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Executive Summary

The Consortium for Housing and Asset Management (CHAM®) and the National Affordable Housing Management Association (NAHMA™) commissioned this study to investigate the steps best-in-class affordable housing providers take to remain mission-driven in the face of significant financial constraints. The recommendations that follow were derived from 38 interviews conducted with industry leaders.

1. **Leverage Intra-Organizational Tension:** Tensions frequently surface among affordable housing developers, asset managers, property managers and resident service coordinators. Ensuring those tensions are productive rather than destructive is what separates strong companies from weak ones. It can only be accomplished when senior leadership teams take steps to build trust, facilitate open discourse and provide those with divergent perspectives a seat at the table when mission-critical decisions are made.

2. **Narrow the Scope to Broaden the Social Impact:** The competitive environments affordable housing providers operate in require them to be recognized as experts in their field and have a brand identity that instills confidence among a variety of stakeholders from policy-makers to community partners to private investors. As a result, many companies narrow the scope of their work to ensure they can advance their missions. This involves being selective about where they invest, the types of projects they take on and the sources of funding they rely upon.

3. **Seek Out New Sources of Cash Flow:** To bolster their financial position and expand their reach, a growing number of affordable housing providers explore ways to monetize their core competencies. Some provide fee management services and third-party resident service coordination, while others offer training programs, grant writing assistance and a host of other services to peer organizations. The trend is promising because it has the potential to encourage the dissemination of knowledge and the development of industry best practices.

4. **Use the Mission to Attract and Retain Talent:** The challenges of the affordable housing industry make it very difficult for companies to attract and retain talent. Thus, hiring individuals who are committed to the mission and putting resources in place to help them be successful is essential. Affordable housing providers accomplish this by recruiting in nontraditional places, implementing robust training programs and recognizing employee contributions.

5. **Integrate Affordable Housing into the Fabric of Neighborhoods:** Affordable housing providers now devote significant attention to the symbiotic relationships that exist between their properties and the built environments that surround them. Longstanding efforts to make affordable housing resilient to blighting influences are being supplanted by efforts to integrate affordable housing into the fabric of neighborhoods. Companies do this by making space available for community use, advocating on behalf of neighborhoods and adopting principles of community development.
**Measure Resident Outcomes and Quantify the Impact on Financial Performance:**
How affordable housing providers measure success is changing. Developers, asset managers, property managers and resident service coordinators all feel increasing pressure to quantify the ways in which they improve the lives of the residents they serve and how those improvements affect financial performance. Companies who do this reap rewards, but only after having difficult conversations with internal and external constituencies about what is working and what is not.

**Recognize Resource Scarcity, Demonstrate Intentionality and Emphasize Transparency:**
Industry leaders recognize that balancing the “mission” and the “margin” in the affordable housing space is an ongoing process and one that requires tradeoffs. Tough choices must be made in a transparent and intentional manner, while recognizing that financial solvency is a prerequisite to achieve any other goals an affordable housing provider may have. Social objectives must therefore always be discussed within the context of the business case that supports them.
# Introduction

Many affordable housing providers have carefully crafted mission statements espousing their commitment to achieve clearly defined social goals. Less clear, however, is how companies operating in this space advance their missions in the ordinary course of business while balancing the oft competing objectives of the individuals they employ. This research report, jointly funded by the Consortium for Housing and Asset Management (CHAM®) and the National Affordable Housing Management Association (NAHMA™), sheds light on this delicate balancing act.

