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## In recent years:

- Housing production has lagged population growth
- Rental vacancy rates have been below healthy levels
- Rent prices have grown faster than inflation


## Vacancy rates and rent prices

When vacancy rates are at natural or healthy levels, asking rent prices follow inflation.



Source: CoStar data on multifamily rentals and vacancy rates in the sevencounty Twin Cities region. Data series begins in the first quarter of 2010.

## Inflation-adjusted rent change

## Year-over-year \% change in inflationadjusted multifamily rent prices



Source: CoStar data on multifamily rentals in the seven-county Twin Cities region. Data series begins in the third quarter of 2006. Data are inflation-adjusted using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items (CPIAUCSL) from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Year-over-year $\%$ change in rent calculated for all quarters.

## Year-over-year \% change

Rent prices are still growing faster than inflation, but growth has slowed


Source: CoStar data on multifamily rentals in the seven-county Twin Cities region. Data series begins in the third quarter of 2010. Data are inflation-adjusted. Quarterly year-over-year percent change in rent shown.

## Vacancy rates over time

Vacancy rates remain relatively low overall



Source: CoStar data on multifamily vacancy rates in the seven-county Twin Cities region. Data series begins in the first quarter of 2010
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## Forecasting rent prices

## Using data ending in 2016 Q3 predicting next 8 quarters



## Example: predicting rent prices

## Using data ending in 2016 Q3 predicting next 8 quarters



Source: Staff analysis of CoStar data on multifamily average asking rent prices in the seven-county Twin Cities region. Data series begins in the first quarter of 2000. Forecasts and prediction intervals are generated using weighted average of several time-series models.


## Future rent prices

## Forecasted \% change in rent (Q3 2019 over Q3 2018)



Source: Staff analysis of CoStar data on multifamily average asking rent prices in the seven-county Twin Cities region. Data series begins in the first quarter of 2000 and ends Q3 2018. Forecasts and prediction intervals are generated using weighted average of several time-series models. Point forecasts and 80\% prediction intervals depicted on the plot.


## Two Areas of Budget Concern

- Rising housing subsidy payment cost - focus of today
- Driven by the rising cost of housing
- Administrative Deficit
- Prorated federal revenues do not cover the rising cost of administration


## Current Budget Status

- 2018 Amended
- \$1.9M use of reserves
- Issue all available vouchers
- Reserves near minimum
- 2019 Public Comment
- \$2M General levy subsidy
- Deficit projected based upon 2\% rental cost increase


## Preserve Housing Vouchers



2018 Adopted Budget
\$710 Federal reimbursement
(740) Subsidy
(30) Deficit per voucher

2019 Public Comment Budget
\$730 Federal reimbursement
(755) Subsidy (2018 + 2\%)
(25) Deficit per voucher

## Payment Standards

- Payment Standards = Rent Limits
- Amount needed to rent a modest housing unit
- Limited by Fair Market Rents (FMR) set by HUD
- Issued for October 1, 2018
- Increased by 5.6\% - 6.8\%!!!!
- Federal Requirement
- Housing Authorities must set rent limits between 90\% and 110\% of Fair Market Rent by bedroom size


## Annual Review Process

- Analysis
- Local average rental data
- Average rents by community and bedroom size
- Rent burden of current assisted families
- Council role (required annually)
- Set rent limits
- Past Council practice has been to balance Thrive outcomes
- High enough to allow choice in all neighborhoods
- Low enough to serve as many families as possible


## Tenant Rent Payments

- Tenants pay between $30 \%$ and $40 \%$ of income towards rent
- Rent within the payment standard $=30 \%$ of income
- Rent above the payment standard = up to $40 \%$ of income
- Tenant pays 30\% plus the difference
- Tenant cannot pay more than $40 \%$ of their income toward rent at initial move-in
- Maximum rent limit based on income


## Who is Metro HRA Serving?

- Average household size $=2.9$ members
- Average household annual income $=\$ 16,000$
- 45\% households have wage income
- 47\% elderly or disabled households
- Average Tenant Rent Payment $=\$ 390$
- Average HRA Payment $=\$ 740$
- Families with children $=53 \%$ of households


## Payment Standard Example

## 2 bedroom apartment <br> Rent \$1025 <br> Utility allowance + \$ 57 (electric only) <br> Gross Rent = \$1082

2 bedroom payment Standard $=\mathbf{\$ 1 0 9 0}$

Tenant Impact

- The gross rent falls within the payment standard
- Tenant will pay $30 \%$ of their income towards rent and utilities.


## Payment Standard Example

## 2 bedroom apartment

| Rent | $\$ 1050$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Utility allowance | $+\$ 57$ (electric only) |
| Gross Rent | $=\$ 1107$ |

2 bedroom payment Standard $=\mathbf{\$ 1 0 9 0}$

## Tenant Impact

- The gross is $\$ 17$ over the payment standard
- Tenant will pay $30 \%$ of their income plus the difference (\$17)


## Payment Standard Considerations

HUD Rule

- Federal government directs us to serve as many families as possible within budget authority
- Council can issue to up 6,616 vouchers
- \$57.7M projected 2019 federal revenue


## Higher Rent Limits

- Higher average subsidy
- Fewer vouchers issued
- Higher success rates
- Build future year funding


## Lower Rent Limits

-Lower average subsidy

- More vouchers issued
-Lower success rates
-Risk future year funding


## Payment Standard Considerations

- Fair Market Rents increased by 5.6\%-6.8\%
- Significant increase = significant budget impact
- Currently two sets of payment standards
- Regular standards - cover most of Metro HRA's service area
- Exception standards - cover 13 high rent communities
- Thrive "will" statements provide direction
- Offer housing options that give people in all life stages viable choices for stable housing
- Develop and provide tools, including competitive rent limits in higher-cost communities, to enable voucher holders to choose a location that best meets their needs


