



NOVOGRADAC

Journal of Tax Credits™

Insights On Affordable Housing, Community Development, Historic Preservation, Renewable Energy and Opportunity Zones
January 2021 ♦ Volume XII ♦ Issue I

Published by Novogradac

HISTORIC TAX CREDIT TOOL BOX

What ‘Historic’ Means to Public Housing



CINDY HAMILTON, HERITAGE CONSULTING GROUP

According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) website, “there are approximately 1.2 million households living in public housing units, managed by some 3,300 Housing Authorities” across the United States. The actual facilities come in all sizes and types, from scattered single-family houses, garden apartments to high-rise apartments. The story of the development of public housing is an interesting one which resonates with our current housing crisis.

The heritage of public housing reflects a holistic approach that sought to provide wholesome living conditions driven in part by the failure of the marketplace to provide viable housing products. The roots of the program date to decades before World War II but were substantially accelerated under President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society. Public housing sites can now be recognized as historic due to their age and significance. Projects frequently engaged leading architects of the time. As such, they are eligible for various local, state and federal financial incentives. This article addresses the history of public housing and how

the redevelopment of these properties interacts with historic preservation regulations and provides opportunities for historic incentives.

History of Public Housing

The history of public housing can be roughly framed into three eras. The first was during President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal era in the 1930s. The second era came under President Harry Truman with the Housing Act of 1949. The final era was during the Johnson administration, which elevated housing to a cabinet-level position and greatly expanded public funding.

The first federal initiative occurred in the New Deal era under the Federal Public Works Administration (PWA). The overall goal of the PWA was to build large-scale public structures such as dams, hospitals, bridges and housing in response to the economic downturn brought upon by the Great Depression. The devastating impact of the Great Depression undercut perceptions of poverty as personal failings and the New Deal focused attention on the inequalities of the housing market, rampant slums and proliferating shantytowns. In particular, Title II, Section 202 legislation of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 formed the PWA and allotted \$3.3 billion for their projects, among them included the construction, reconstruction, alteration or repair under public regulation or control of low-cost housing and slum clearance projects.

The next era came about with the Housing Act of 1949 under President Truman. Here, in the face of aging and outdated housing stock, public housing construction was tied to urban redevelopment. Several additional housing acts were passed after 1949, but no major legislation changes occurred until the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 under President Johnson's Great Society initiative.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 created (HUD). Perhaps of greater importance, it opened the funding pipeline. The 1965 act authorized 60,000 units of public housing over four years. This was followed by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, which set a goal of 26 million new dwellings, including 6 million new units for low- and moderate-income households over 10 years. In practical terms, this resulted in a surge of public housing construction across the country that by 1970 had reached over 1 million units.

What government planning did not account for was the impact public housing would have on the history of the United States. Due to the importance of public housing development throughout the mid-20th century, many of these structures are now considered historic resources.

As such, they qualify for financial incentives, but are also subject to historic preservation regulatory review.

Historic Preservation Regulation (Section 106)

In 1966, the federal government adopted the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), which included some regulatory protections on historic buildings and structures. One of these regulatory protections is a Section 106 review. Section 106 of the NHPA requires individual agencies within the federal government, in collaboration with the respective state historic preservation offices (SHPOs), to determine the impact of federally funded projects, referred to in this process as undertakings, on historic properties.

Historic properties are generally assessed using guidance from the National Parks Service's National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, though some states have developed individual guidelines for the Section 106 process. In this, undertakings include, but are not limited to, alterations or demolition of existing buildings, as well as adjacent new construction. The Section 106 process first identifies the area of potential impact and then assesses whether or not there will be an adverse effect or no adverse effect on any potentially historic resources.



Image: Courtesy of Heritage Consulting Group
The High View Apartments in Killeen, Texas, may use historic tax credits for rehabilitation.

As it particularly relates to public housing authorities (PHAs), the Section 106 process is most commonly triggered by the use of funds through the HUD under 24 CFR Part 50.4(a) or Part 58.5(a), which both require HUD or its responsible entities to comply with the NHPA and Section 106 review process.

Examples from the Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) provide excellent insight into local housing authorities' compliance with the Section 106 process. According to Nichole Tillman, executive vice president of communications for the PHA, the PHA controls more than 11,500 units spread over 56 distinct developments and scattered sites throughout the city.

“Every redevelopment will be evaluated under Section 106,” Tillman said.

In Philadelphia, the majority of PHA buildings in line to be redeveloped are likely more than 50 years old, indicating they may be considered historic and redevelopment may result in adverse effects. Any HUD-funded project to replace windows, update interior finishes or install new entrances therefore requires SHPO review to determine any potential adverse effects to historic properties.

Tillman explained the potential challenges with the Section 106 review process.

“Given the age of some of our developments, many do not meet current design standards,” Tillman said. “This may relate to bedroom size, layout, features and the overall site plan. Today’s design standards and PHA’s approach are much different than what was planned in the 1950s. The biggest challenge then becomes balancing historic character and cost. In some cases, rehabilitation of our older buildings becomes cost-prohibitive. Typically, every mechanical system must be replaced and the structural components often present significant challenges.”



