## Matrix of Alignment Proposals

|    |  | Pilot Prop   | osals  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| ID | Title and Lead Agency  | Summary  | Estimated Direct<br>Costs  | Estimated<br>Governmental<br>Savings/Benefits  | Estimated Private<br>Party Savings/Benefits  |
| 1  | Physical Inspection –<br>Pilot (6 States)<br>USDA-RD                 | <ul> <li>One federally-sponsored visit to each property with standard sampling size, intervals, and inspector qualifications.</li> <li>Accomplished by: <ol> <li>Expanding REAC to be used for all UPCS inspections on federally-assisted properties; or</li> <li>Adjusting REAC input methods to allow for non-REAC inspections to be 'read' into the system</li> </ol> </li> </ul> | \$270,000 (Funded<br>through HUD-REAC)   | Fewer physical<br>inspections performed;<br>potential cost savings of<br>up to \$440,000 in the<br>first year of the pilot.                                  | Reduced staff time,<br>travel costs, and<br>increased attention to<br>regular duties;<br>potential cost savings<br>of up to \$18 million in<br>the first year of the<br>pilot.                         |
| 1a | Physical Inspection<br>National<br>Implementation<br>USDA-RD/HUD-PIH | <ul> <li>One federally-sponsored visit to each property with standard sampling size, intervals, and inspector qualifications.</li> <li>Accomplished by: <ol> <li>Expanding REAC to be used for all UPCS inspections on federally-assisted properties; or</li> <li>Adjusting REAC input methods to allow for non-REAC inspections to be 'read' into the system</li> </ol> </li> </ul> | \$120,000-\$1,080,000<br>depending on<br>ultimate solution<br>(Potentially funded<br>through TI funds) | Fewer physical<br>inspections performed;<br>potential future cost<br>savings of up to \$4.8<br>million annually on the<br>current stock of CF<br>properties. | Reduced staff time,<br>reduced travel costs,<br>and increased attention<br>to regular duties;<br>potential cost savings<br>of up to \$42 million<br>annually on the current<br>stock of CF properties. |
| 2  | Subsidy Layering<br>Review – Pilot (7 States)<br>USDA-RD             | State-level MOUs will be entered into between HUD, USDA-RD, and HFAs that identify standard procedures for SLR delegation and information sharing.   | None   | Fewer subsidy layering reviews performed.  | Improved transaction<br>completion time and<br>reduced risk of closing<br>delays.  |

|            | Pilot Proposals  |   |   |   |  |  |
|------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| ID         | Title and Lead Agency  | Summary   | Estimated Direct<br>Costs   | Estimated<br>Governmental<br>Savings/Benefits   | Estimated Private<br>Party Savings/Benefits  |  |
| <b>2</b> a | Subsidy Layering<br>Review<br>National Delegation of<br>Protocols<br>USDA-RD         | MOU will be entered into between HUD, USDA-<br>RD, and HFAs that identifies standard<br>procedures for SLR delegation and information<br>sharing. | No direct costs; SLRs<br>are already being<br>conducted by HFAs,<br>and the basic product<br>are agreements or<br>MOUs. | Fewer subsidy layering reviews performed.   | Improved transaction<br>completion time and<br>reduced risk of closing<br>delays due to slow<br>approvals. |  |
| 2b         | Subsidy Layering<br>Review<br>National<br>Standardization of<br>Protocols<br>USDA-RD | Agree on a standard set of SLR facts and<br>protocols for sharing findings between all<br>federal funders and the LIHTC allocating<br>agencies.   | TBD   | Consistent reporting of<br>facts leads to faster and<br>better informed<br>decision-making, as well<br>as savings due to less<br>frequent over-<br>subsidization. | Quicker transactions<br>and reduced risk of<br>complications due to<br>slow approvals.                     |  |