A total of 38 semi-structured interviews were conducted with those in charge of development, asset management, property management and resident service coordination at 10 companies in the affordable housing industry. The companies were selected in conjunction with the research sponsors based on their proven track record of helping low-income populations in a financially prudent manner. Both for-profit and nonprofit organizations were included in the sample, ranging in size from approximately 2,000 affordable housing units under management to over 50,000. Each interview lasted approximately one hour in duration and was guided by prompt questions designed to investigate how individuals working in different capacities conceptualize the role they play in balancing the financial and social goals of the companies they represent. Interview transcripts were then reviewed and coded to identify reoccurring themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Location of Headquarters</th>
<th>For-Profit or Nonprofit:</th>
<th>Approx. # of Affordable Units Under Management:</th>
<th>Markets Currently Served:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeon</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHC Inc.</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>DC, MD, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alco Management, Inc.</td>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>AL, AR, GA, KY, MO, MS, NC, SC, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avesta</td>
<td>Portland, ME</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>ME, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Communities LLC</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>CT, DC, KY, MA, MD, ME, NY, OH, PA, VA, WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormack Baron Salazar</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>AR, AZ, CA, GA, FL, IL, IN, LA, MI, MO, MN, MS, NC, NE, NJ, OH, OK, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Church Residences</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>AR, AZ, CA, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, LA, MD, MI, MO, NC, NJ, NY, OH, PA, PR, SC, TN, TX, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD Management, Inc.</td>
<td>Collingswood, NJ</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>NJ, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELACU</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WinnResidential</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, GA, FL, KY, MA, MD, NC, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seven themes put forth in the following sections are high level distillations of the interviewees’ perspectives. They are presented as steps affordable housing providers can take to remain mission-driven in the face of significant obstacles. These steps include 1) leveraging intra-organization tension, 2) narrowing the scope of a company’s activities to broaden the social impact, 3) seeking out new sources of cash flow, 4) using the mission to attract and retain talent, 5) integrating affordable housing into the fabric of neighborhoods, 6) measuring resident outcomes and quantifying their impact on financial performance and 7) adopting standards of
practice that recognize resource scarcity, demonstrate intentionality and emphasize transparency. Anonymous statements made by the interviewees are included throughout the report to highlight important issues, as are company-specific best practices.

1 Leveraging Intra-Organizational Tension

Even under the best of circumstances, tension frequently exists among affordable housing developers, asset managers, property managers and resident service coordinators. Tensions surface because individuals employed in each of these capacities have different priorities and responsibilities that influence how they go about achieving their common goals of improving lives and stabilizing communities. The challenge for mission-driven companies lies in making sure tensions are productive rather than destructive.

Productive tension results from conscious efforts on the part of affordable housing providers to create environments conducive to idea sharing among professionals with different backgrounds. Destructive tension, on the other hand, is the product of poor communication, competing interests and misaligned incentives that stand in the way of collaboration and ultimately degrade abilities to achieve specified missions. Promoting the former while avoiding the latter is no easy task because there are multiple potential points of conflict as affordable housing projects move from planning to construction to operation.

For example, developers interested in doing deals and generating fees may find themselves at odds with asset managers responsible for the long-term financial performance of affordable housing, property managers responsible for maintaining affordable housing and resident service coordinators responsible for ensuring occupants of affordable housing have access to resources. Similarly, asset managers may run afoul of property managers and resident service coordinators when capital allocation decisions are made to preserve affordable housing over the entire lifecycle of an investment rather than immediately enhance resident satisfaction. Even property managers and resident service coordinators who work together on a regular basis may butt heads when one party is interested in enforcing lease terms and the other party in helping economically disadvantaged people stay in their homes after those terms are breached.

The points of conflict that arise speak to the pervasiveness of intra-organizational tension in the affordable housing industry and the importance of not only mitigating its detrimental effects, but also leveraging it whenever possible. Mission-driven companies accomplish this in a variety of...
ways. Most center on building trust, facilitating open discourse, and giving those with divergent perspectives a seat at the table when decisions are made.

Some companies implement policies that require developers to solicit more and more input from asset managers, property managers and resident service coordinators as projects move closer to capitalization. Others offer interdisciplinary training programs to stimulate knowledge exchange and foster empathy. Still others invest in IT platforms and dashboards that provide professionals working in different areas with access to unfiltered data and information they can jointly use to evaluate alternative courses of action. All of these strategies have merits worthy of discussion, but the simple fact that they are being implemented makes one thing clear: mission-driven companies recognize they must empower and enable their employees to cooperate.

