



# TCAC Crash Course: Understanding LIHTC with Bill Pavao

*Executive Director Emeritus of TCAC  
and Current SCANPH Board Member*

---

Thursday, February 14th

1:00 pm - 3:00 pm

City of Tustin Council Chambers

300 Centennial Way



***Get All Your TCAC  
Questions Answered!***

# Low Income Housing Tax Credits

Overview of the California Program

William Pavão, SCANPH Board Member



# Outline

- How affordable housing is financed
- Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits
- The California Program

# Financing

- Combination of debt and equity
  - Like home purchase loan & downpayment
- Affordable housing:
  - **Conventional debt** - bank loans
  - **Equity** - through Low Income Housing Tax Credits
  - **Gap financing** - “soft debt”



# Conventional Debt

- Using assumptions about project size, unit configuration, rents, subsidies, and design, developer creates a pro forma operating budget estimating annual income and expenses
- Establishes how much Net Operating Income (NOI) remains after paying operating costs
- Private (conventional) debt may be borrowed using a portion of NOI: Debt Service Coverage Ratio (DSCR).

# Soft Debt and Low Income Housing Tax Credit Equity

- The development costs not paid by a conventional loan must be covered by capital that does not require a fixed repayment schedule
- Soft debt is typically low-interest and due on an annual “residual receipts” basis. Unpaid balance is due at the end of a specified term (e.g., 55 years)
- Equity is induced in by tax benefits



# Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs)

- Created by the Tax Reform Act of 1986
- Federal government no longer a significant lender
- Induces in equity from investors who become limited partners (LPs) in ownership (single asset partnerships)
  - LP: 99.9% vs. 0.01% ownership of partnership
- Ten years of credits against federal taxation, 15 years of programmatic compliance (recapture)

# The Basics

- Two types of credits: “9%” and “4%”
  - 9% credit authority for the State is limited
  - 4% authority is unlimited, but tied to tax exempt bond authority (must pay for at least 50% of development’s basis costs)
- Income and rent restricted to 60% Area Median Income (AMI) - now up to 80% in limited cases
  - HH of 4 in Orange Co.: 60% AMI = \$65,580,  
80% AMI = \$87,440



# The Basics about Basis

- Basis = costs associated with the development of a depreciable asset
- Does not include land, some legal costs, some interest costs
- Can be increased or “boosted” by location
  - Qualified Census Tracts (QCTs)
  - Small Difficult Development Areas (SDDAs)\*

\* State-designated DDAs in 9% program for Special Needs projects and State credit applicants.

# Two Types of Credits

- 9% credits (formerly 70% present value (PV) credits)
- 4% (30% PV credits)
  - Used with tax-exempt bond financing
- Floating rate:
  - “9%” = 9% fixed (no longer floats)
  - “4%” = 3.32%, floats monthly to maintain 30% approximation



# 9% Example: \$23 million Project

- \$20 million in “basis”
  - QCT or DDA boost:  $130\% \times \$20M = 26M(!)$
  - 9% Credits:  $9\% \times \$26M = \$2.34M$  annually
  - **\$23.4 million** in credits over 10 years\*
- \* Exceeds total development cost (TDC)

# Same Project Using 4% Credits

- \$20 million in “basis”
- QCT or DDA boost:  $130\% \times \$20M = \$26M$
- 4% Credits:  $3.32\% \times \$26M = \$863,200$  annually
- **\$8.632 million** in credits over 10 years

\*Note: \$6.64 million received over 10 years = 30% of unboosted \$20M (PV)



# 9% Competition: Annual Federal Credit

- Total: 39.5M population x \$2.70 = \$106M
- Set-Asides
  - Nonprofit: Homeless Assistance (10%) \$10.7M
  - Rural (20%) \$21.4M
  - At-risk (5%) \$ 5.2M
  - Special Needs (4%) \$ 4.2M

# Geographic Apportionments: Annual Credits Plus State Credits

|                             |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| • City of LA (17.6%)        | \$11.3M |
| • Balance of LA Co. (17.2%) | \$11.1M |
| • Central Valley (8.6%)     | \$ 5.5M |
| • San Diego (8.6%)          | \$ 5.5M |
| • Inland Empire (8.2%)      | \$ 5.3M |
| • East Bay (7.4%)           | \$ 4.7M |
| • Orange Co. (7.3%)         | \$ 4.7M |
| • S&W Bay Area (6.0%)       | \$ 3.8M |
| • Capital Region (5.7%)     | \$ 3.6M |
| • Central Coast (5.2%)      | \$ 3.3M |
| • Northern (4.4%)           | \$ 2.8M |
| • San Francisco (3.7%)      | \$ 2.3M |



# 9% Scoring

- GP Experience 6 pts.
  - Management Experience 3 pts.
  - Housing Needs w/ Amenities 10 pts.
  - Site Amenities (SN - NonSN) 15 pts.
  - Service Amenities (SN - Non-SN) 10 pts.
  - Sustainable Building Methods 5 pts.
  - Lowest Income Targeting 52 pts.
  - Readiness to Proceed 10 pts.
  - Misc Fed and State Policies 2 pts.
- 113 pts.

# Tiebreakers

Within City of LA: HCID Letter of Support

Otherwise:

**First:** Housing Type Goal

- Large Family (65%)
- LF New Construction, High Resource (30%)
- Special Needs (30%)
- At-Risk (15%)
- Seniors (15%)

- 
- Rural Acq/Rehab (30%)



# Tiebreakers cont.

**Final:**

Soft Resources  
TDC (Residential)

+

1 -  $\frac{\text{(Requested Unadjusted Eligible Basis*)}}{\text{(Total Residential Development Costs)}} / 3$

\* Decreased basis requests will benefit the tiebreaker only to the extent that they exceed committed soft public funds.

# Final Tiebreaker Example

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{Final:} \\ \frac{\$4.6 \text{ Million}}{\$23 \text{ Million}} \\ + \\ 1 - \left( \frac{\$10 \text{ Million}^*}{\$23 \text{ Million}} \right) \end{array} \quad / 3$$

\* Decreased basis requests will benefit the tiebreaker only to the extent that they exceed committed soft public funds.



# Final Tiebreaker Example

Final:

$$1 - \frac{20\% + (43.4\%)}{3}$$

$$= 20\% + (56.6\% / 3)$$

$$= 20\% + 18.84\% = 38.84\%$$

# 2019: Opportunity Area Bonus

- Highest Resource Area (non-rural) 20%
- High Resource Area (non-rural) 10%
- Highest Resource Area (rural) 10%
- High Resource Area (rural) 5%



# Final Notes

- California State Credits
  - Certificated Credits
- First Time Applicants for Credits: Consultants
- TCAC application forms

# Q&A Session