21 March 2018, the consultant should submit a draft analysis to the CPC.
- By 26 March 2018, the consultant should participate in a conference call with CPC officers and staff, to review the draft analysis.
- By 2 April 2018, the consultant should submit the final analysis for publication on the CPC website and for discussion at the CPC's 10 April 2018 public meeting.

As noted above, the CPC recognizes that it may need to extend this timeline. If the projected timeline is not feasible for you but you are otherwise willing to provide this analysis, please submit your minimum feasible timeline along with your price quotation.

Budget:

- The CPC has budgeted a maximum of $10,000 for this analysis.

Consultant qualifications:

- 10 years of professional experience in affordable housing finance and development, or professional participation as a funder, developer or consultant in at least 7 successfully completed projects that included deed-restricted affordable housing; experience should include both all-affordable and mixed-income projects
- familiarity with Massachusetts affordable housing funding sources and regulatory requirements
- familiarity with the Massachusetts Community Preservation Act's eligibility criteria for housing projects

Additional background information online:

Newton CPC webpage for Crescent Street project, including phased project proposals, minutes of CPC discussions and votes, and community letters:
www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/crescent.asp

City of Newton webpage for Crescent Street project:
www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/hcd/crescent_street.asp

Joseph Development Inc.

Memorandum

To: Alice Ingerson, Program Manager, Community Preservation Program
City of Newton, MA

From: Gerry Joseph, President

Date: March 12, 2018

Re: Financial Analysis Services – Crescent St Affordable Housing Proposal

I am responding to your Request for Quotations dated February 22, 2018 relative to providing Financial Analysis Services to the Newton Community Preservation Program. Based on your correspondence, my understanding of the scope of work is as follows:

a. Provide Financial Analysis of the proposal submitted by the City of Newton to the Newton CPC dated March 6, 2018 including an evaluation of the completeness, feasibility/achievability, and economic risk level of the operating budgets, development budgets and terms for a non-City property manager;
b. Within the terms of the 2015 re-use order from the Newton City Council, recommend any feasible options for strengthening the economic feasibility and ratio of public benefits to public costs in this project's housing component, including but not limited to revisions in income/unit mix, funding sources, balance of debt to direct financing, and arrangements for property management

My fee proposal for these services is as follows:

Financial Analysis Services: Fixed fee of $8,000.

Additional fee of $1000 per trip (including travel expenses) for each of two potential visits to Newton for site visit and/or meeting with CPC to discuss analysis

Assuming a contract is awarded by March 16th, the work can be completed by May 4, 2018 **

Attached please find my Qualifications Package for your review. I look forward to discussing this further at your convenience.

** Based on approval of terms on 26 March 2018,
the new target date for completion is 18 May 2018.

1410 Ingraham St NW, Washington, DC 20011 202-829-1251 gjoseph@josephdev.com

Joseph Development Inc.

Qualifications and Experience

February 2018

Joseph Development Inc 1410 Ingraham St. NW, Washington DC 20011

Joseph Development Inc.

Real Estate Development & Consulting

OFFICE
1410 Ingraham Street NW
Washington, DC 20011

PHONE
202.829.1251

CELL
413.348.0695

EMAIL
gjoseph@josephdev.com

JOSEPH DEVELOPMENT INC. , *is a real estate development and consulting company, that specializes in the development of affordable rental and for sale housing. The principal of the company, Gerry Joseph, has over 30 years experience in the affordable housing and community development industry. He has worked as a developer, Senior Manager, Director and consultant for nons profit developm ent organizations at the neighborhood, regional and national levels.*

EXPERIENCE

- **Vice President and Director of Real Estate Development**, Community Preservation and Development Corporation – Washington DC
- **Vice President/Director of Massachusetts Operations**, The Community Builders Inc. – Boston, MA
- **Executive Director**, Franklin County Community Development Corporation, - Greenfield, MA
- **Director of Development,** Brightwood Development Corporation – Springfield, MA

AREAS OF EXPERTISE

- Development of affordable rental housing (LIHTC and mixed income) Multi-family housing rehabilitation and new construction
- Work outs and restructuring of troubled assets
- Historic preservation
- Green building design, financing and construction
- Comprehensive neighborhood revitalization
- Public housing redevelopment
- Mixed income homeownership
- Senior independent living
- Household model skilled nursing home development
- Management and operations of non-profit housing and community development organizations
- Financial Structuring utilizing public and private sector resources
- Coordination and management of development team members
- Building stakeholder and community collaboration and consensus

RANGE OF SERVICES

- New business development
- Financial Structuring
- Development project management
- Feasibility Analysis
- Needs assessment/Market Analysis
- Due diligence
- Permits and entitlement approvals
- Project design and development
- Comprehensive neighborhood revitalization planning and development
- Securing debt, equity and gap financing
- Syndication of LIHTC
- Staff training and mentoring