|    | Additional Alignment Proposals        |  |   |   |  |  |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| ID | Title and Lead Agency                 | Summary  | Estimated Direct<br>Costs   | Estimated<br>Governmental<br>Savings/Benefits   | Estimated Private<br>Party Savings/Benefits  |  |
| 3  | Capital Needs<br>Assessment<br>HUD-MF | <ol> <li>Develop and implement a new, single<br/>CNA template tool for use by Agencies<br/>that administer housing programs that<br/>require CNAs; and</li> <li>Develop a set of common minimum<br/>professional qualifications standard for<br/>providers of CNAs.</li> </ol> | The total cost to<br>design, develop,<br>implement, provide<br>training, and<br>maintain the CNA<br>template tool would<br>be approximately<br>\$1.0M - \$1.5M.<br>(Potentially funded<br>through TI funds) | Simplified coordination<br>and updates to the<br>Agencies' CNAs as<br>requirements change.<br>The cost/benefit and life<br>cycle analyses will<br>ultimately create utility<br>savings within the \$6<br>billion that HUD and<br>USDA-RD expend on<br>utility costs annually. | 10%-20% savings per<br>transaction to the cost<br>of the comparable CNA<br>assessment and report,<br>primarily due to the<br>efficiencies of a<br>standardized<br>assessment approach.<br>Estimated savings of<br>\$3M/year. |  |

|    |  | Additional Alignme   | ent Proposals             |   |  |
|----|--|--|---------------------------|---|--|
| ID | Title and Lead Agency  | Summary  | Estimated Direct<br>Costs | Estimated<br>Governmental<br>Savings/Benefits   | Estimated Private<br>Party Savings/Benefits  |
| 4  | Common Energy<br>Efficiency Standards<br>Department of Energy<br>HUD-OSHC        | <ol> <li>Promulgate Energy Efficiency standards for:</li> <li>Newly constructed and 'gut<br/>rehabilitations' of single family and<br/>multifamily rental housing;</li> <li>Newly constructed single family and<br/>multifamily rental housing;</li> <li>Substantial or moderate rehabilitation<br/>of multifamily rental housing;</li> <li>Lighter retrofits or continuing capital<br/>improvements of multifamily rental<br/>housing.</li> </ol> | None.                     | Significant savings<br>associated with reduced<br>long term energy<br>expenditures (e.g. HUD<br>Green Retrofit Program<br>realized \$12 million in<br>annual utility costs on<br>20,000 apartments in<br>221 properties). | Energy Star for Homes<br>standard or similar may<br>add 2.1 percent to<br>average total project<br>costs, but present value<br>of realized lifecycle<br>savings are significantly<br>larger. |
| 5  | Appraisal Primer<br>HUD-MF   | Work with the Appraisal Institute to develop and<br>publish a primer as a learning tool among<br>agencies and industry participants to address<br>specific affordable housing valuation issues and<br>minimize the likelihood of varying appraisal<br>standards among funding agencies.  | None                      | Improved decision-<br>making and future<br>efficient use of Federal<br>rental housing subsidy<br>resources.   | \$5.6 million estimated<br>savings to<br>developer/owners from<br>reduced number of<br>contracted appraisals   |
| 6  | Compliance (Fair<br>Housing MOU)<br>HUD-FHEO                                     | Examine the current 1997 HUD-USDA MOU and<br>the 2000 HUD-Treasury MOU relating to fair<br>housing, to create a unified HUD-Treasury-<br>USDA-DOJ agreement  | None                      | Expedited compliance enforcement actions.   | None   |
| 7  | Reduction in State-to-<br>State Variability for<br>Income Definition<br>Treasury | Resolve state to state variability in execution of LIHTC requirements.   | None                      | None  | Eliminate the added<br>cost of staff training<br>and software needed<br>by multi-state<br>operators.   |