Image: Courtesy of Heritage Consulting Group
The High Rise Apartments in Great Bend, Kansas, seek historic tax credits for rehabilitation.

Despite the challenges posed by Section 106, the review facilitates the protection of our nation’s historic resources. Tillman and the PHA understand the importance of historic building and have learned through experience with historic reviews the most effect ways to mitigate the challenges posed by them.

“Planning and community engagement [are the most important factors],” Tillman said. “PHA has learned from experience that you need to integrate time into your schedule and invest in the proper planning for older developments. This typically means hiring consultants who are well versed in the historic properties requirements under the federal regulations and the Section 106 process, and planners who are creative to seek solutions in order to properly engage with the community and interested parties.”

Tillman expanded upon the importance of a proactive and practiced historic consultant.

“Older properties that may seem to present no challenges often have surprises that are difficult to anticipate and can cause significant delays and changes to plans,” he said.

Proper planning for potential setbacks, therefore, is the best way to ensure a successful Section 106 review, which opens the door to alternative funding options in the form of historic tax credits (HTCs) and HUD Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) funds, which are available to historic resources.

Incentives for Historic Public Housing Properties

While the Section 106 process can be a “stick,” HUD’s RAD program offers PHAs a “carrot.” The RAD program was created in 2012. The program was enacted in an attempt to resolve deferred maintenance amounting to \$49 billion on 1.1 million public housing units nationwide.

What is particularly important about RAD is that it may be combined with the 20% federal HTC. To encourage the creation of additional affordable housing, the low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC) was created and structured so it could capitalize on the HTC. However, by definition, public housing properties were excluded from private investment as found from the LIHTC and HTC. RAD extended the syndication framework to public housing resources.

The RAD program seeks to preserve affordable housing by providing PHAs with the ability to leverage private capital to finance improvements and invest in the existing housing stock. The RAD conversion allows for other funding sources, such as LIHTCS and HTCs. In this way, RAD allows PHAs to preserve and make improvements to affordable housing units that could otherwise be lost. Many public housing developments

built between the 1930s and mid-1970s have used HTCs and/or LIHTCS through the RAD program. For example, the Philadelphia Housing Authority, according to Tillman, “utilizes the RAD program whenever it is possible. The project-based voucher platform provides tremendous flexibility to our development efforts.”

As public housing was historically the federal government’s approach to solving housing dilemmas, other forms of housing are inching into the marketplace, given the economic disparity in the country. One of those forms is workforce housing.

The Bigger Picture

The ever-increasing economic reality is that the vast number of working Americans no longer earn enough money to pay rent. Public housing is an important solution, but cannot be the only solution. We need a full spectrum of housing types, responsive to the needs of our population. Beyond the distinct categories of public and affordable housing, developers and capital providers are increasingly focused on another type of housing that has gained popularity in recent years—workforce housing.

While there is no official definition or IRS guidance on what constitutes “workforce housing” exactly, it is generally regarded as multifamily housing targeting households that earn between 61% and 120% of area median income (AMI). Unlike public or affordable housing, which rely on rental assistance and/or LIHTCs, workforce housing is fundamentally a market-rate product. Workforce housing aims to serve households that do not income qualify for public or affordable housing, but that may struggle with affording market-rate housing. In some high-rent markets, such as New York or San Francisco, “workforce housing” can mean housing that serves households earning as much as 180% of AMI. In this sense, workforce housing is harder to define in part because it is location-specific, occupying a gray area depending on local incomes, local rental rates and local availability of high-quality rental housing.



Workforce housing also occupies a gray area in the capital markets, but it is nonetheless a natural candidate for HTC finance. There are few explicit public subsidies for workforce housing. State housing finance agency incentives are varied and there are a wide range of private equity and opportunity zones funds that are focused on investing in workforce housing. Regardless, federal HTCs deployed in multifamily historic rehabilitations or adaptive reuse conversions to workforce housing are a natural fit.

It can be difficult for even the best historic rehabs to compete with new-construction apartments on rental rate. As a result, historic multifamily projects can result in “naturally occurring” workforce housing—that is, housing units for which the market rate is in line with workforce housing rental rates. HTCs play a mission-critical role in equalizing return on investment for capital providers on historic multifamily rehabs relative to new-construction projects. The HTC helps make up the financing gap for developers of historic multifamily projects that earn workforce housing rents instead of new construction rents.

Conclusion

The historic significance of public housing in the United States cannot be understated. The need for public housing in the early- and mid-20th century appropriately echoes the ongoing economic disparity and housing affordability crisis. The historical impact of public housing, therefore, will only continue to grow in importance. Regulatory processes and financial incentives have become an important factor in both helping preserve these buildings as well as funding redevelopment of them. Sometimes, PHAs try to navigate this on their own, which can lead to time delays, cost concerns and general frustration. As noted by George Tillman, a way to ease the process is to engage a qualified project team. Bottom line, there are a lot of opportunities for the rehabilitation of older public housing. The active redevelopment of public housing is but one way in which historic preservation can aid in bringing an end to the current economic crisis. ❖

.....
Cindy Hamilton is president of Heritage Consulting Group.