Joseph Development

Client List

The O'Connell Companies, Holyoke MA
Sisters of Providence, Holyoke MA
MBL Housing and Development, Springfield MA
New England Farm Workers Council, Springfield, Ma
HAP Inc. Springfield, MA
Home City Development Inc., Springfield, MA
Harwell Homes Cooperative, Cambridge MA
The Community Builders, Boston MA
Maloney Properties, Wellesley, MA
Volunteers of America, Alexandria VA
Wesley Housing Development Corporation, Alexandria VA
Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing, Arlington VA
Arlington Retirement Housing Corporation, Arlington VA
Community Lodgings Inc., Alexandria, VA
Housing Development Corporation, - Mid-Atlantic, Lancaster, PA
Telesis Corporation, Washington DC
Cornerstones Housing Corporation, Reston Va
Community Preservation and Development Corp, Washington DC
National Housing Trust, Washington DC
N Street Village Inc., Washington DC
District of Columbia Housing Authority, Washington DC
Memorial Apartments Corporation, Baltimore, MD
Gragg Cardona Partners, Washington DC

Joseph Development Inc.

Current and Recent Project List
November 2017

1621 Flats, Washington DC
Project: Redevelopment of 9-unit apartment building on Capitol Hill into market rate condominiums – Completed 2015
Role: Developer in cooperation with Tenant Association

Harwell Homes Cooperative, Cambridge MA
Project: Harwell Homes Cooperative – Recapitalization and Renovation of a Limited Equity Cooperative at the expiration of its HUD 236 mortgage – Completed, 2015
Role: Lead developer on behalf of Resident Cooperative (56 units)

N Street Village Inc., Washington DC
Project: Recapitalization and Renovation of of N Street Village following expiration of initial 15 year LIHTC Compliance Period using tax exempt bonds, Housing Production Trust Funds, and LIHTC. Facility provides 51 affordable apartments as well as 44 units of permanent supportive housing. Project entailed renovation of residential space as well as redesign and repurposing of over 25,000 square feet of programmatic and administrative space occupied by the owner/sponsor. Residential Phase Complete; Phase 2 in construction
Role: Developer on behalf of Non-profit Service provider for Homeless Women (95 units)

Gragg Cardona Partners
Project: Arnold Gardens, Suitland MD – Acquisition and Renovation of project based Section 8 development utilizing

Tax Exempt Bonds, LIHTC and HOME funds from Price George's County
Role: Development Consultant for start up for profit developer (68 units) – Completed, 2017

Reston Interfaith Housing Corporation, Reston VA
Project: Apartments at Northpoint – acquisition and recapitalization of LIHTC project at the expiration of initial 15-year compliance period by non-profit General Partner/Sponsor
Role: Development Consultant – secured acquisition and rehab financing (40 units) – Completed 2015

Arlington Retirement Housing Corporation, Arlington VA
Project: Culpepper Gardens – senior housing -
Role: Development Consultant – development of a plan for recapitalization of HUD assisted Senior property at the expiration of its HUD 236 mortgage on behalf of non-profit sponsor (340 units) – Pre-Closing

New England Farm Workers Council, Springfield MA
Project: Memorial Square Apartments
Role: Development Consultant – LIHTC redevelopment of 3 properties on behalf of Non-profit sponsor utilizing 9% LIHTC, Historic Tax Credits, and subordinate financing from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (56 Units) – Phase 1 Completed, 2017

Better Home Inc., Springfield MA
Project: E Henry Twiggs Estates Phase I
Role: Development Consultant – Acquisition and rehab of 34 Scattered Site properties utilizing tax-exempt bond financing LIHTC, and subordinate financing from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (75 Units). – In Construction

Better Home Inc., Springfield MA
Project: E Henry Twiggs Estates Phase 2
Role: Development Consultant – Acquisition and rehab of 25 Scattered Site properties utilizing tax-exempt bond financing LIHTC, and subordinate financing from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (61 Units). – Closing Projected – Fall, 2017

Housing Development Corporation - MidAtlantic, Lancaster PA
Project: Bond 2 LP - Multi-Site (4) Tax Exempt Bond/LIHTC Transaction on behalf of Non-Profit Sponsor (137 units)
Role: Development Consultant- Completed, 2015-2016

Housing Development Corporation - MidAtlantic, Lancaster PA
Project: Bond 3 LP - Multi-Site (7) Tax Exempt Bond/LIHTC Transaction on behalf of Non-Profit Sponsor (324 units)
Role: Development Consultant   – Closing Projected – Winter, 2018