2 Narrow the Scope to Broaden the Social Impact

To unify the parties working on their behalf, a growing number of affordable housing providers narrow the scope of activities in which they participate to broaden the social impact they are capable of generating. This involves being selective about the communities where they invest, the parties with whom they partner and the types of projects they take on. Benefits of such an approach may include expedited delivery of affordable housing in areas where it is severely needed, improved investor relations and the creation of compelling brand identities.

Mission-driven companies develop and acquire properties in communities where they have strong allies and understand available funding sources. They avoid investing in municipalities where they are not wanted and in neighborhoods where their ability to effectuate positive change is questionable. When moving into new markets, they consider whether increasing the size of their portfolios will strain their human resources or yield economies of scale. They recognize most communities need more affordable housing, yet not all represent an opportunity to advance their missions within acceptable risk parameters.

Discriminately deciding with whom to invest and what types of projects to invest in is just as essential as being selective about where to invest. Partnering with debt and equity providers who do not share a company’s values is one of the surest ways to drift from mission-driven behavior. Likewise, investing in property types outside a company’s area of expertise can have financial repercussions that impinge upon its capacity to do good. Long-term success hinges on remaining cognizant of these threats.

Companies who strategically limit the scope of their work may also benefit from brand identities that resonate with investors, community leaders and public officials. Brands matter be-
cause affordable housing providers are rewarded for their ability to communicate who they are, what they care about and why they are better equipped to achieve their financial and social goals than their peers. This is easier when companies are selective about how, where and with whom they do business. Every company must decide for itself what area of expertise to build a brand around, but knowledge of select markets, familiarity with specific affordable housing product types and proficiency in certain types of financial engineering are all possibilities.

Disciplined investing is undoubtedly difficult when affordable housing providers feel pressure to serve new constituencies and expand their reach. However, mission-driven companies stay the course to signal to market participants that they understand their core competencies and their core values. They pursue out-of-the-box opportunities on occasion, but only when they understand the risks and can clearly articulate why it is appropriate to take them.

Seek Out New Sources of Cash Flow

Some affordable housing providers find they can be selective about their investments, while still growing their revenues and social impact, by offering services to peer organizations on a fee basis. Third-party property management and resident service coordination are common examples, but there are also those who participate in construction management, due diligence, grant writing, market studies and workforce training. The trend is promising because it allows mission-driven companies to simultaneously earn ancillary income and contribute to the dissemination of knowledge.

Launching successful fee generating programs is not, however, solely a matter of identifying areas of internal strength and selling services in one or more of those areas to others. The services must be scalable, differentiable and deliverable in a way that does not dilute a company’s competitive advantage. Careful consideration must also be given to whether a company can absorb the additional workload associated with providing fee-based services without overtaxing its employees or compromising its ability to run its primary business.
The most lucrative opportunities tend to exist when affordable housing providers have development, asset management, property management or resident service coordination platforms in place within their own organizations that are formalized to the point where they can be exported without a great deal of refinement. That is not to say offering tailored services can never be profitable. It is just a much more labor intensive undertaking and one that poses a greater threat of moving a company in a direction it might otherwise prefer not to go.

Reputational risk is another factor that must be taken into account. Just as partnering with the wrong investors can tarnish a company’s image, selling services to the wrong clients can do the same. Advising developers who do not have compelling social missions, managing properties for owners who are not willing to reinvest and training resident service coordinators who are not supported by their home organizations are all dangerous propositions. Thus, having the will to walk away from fee income when circumstances demand it may be equally important to having the motivation to seek it out.

Notwithstanding the concerns, there are nonmonetary reasons to offer fee-based services in addition to monetary ones. Collaborating with peer organizations exposes affordable housing providers to new ideas, encourages them to reflect on the efficacy of their own practices and forces them to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of deal structures that are not represented in their own portfolios. Mission-driven companies evaluate fee work with these benefits in mind.

**Use the Mission to Attract and Retain Talent**

Investing and pursuing fee income in a mission-driven manner is not only about balancing financial and social goals. It is also about attracting and retaining talent. Since many affordable housing providers cannot pay their employees as much as they could earn elsewhere they must use their missions as recruiting tools to meet their human resource needs. The strategy works best when companies target individuals who believe in what they are trying to accomplish and show them how to make an impact.