## Scenario 1 <br> Maintain Current Rent Standards

## Pros

- Ability to issue nearly all vouchers
- Less program deficit than other scenarios


## Cons

- Voucher use becomes more difficult
- Rent burden increases for existing families
- $50 \%$ for some families
- Limits housing choice to low rent areas
- Risks future federal funding in 2020 and beyond


## Scenario 1: Maintain Standards

|  | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Standards | Increase All Standards | Targeted Increase |
| Per Voucher Impact |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement | 730 |  |  |
| Rent Subsidy | (755) |  |  |
| Structural Impact | (25) |  |  |
| Program Level Impact - 2019 Budget |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement | (\$1.4M) |  |  |
| Council Subsidy | \$1.1M |  |  |
| Budget Impact | (\$0.3M) |  |  |

- Rent burden increases for existing families
- Council unable to issue 30 vouchers; families at risk of homelessness
- Difficulty placing vouchers
- Voucher holders limited to lower rent areas
- Risks future federal funding



## Scenario 2 <br> Increase limits for all bedrooms sizes

## Pros

- Increases voucher placement success some
- Improves housing choice in all neighborhoods
- Reduces rent burden for existing families
- Increases federal revenue base in 2020


## Cons

- Results in program structural deficit
- Reduce vouchers issued
- Secure additional funding
- Rent limits still not high enough for some bedroom sizes


## Scenario 2: Increase All Limits

|  | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Standards | Increase All Standards | Targeted Increase |
| Per Voucher Impact |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement |  | 730 |  |
| Rent Subsidy |  | (767) |  |
| Structural Impact |  | (37) |  |
| Program Level Impact - 2019 Budget |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement |  | (\$1.9M) |  |
| Council Subsidy |  | \$1.1M |  |
| Budget Impact |  | (\$0.8M) |  |

- Families considered rent burdened decreases from 55\% to 33\%
- Council unable to issue 85 vouchers; families at risk of homelessness
- Families somewhat limited to low-rent areas
- Some difficulty placing vouchers


## Scenario 3

## Increase limits based on market conditions (Targeted Increase)

## Pros

- Reflects market conditions
- Increases voucher placement success
- Improves housing choice in all neighborhoods
- Reduces rent burden to families
- Increases federal revenue base in 2020


## Cons

- Results in program structural deficit
- Reduce vouchers issued
- Secure additional funding


## Scenario 3: Targeted Increase

|  | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Standards | Increase All Standards | Targeted Increase |
| Per Voucher Impact |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement |  |  | 730 |
| Rent Subsidy |  |  | (770) |
| Structural Impact |  |  | (40) |
| Program Level Impact - 2019 Budget |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement |  |  | (\$2M) |
| Council Subsidy |  |  | \$1.1M |
| Budget Impact |  |  | (\$0.9M) |

- Decreases rent burden from 55\% to 28\% of families
- Council unable to issue 100 vouchers; families at risk of homelessness
- Families have a larger universe of units to choose
- Increased neighborhood choice


## Scenario Summary

|  | Scenario 1 <br> Current <br> Standards | Scenario 2 <br> Increase All <br> Standards | Scenario 3Targeted <br> Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Per Voucher Impact |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement | 730 | 730 | 730 |
| Rent Subsidy | (755) | (767) | (770) |
| Structural Impact | (25) | (37) | (40) |
| Program Level Impact - 2019 Budget |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement | (\$1.4M) | (\$1.9M) | (\$2M) |
| Council Subsidy | \$1.1M | \$1.1M | \$1.1M |
| Budget Impact | (\$0.3M) | (\$0.8M) | (\$0.9M) |

## Balancing the 2019 Budget

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scenario } 1 \\ & \text { Current } \\ & \text { Standards } \end{aligned}$ | Scenario 2 Increase All Standards | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scenario } 3 \\ & \hline \text { Targeted } \\ & \text { Increase } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Program Level Impact - 2019 Budget |  |  |  |
| Federal Reimbursement | (\$1.4M) | (\$1.9M) | (\$2M) |
| Council Subsidy | \$1.1M | \$1.1M | \$1.1M |
| Budget Impact | (\$0.3M) | (\$0.8M) | (\$0.9M) |
| Options to Balance 2019 Budget |  |  |  |
| Reduce Vouchers | 30 | 85 | 100 |
| Reduce Community Choice | \$1M | \$1M | \$1M |
| Subsidize with Council or other funds | \$0.3M | \$0.8M | \$0.9M |

## Long Term Problem?

- Housing voucher deficit is due to rising housing costs and federal revenue is not keeping pace with rent
- Structure of housing market would need to change to address this problem
- Research indicates rents are starting to level off
- Council 2019 budget decisions impact
- Low income families in the region
- Increase in homelessness
- Impact on Areas of Concentrated Poverty
- Council investment in other initiatives
- Council commitment in Thrive "will" statements
- Future year federal funding levels


## Actions taken to date

- Legal Opinion
- HRA specific levy authority
- Other Housing Authorities Solutions
- Adopt lower rent limits to serve all families
- Reductions in program size
- Use of other agency funds for subsidy
- Data Analysis
- Developed rent forecast
- Refined financial forecasts

Up Next

- Engage policy makers from other parts of the region


## Potential Solutions

- Subsidize program with other Council funds
- Reduce vouchers through attrition
- Reduce cost through reduced community choice
- Secure alternate funding source(s)
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