Gerald Joseph
Representative Development Projects

Project Name and Location	Description	Role	Total Units	Development Cost
Harwell Homes Cooperative Cambridge, MA	Recapitalization of HUD 236 Cooperative following loan maturity utilizing conventional debt financing and Mark Up to Budget Rent Increase through HUD	Development Consultant	56	$2.5 million (in process)
Borinquen Apartments Springfield, Ma	Redevelopment of highly distressed historic property originally renovated under S. 8 Mod rehab program. Financing included HOME, Federal and State Historic Tax Credits	Development Consultant	41	$11,328,000
Mayfair Mansions, Washington, DC	Acquisition preservation and Redevelopment of Historic HUD 236 property NE Washington DC utilizing tax exempt bonds, 4% LIHTC, Historic tax credits and local subordinate debt.	Principal CPDC	410	$96 million
Parkside Terrace Washington DC	Redevelopment of vacant 12-story tower in SE Washington DC that had failed as a section 8 family building. Converted to 181 units of Senior housing and 135 units of workforce housing utilizing Tax-exempt bonds, 4% LIHTC and local subordinate debt.	Principal CPDC	316	$73 million
Wheeler Terrace Washington DC	Acquisition, preservation and redevelopment of distressed 113 unit Section 8 property in SE DC utilizing Tax exempt bonds, 4% LIHTC and local subordinate debt. . Will be the first Leed certified green affordable housing property in the District	Principal CPDC	116	$31.5 million

Gerald Joseph
Representative Development Projects

Project Name and Location	Description	Role	Total Units	Development Cost
Bates Senior Residences Annapolis, Md	Adaptive reuse of historic African American High School in Annapolis Md into 71 units of senior housing with PBA Section 8, Historic Tax Credits and 9% LIIHTC allocation	Principal CPDC	71	$14.2 million
Island Walk Apartments Reston, VA	Redevelopment of townhouse community in Reston VA formerly owned by a limited equity cooperative utilizing Tax exempt band financing, 4% tax credits and local subordinate debt	Principal CPDC	102	$16 million
1330 Seventh St Apartments Washington DC	136 units, HUD 236 high rise building in NW Washington DC preserved and redeveloped in partnership with tenant association utilizing Tax exempt bonds, 4% LIHTC and local subordinate debt	Principal CPDC	136	$22 million

Gerald Joseph
Representative Development Projects

Project Name and Location	Description	Role	Total Units	Development Cost
Oxford Manor Apartments Washington DC	Conventional garden apartment complex in SE Washington DC preserved and redeveloped as mixed income housing in partnership with the tenant association utilizing 9% LIHTC allocation and $4 million city CDBG loan	Principal CPDC	227	$25.6 million
Mary's Meadow at Providence Place Holyoke, MA	"Small House" skilled nursing facility developed on behalf of Sisters of Providence aimed as creating a new innovated household model for the provision of skilled nursing services	Developer	40	$10.5 million
Village at Hospital Hill Northampton, MA	Master plan for reuse of 124-acre site as a mixed-use urban village. Responsible for site acquisition, planning, community relations, permitting	Principal and lead project manager TCB	207 residential units and 476,000 SF of commercial space	Est. $25,000,000 (Land development only)
Holyoke HOPE VI Holyoke, MA	Master plan for the revitalization of a distressed public housing site	Principal TCB	100 rental units, 176 ownership units, community building, new roads and infrastructure	Est. $40,000,000

Gerald Joseph
Representative Development Projects

Project Name and Location	Description	Role	Total Units	Development Cost
Parkwood Apartments Indianapolis, In	Acquisition and redevelopment of HUD assisted distress property	Principal TCB	329 units	$33,000,000
Churchill Homes Holyoke, MA	HOPE VI LIHTC mixed income, mixed finance Rental development	Principal TCB	100 units	$9,847,800
Plumley Village Worcester, MA	Recapitalization and refinancing of corporate asset	Principal and team leader TCB	430 units	$35,000,000
Osprey Lane Sandwich, MA	New construction LIHTC Chapter 40B	Principal TCB	36 Units	$5,000,000
Odd Fellows Lofts Worcester, MA	Historic Rehab residential over commercial	Principal TCB	24 units plus 10,000 sf commercial space	$4,200,000
Dickson Meadows Weston, MA	40B new construction mixed income homeownership	Principal TCB	18 units	$15,000,000
Allen Park Apts. Springfield, MA	ELIPRA LIHTC Resident buyout	Lead Project Manager TCB	264	$15,134,000
Upsala School Elder Apts., Worcester, MA	Historic Rehabilitation HUD 202	Project Manager TCB	50	$4,500,000
Leyden Woods Apartments Greenfield, MA	Tax Credit, Preservation Acquisition	Project Manager TCB	199	$14,251,038
Providence Place Holyoke Ma	Conversion of Old convent into Moderate Income Senior Independent Living	Lead Project Manager/ consultant TCB	120	$14,000,000

Resume of
Gerald Joseph

PERSONAL

Address: 1410 Ingraham St NW
Washington DC 20011
Telephone: (202) 829-1251
E-Mail: gjoseph@josephdev.com

SUMMARY

Over 30 years experience in the affordable housing and community development industry as a developer, Senior Manager, and Director for non-profit development organizations at the neighborhood, regional and national levels. Expertise in the development of affordable rental housing (LIHTC and mixed income); historic rehabilitation; housing preservation and new construction; comprehensive neighborhood revitalization; public housing redevelopment; mixed income homeownership, senior independent living, household model skilled nursing home development; management and operations of non-profit housing and community development organizations.

