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Overview

• Living Cities Initiative Strategy and Process
• Neighborhood Stabilization Models
• Aspirations and Challenges
• Close-up: Cleveland and Detroit
• Next Steps
About Living Cities

• World’s most enduring corporate/philanthropic collaborative
• Over 15 years, $543 MM in investments leverages $17 B in community assets
• Pivot to more comprehensive substantive agenda
• Foreclosure crisis threatens investment
Our Response

• Focus on local/regional neighborhood stabilization efforts.

• Identify and test models for federal intervention and support

• Forms of support:
  _ Grants: $500,000 or less
  _ Flexible Capital: Select sites; amount TBD
  _ Technical Assistance
  _ Knowledge Community
  _ Advocacy/Convening

----------------------------------------
Pilot Selection

• Criteria:
  _ Readiness
  _ Resources
  _ Scalability
  _ Impact/Output
  _ Meaningful Role for Living Cities Funding

• Representation from strong, mixed and weak markets
Results

- Reviewed applications from 14 cities; selected 10

- Uses of LC dollars:
  - Operations Support
  - Strategic Support
  - Credit Enhancement/ Leverage
Pilot Characteristics

• Innovative, market-savvy
• REO strategy part of larger, comprehensive strategy
• Some operational now; all by October
• Strong coalitions; aggressive multi-sectoral leadership
• Neighborhood-level data
• Typically operate at neighborhood level
• Plan to touch 50-250 units per year
Types of Innovation

- Entity: Create New or repurpose existing
- Financing: New sources/structures
- Affordability:
  - Subsidy structure
  - Affordability preservation
  - Product development
- Property Treatment:
  - Acquisition/rehab/disposition
  - Demo
  - Brokerage
  - Land Bank/Trust
## Market Characteristics and Pilot Goals

### Market Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Characteristics | – Properties often do not enter REO  
– Acquisition costs high; competition for properties | – Had severe economic challenges before foreclosure crisis | – Market dynamics vary by city/neighborhood  
– Multi-pronged strategies needed |

### Pilot Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| – Provide/preserve affordable housing  
– Preserve neighborhood owner-occupancy | – Preserve progress  
– Integrate REO strategy into community revitalization strategy | – Capitalize on opportunity to provide and preserve affordable housing  
– Prevent market collapse |
Strong Market Pilots

• New York
  • Center for NYC Neighborhoods
  • Mission-Driven Brokerage

• Washington, DC
  • Shared Equity Land Trust Model
  • New Markets Tax Credit
  • Cluster Approach
Mixed Market Pilots

Chicago
• City-wide entity
• ACA/Bulk purchase
• Mix of rehab for rental /demo

Dallas
• Repurposing Asset Control Area program
• Scattered-site model

Los Angeles
• Brokerage/REO model in rapidly declining market

Massachusetts
• Statewide stabilization fund
• Three-city pilot

Rhode Island
• Statewide land trust
• Smaller city

Twin Cities
• New financial products
Weak Market Pilots

• Cleveland:
  – REO integrated into comprehensive six-neighborhood revitalization strategy
  – Will rehab/sell some properties, demo and redevelop others

• Detroit:
  – New Office for Foreclosure Prevention and Response
  – Strategy remains under development
Aspirations

• Feasible models identified
• Sites succeed in acquiring REO properties this quarter
• Lessons learned inform policy and industry planning / practice
• New relationships develop between nonprofits and servicers
Challenges

• Market uncertainty
• Acquiring REO properties from servicers
  – Accessing decision-makers
  – Finding title-holders
  – Negotiating purchase terms
• Disposition strategy selection
• Risk to nonprofits
  – Holding period/costs
  – Continued market shift
• Politics (mixed bag)
• Replicability
Neighborhood Progress, Inc.

- REO strategy meant to preserve community development gains
- Built into comprehensive six-neighborhood revitalization plan
- Weak market makes servicers more willing to play
Pluses

• Strong support from city, state
• Early-stage agreements with servicers
• Strong data platform
• Sharp overall strategy; high capacity

Challenges

• Actualizing servicer agreements
• Market volatility
Detroit

Office of Foreclosure Prevention and Response

• Quasi-public coordinating entity
• Created by funder community and the city
• Charged with crafting city’s response
Detroit (Cont’d)

Pluses
- Strong foundation engagement
- Encouraging early signs for new mayor
- Top-notch data platform

Challenges
- Positioning
- Public sector systems
- Moving from planning to implementation
Next Steps

• Responding to HUD funding regs
• Collecting and disseminating learnings
  • Web platform
  • Case study—NMTC
• Implementing TA pool
## Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Innovation/Point of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>City-Wide entity; Mission-driven broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Shared Equity; NMTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>City-wide; rental; secondary market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>ACA model; scattered site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Statewide fund; Multi-city pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Land trust; Statewide; Small city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twin Cities</td>
<td>New products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>NPI model; demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>City-wide entity; revitalization strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>