|    | Additional Alignment Proposals   |   |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| ID | Title and Lead Agency  | Summary   | Estimated Direct<br>Costs  | Estimated<br>Governmental<br>Savings/Benefits  | Estimated Private<br>Party Savings/Benefits   |  |
| 8  | Grandfathering of<br>HUD/USDA-RD tenants<br>>60% AMI in LIHTC<br>rehab<br>Treasury | Future legislation might grandfather some HUD<br>and USDA-RD tenants who are now over 60% of<br>AMI as required for the LIHTC, but are still<br>eligible under HUD and USDA-RD programs for<br>rental assistance at 80% or less of AMI.                             | None   | Encourages preservation<br>of HUD and USDA-RD<br>affordable units.   | Would bring additional<br>equity into projects in<br>which HUD or USDA-RD<br>has an existing<br>investment. |  |
| 9  | Financial Reporting- RD<br>515 & Section 8<br>Properties<br>USDA-RD                | <ul> <li>Harmonize audit exemption requirements for</li> <li>515 &amp; S8 properties.</li> <li>1. HUD-MF modify policy exemption to<br/>match USDA-RD; and</li> <li>2. USDA-RD defers to HUD-MF on financial<br/>statement formats and audit guidelines.</li> </ul> | None   | Reduced audits and reduced audit reviews.  | \$6.3M/year through the reduction in audits.  |  |
| 9a | Financial Reporting –<br>Requirements<br>Standardized<br>HUD-PIH                   | Agree upon standard form for financial statement submission and standard audit guidelines.  | HUD-REAC est. up to<br>\$400k-\$500k;<br>USDA-RD est. up to<br>\$200k-\$800k | Federal (HUD and USDA)<br>savings of up to \$1<br>million annually in<br>foregone systems<br>maintenance.  | Multi-program<br>standardization<br>estimated \$14.5<br>million/year, to<br>property<br>owners/operators.   |  |
| 10 | USDA-RD and HUD-MF<br>Market Study Standards<br>Alignment<br>USDA-RD               | Align existing USDA-RD standards to conform to<br>HUD-MF MAP Standards a unified Federal<br>standard which can be made available to HFAs<br>as best practices.  | None   | Remove duplicative<br>processes between<br>HUD-MF and USDA-RD.<br>Improved real estate<br>decision making and<br>enhanced soundness of<br>public investment. | \$3.5 M estimated to be<br>saved through the<br>reduction in duplicated<br>market studies.                  |  |

|     |  | Additional Alignme  | ent Proposals   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| ID  | Title and Lead Agency  | Summary   | Estimated Direct<br>Costs   | Estimated<br>Governmental<br>Savings/Benefits   | Estimated Private<br>Party Savings/Benefits   |
| 10a | Support development<br>of 3 <sup>rd</sup> party market<br>study standard<br>HUD-MF | Support the emergence of any future private<br>sector standard through technical assistance, or<br>other support. | Several HUD staff will<br>spend 20% of work<br>hours available in a<br>year on this project;<br>USDA-RD and other<br>participants will<br>spend significant but<br>perhaps lesser levels<br>of effort | To the extent that<br>decision making is<br>improved, government<br>agencies will see fewer<br>claims on government<br>mortgage insurance<br>funds or other credit<br>enhancements. | Through the reduction<br>in duplicated market<br>studies, the savings to<br>owner/developers<br>would be in the range<br>of \$3.5M. |
| 11  | Improve sharing of data<br>on owner defaults<br>HUD-MF                             | Improve access to HUD-MF's existing owner default database (APPS).  | None, if done as part<br>of anticipated HUD-<br>MF APPS overhaul  | Improved decision-<br>making and future<br>efficient use of Federal<br>rental housing subsidy<br>resources.   | Faster USDA-RD<br>approvals translate into<br>lower private carrying<br>costs.  |
| 12  | Coordination of Income<br>Data Release Dates<br>HUD-PD&R                           | Coordinate the release of AMI data to align<br>Effective Dates (may require statutory action).                    | None  | None  | Simplify the calendar<br>for calculating effective<br>dates regarding AMI.  |
| 13  | Standardized Tenant<br>Certification Form<br>Treasury                              | Provide for a common electronic reporting<br>template for reporting tenant income<br>information.                 | Requires IT<br>investment (TBD).  | Avoids duplicative processing.  | Would reduce<br>significant staff cost<br>associated with<br>reporting a given<br>household's status in<br>multiple formats.        |