EXPERIENCE

PRESIDENT, JOSEPH DEVELOPMENT INC, WASHINGTON DC (FEBRUARY 2010 – PRESENT)

Joseph Development provides real estate development and consulting services to non-profit and for profit developers through the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast. Areas of expertise includes affordable housing production and preservation, historic rehabilitation, and complex financing including utilizing Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Historic Tax Credits, tax-exempt bond financing, and mixed finance of public housing. Consulting assignments include new business development, financial structuring, development project management, feasibility analysis, project design and development, securing debt, equity and gap financing, syndication of Low Income Housing Tax Credits and Historic Tax Credits, Staff training and mentoring

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – WASHINGTON DC (MARCH 2004 – FEBRUARY 2010)
TITLE: VICE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT

Responsible for management and oversight of all aspects of CPDC's real estate development department. Manages a team of six full time personnel involving in all aspects of real estate development process from conception to completion. Focus on preservation of large scale multifamily housing developments in the Washington, Virginia and Maryland marketplace.

Accomplishments included the development or preservation of over 1500 units involving in excess of $311 million of total development

THE COMMUNITY BUILDERS, INC. – Boston, MA (1991 to 2004)

TITLE: Vice President/Director of Massachusetts Operations (2001 to 2004)
Director of Western Massachusetts and New York Regions (1995 to 2001)
Development Project Manager, Springfield Office (1991 to 1995)

Responsible for business development, project management (including conceptualization, site assessment and acquisition, feasibility analysis, financing, design and construction, rent-up, marketing and sales) and relationship management. Responsible for asset management for portfolio of more than 2,500 units. Managed a staff up to 15 staff and oversaw a pipeline of more than $150 million in development projects involving nearly 1,200 units of housing. Specific duties include analysis, due diligence and execution on proposed sites for development. Select architect and engineer and manage design process. Also work to obtain financing through traditional bank debt and equity, LIHTC applications, writing grant proposals and securing HOPE VI funds.

Representative Responsibilities:

* Revitalization of distressed publicly-assisted housing (HOPE VI)
* Comprehensive redevelopment of abandoned state hospital site
* Historic rehabilitation and adaptive reuse
* Low Income Housing Tax Credit financed mixed-income development
* Mixed-income single family development
* Low-income senior housing
* Independent living/retirement housing

FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – Greenfield, MA (1982 to 1991)

TITLE: Executive Director

Was responsible for overall organizational development and management including planning, designing, and managing community economic development and affordable housing projects. Served as senior loan officer responsible for small business lending. Increased the financial support for organization's efforts one hundred fold. Hired and managed staff of up to 15 employees (began with one employee).
Duties included raising capital through grants, state funds and traditional fund raising. Through real estate consultants, acquired several sites including abandoned industrial buildings, business district real estate and housing that were subsequently redeveloped, marketed/leased and/or sold.

Representative Projects:

* Development of a small business incubator facility (30,000 sq. ft. total)
* Historic restoration of neighborhood theater (to be converted to a community center)
* Renovation of historic mill housing (Turners Falls, MA; acted as developer, used Section 8 Funding; rental units)
* Single family housing development (subdivided land turning into low income housing using home owners grants)
* Over $15 million in small business loans personally originated

BRIGHTWOOD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – Springfield, MA (1978 to 1982)

TITLE: Director of Development (1980 to 1982)
Director of Community Anti-Crime Program (1978 to 1980)

Was responsible for program development, grant applications, planning neighborhood economic development, residential and commercial real estate development, and providing technical assistance to small business owners.

SPANISH AMERICAN UNION – Springfield, MA (1976 to 1978)

TITLE: Director of Youth Services (1977 to 1978)
Vista Volunteer (1976 to 1977)

Initially a Vista volunteer and then the Director of Youth Services for this inner-city social services agency; responsible for youth program development, planning for community development, and organizational planning, development, and administration.

EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS – Amherst, MA
B.A. Individual Concentration – Urban Studies, 5/75

PROFESSIONAL

- Member, Board of Directors Housing Association of Non-Profit Developers
- Former Member and Chairperson, Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston's Affordable Housing Advisory Council,
- Former Member, Board of Directors, Massachusetts Community Development Finance Corporation
- Co-Founder and First President, Western Massachusetts Enterprise Fund, a Regional Micro-Business Investment Fund