Recruiting on the merits of a company’s mission is extremely important in the field of property management. Affordable housing operators serve challenging populations, and as a result have a high risk of burnout when they are not committed to improving the lives of those with limited economic resources. Teachers, healthcare professionals and social service providers often have such a commitment, which makes them excellent candidates for entry-level property management positions. Mission-driven companies recruit from these fields, thereby acknowledging it is far easier to teach people about multifamily real estate operations than it is to make them passionate about helping others if they are not already so inclined.
The quickest way to lose property managers who want to have a social impact is by failing to provide them with the resources they need to be successful in their jobs. This most frequently occurs when members of senior leadership teams offer lip service to mission statements during orientation programs, training seminars and corporate retreats without investing in the corporate infrastructure necessary to ensure the core values embedded in those statements are reflected in day-to-day operational decisions. Avoiding such outcomes requires a thoughtful approach to human resource development.

Training onsite personnel in conflict resolution and establishing hotlines they can call for information on dealing with problems stemming from poverty are some of the steps mission-driven companies take to promote customer service-centric property management. Others include standardizing policies across affordable housing communities and bringing property managers and resident service coordinators together to discuss how they can best serve residents when those policies are violated. Companies who do these things show they care about resident outcomes, while putting their employees in a position to balance the administrative side of the property management business and the human side.

Recognizing property managers for their efforts to advance a company’s mission is no less imperative than providing them with resources. Awards and acknowledgements at corporate events are great, but they are not enough on their own. Mission-oriented metrics must be included in employee performance evaluations to make sure people, not properties, remain the focus of affordable housing operations.

Integrate Affordable Housing into the Fabric of Neighborhoods

Property managers are certainly not the only parties motivated by mission. Developers, asset managers and resident service coordinators are equally likely to be drawn to the affordable housing industry due to the opportunities it affords to improve the prospects of historically marginalized groups. These opportunities are arguably most appealing when companies are catalysts for social change extending well beyond the confines of the properties they develop, own and manage.
In order to be such a catalyst, affordable housing providers must exploit the symbiotic relationships that exist between affordable housing complexes and the neighborhoods that surround them. Some are better at this than others, but all who are serious about their missions realize strengthening communities should be at the heart of their work. Financial benefits accompany social benefits when companies use such efforts to build support among diverse constituencies.

Integrating affordable housing into the fabric of neighborhoods is not about insulating residents from blighting influences. Nor is it about making nearby homeowners and renters comfortable living in close proximity to those in economic need. It is about helping developers, asset managers, property managers and resident service coordinators use affordable housing as an instrument to put time-tested principles of community development to work. Mission-driven companies do this by talking with neighborhood leaders about their problems, building consensus about which are most pressing and collaboratively exploring ways to resolve them. They view affordable housing as a conduit to resources, while ensuring those resources are available to both those who live onsite and those who do not.

There are instances where affordable housing providers serve neighborhoods by incorporating childcare facilities, healthcare clinics and office space for nonprofit organizations into their projects, but these facilities require dedicated funding that is often difficult to come by. As a result, more common endeavors include allowing community groups to use onsite meeting rooms, sponsoring public events, operating food banks and bringing stakeholders in the public, private and nonprofit sectors together to discuss issues. The last of these activities can be very impactful when it increases awareness of problems pervasive in economically fragile neighborhoods.

Sometimes mission-driven companies even directly advocate for neighborhoods. They lobby policymakers to demolish abandoned buildings and improve public infrastructure, leverage relationships with social service providers to get them to expand their offerings in targeted areas and rally business leaders to their cause when it is necessary to achieve their goals. In these situations, they pick their battles wisely and use their political capital in ways anticipated to produce spillover benefits for their residents and their investors.
Measure Resident Outcomes and Quantify Their Impact on Financial Performance

Engaging in activities to strengthen neighborhoods through the provision of high quality affordable housing is one thing. Measuring the effectiveness of those activities is another. Mission-driven companies devote as much attention to one as the other to facilitate continuous improvement at the property, portfolio and organizational level.