© Novogradac 2021 - All Rights Reserved.

This article first appeared in the January 2021 issue of the Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits. Reproduction of this publication in whole or in part in any form without written permission from the publisher is prohibited by law.

Notice pursuant to IRS regulations: Any discussion of U.S. federal or state tax issues contained in this article is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code; nor is any such advice intended to be used to support the promotion or marketing of a transaction. Any discussion on tax issues reflected in the article are not intended to be construed as tax advice or to create an accountant-client relationship between the reader and Novogradac & Company LLP and/or the author(s) of the article, and should not be relied upon by readers since tax results depend on the particular circumstances of each taxpayer. Readers should consult a competent tax advisor before pursuing any tax savings strategies. Any opinions or conclusions expressed by the author(s) should not be construed as opinions or conclusions of Novogradac & Company LLP.

This editorial material is for informational purposes only and should not be construed otherwise. Advice and interpretation regarding property compliance or any other material covered in this article can only be obtained from your tax advisor. For further information visit www.novoco.com.

EDITORIAL BOARD

PUBLISHER

Michael J. Novogradac, CPA

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR

Alex Ruiz

TECHNICAL EDITORS

Thomas Boccia, CPA	Matt Meeker, CPA
James R. Kroger, CPA	John Sciarretti, CPA
Diana Letsinger, CPA	Stacey Stewart, CPA

COPY

SENIOR EDITOR

Brad Stanhope

SENIOR MARKETING MANAGER

Teresa Garcia

COPY EDITOR

Mark O'Meara

STAFF WRITER

Caroline Gallegos

CONTRIBUTING WRITERS

Christian Ayson	Robert Graham
Frank Buss	Cindy Hamilton
Kareema Charles	Albert Rex
Victor Cirilo	Michael K. Wong
Arlene Conn	

ART

CREATIVE DIRECTOR

Alexandra Louie

CARTOGRAPHER

David R. Grubman

GRAPHIC DESIGNER

Brandon Yoder

CONTACT

CORRESPONDENCE AND EDITORIAL SUBMISSIONS

Alex Ruiz
alex.ruiz@novoco.com
925.949.4243

ADVERTISING INQUIRIES

Christianna Cohen
christianna.cohen@novoco.com
925.949.4216

ALL MATERIAL IN THIS PUBLICATION IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED AS PROFESSIONAL ADVICE OFFERED BY NOVOGRADAC OR BY ANY CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS PUBLICATION.

ADVICE AND INTERPRETATION REGARDING THE LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT OR ANY OTHER MATERIAL COVERED IN THIS PUBLICATION CAN ONLY BE OBTAINED FROM YOUR TAX AND/OR LEGAL ADVISOR.

ADVISORY BOARD

OPPORTUNITY ZONES

Dan Altman	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
Glenn A. Graff	APPLGATE & THORNE-THOMSEN
Martin Muoto	SOLA IMPACT

LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS

Jim Campbell	SOMERSET DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LLC
Tom Dixon	BOSTON CAPITAL
Richard Gerwitz	CITI COMMUNITY CAPITAL
Elizabeth Bland Glynn	TRAVOIS INC.
Rochelle Lento	DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
John Lisella III	U.S. BANCORP COMMUNITY DEV. CORP.
Derrick Lovett	MBD COMMUNITY HOUSING CORP.
Thomas Morton	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
Rob Wasserman	U.S. BANCORP COMMUNITY DEV. CORP.

PROPERTY COMPLIANCE

Kristen Han	WNC
Michael Kotin	KAY KAY REALTY CORP.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Victor Cirilo	NEWARK HOUSING AUTHORITY
Flynnann Janisse	RAINBOW HOUSING
Ray Landry	DAVIS-PENN MORTGAGE CO.
Denise Muha	NATIONAL LEASED HOUSING ASSOCIATION
Monica Sussman	NIXON PEABODY LLP

NEW MARKETS TAX CREDITS

Frank Altman	COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT FUND
Maria Bustria-Glickman	US BANK
Elaine DiPietro	BLOOMING VENTURES LLC
Chimeka Gladney	ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT INC.
Merrill Hoopengardner	NATIONAL TRUST COMMUNITY INVESTMENT CORP.
Ruth Sparrow	FUTURES UNLIMITED LAW PC
William Turner	WELLS FARGO

HISTORIC TAX CREDITS

Irvin Henderson	HENDERSON & COMPANY
Bill MacRostie	MACROSTIE HISTORIC ADVISORS LLC
Claudia Robinson	BANK OF AMERICA
Donna Rodney	MILES & STOCKBRIDGE
John Tess	HERITAGE CONSULTING GROUP

RENEWABLE ENERGY TAX CREDITS

Jim Howard	DUDLEY VENTURES
Elizabeth Kaiga	DNV GL
Forrest Milder	NIXON PEABODY LLP

© Novogradac
2021 All rights reserved.
ISSN 2152-646X

Reproduction of this publication in whole or in part in any form without written permission from the publisher is prohibited by law.