Affordable housing providers who rely on unsubstantiated assumptions about how their projects affect residents and neighborhoods often find themselves at a competitive disadvantage. Demand for data analytics is on the rise as a result. This is particularly true in the area of healthcare where there is growing interest in the social determinants of health and wellbeing. The trend has implications for affordable housing developers, asset managers, property managers and resident service coordinators alike, who all face growing pressure to quantify how their work influences resident outcomes, and in turn, how those outcomes impact the financial performance of affordable housing complexes.

Perhaps nowhere are data analytics in greater need than among companies who wish to obtain funding for resident service coordinators. There is strong tangential evidence that having resident service coordinators on affordable housing sites is beneficial. Yet, efforts to quantify the impact on residents’ health, education and employment opportunities are in a nascent state. Empirical models examining how improved resident outcomes impact operating expenses, occupancy rates, rent collection and eviction are even further behind. Filling these voids in the body of knowledge is an emerging priority because affordable housing providers must frequently convince funding agencies and philanthropists of the importance of onsite resident service coordinators when they are to be funded outside a property’s budget, and investors when they are to be funded inside a property’s budget.

For many affordable housing providers, getting ahead in the analytics game starts by reconsidering how they measure success. Output measures are replacing input measures, just as measures of program and service effectiveness are replacing measures of program and service utilization. When done well, this involves determining what outcomes are mission-critical, collecting baseline data to track how those outcomes change over time in response to various interventions and linking those changes to budget line-items in ways that are defensible on methodologi-
cal grounds. New technologies make it increasingly possible to do all of these things in a cost effective manner, but they are of little value if companies are not prepared to evolve.

Data analytics frequently serve as a roadmap for improvement by shining a spotlight on long-standing business practices and social programs that are not particularly effective. Thus, companies who rely on them must be prepared to have tough conversations with their staff, as well as the staff of their partner organizations, about what is working and what is not. These conversations are never easy, but they are necessary to avoid institutional inertia and to create environments where data-driven decision-making is the norm rather than the exception.

7 Recognize Resource Scarcity, Demonstrate Intentionality and Emphasize Transparency

The preceding sections of this report suggest there are few perfect solutions in the affordable housing industry and even fewer one-size-fits-all strategies companies can adopt to put their missions into action. That said, developers, asset managers, property managers and resident service coordinators working on behalf of best-in-class affordable housing providers tend to embrace three common standards of practice that are important to note. They include recognizing resources are scarce, demonstrating intentionality and emphasizing transparency.

Resource scarcity is a dilemma all organizations face. In the affordable housing industry, it requires companies to recognize they cannot do every deal, address every social problem or serve every family in need of a safe, decent and affordable place to live. Only by making tradeoffs can they remain financially solvent, which is a prerequisite to achieve any other goal.

Demonstrating intentionality is the key to stretching resources as far as possible when tradeoffs are necessary. Companies who invest with purpose know what they are getting and what they are giving up when they pursue social objectives, just as they know when generating more cash flow today will help them have a greater social impact tomorrow. Both are imperative because good intentions mean little in the absence of funding to bring them to fruition.

Irrespective of the financial and social goals companies decide to pursue when building the business case for affordable housing investments, they stand a better chance of achieving them when decision-making processes are transparent. Transparency is critical because it serves as a foundation for cooperation, a bridge to information and a means of obtaining buy-in to corporate decisions. Without it, affordable housing providers set the stage for conflict.
Conclusion

The standards of practice and tactical recommendations presented throughout this report should hardly surprise readers who have experienced some modicum of success in the affordable housing industry. However, as many a guide to organizational improvement attest, moving forward often requires reflection on what practices have worked for similarly situated companies in the past and analysis of how shifting competitive landscapes are likely to impact the efficacy of those practices in the future. This report serves as a starting point for such reflection and analysis in the hopes of helping affordable housing providers achieve the lofty goals outlined in their mission statements.