Revolving Fund Feasibility Study
for the Nevada Preservation Foundation

HANBURY
PRESERVATION
CONSULTING

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In 2019, the Nevada Preservation Foundation hired Hanbury Preservation Consulting to conduct a revolving fund feasibility study. The study included a review of organizational documents, a board survey, a membership survey, interviews with local stakeholders, and literature review.

The Nevada Preservation Foundation has decided to focus their initial efforts in the historic Westside neighborhood of Las Vegas. This focus has shaped the study and will shape the ensuing business plan.

While nonprofits need to adopt prudent financial policies, profitability is not their ultimate goal. Thus the study

- addresses whether there is a **need** for a revolving fund,
- gauges the **costs**,
- insures it fits the organization's **mission**, and
- considers what the program should **accomplish**.

The study provides evidence of need through survey and interview responses. It also demonstrates how a revolving fund program is consistent with the organization's mission. The costs of a program can and will vary widely depending on scope and properties involved and will be further explored in the business plan. The remainder of the plan is a series of best practices and recommendations.

Introduction and Methodology

In early 2019 the Nevada Preservation Foundation solicited a proposal to conduct a feasibility study for a revolving fund for the Foundation. They hired Hanbury Preservation Consulting in the spring. The proposed study would include an **internal assessment**, a **needs survey**, **neighborhood meetings**, a review of **best practices**, a **meeting** (with draft report) and a **final report**. The process was designed to examine not only the organization's capacity to develop such a program, but also how it would fit with community needs. An examination of model programs from peer organizations identified best practices relevant to the Foundation. Preliminary results were shared with the board at a meeting on 21 October 2019. This facilitated session allowed the board to consider how a revolving fund would fit its mission, impact operations, and serve the community.

The internal assessment involved a review of relevant documents from the organization. Using online surveys for the board and membership, data was collected about perceptions of needs within the larger community; opinions about and knowledge of revolving funds (their operation and impact); and opportunities for increased cooperation and collaboration with partner organizations. The surveys were augmented by a series of interviews with local community leaders: Earlie King, Shondra Summers-Armstrong, Ken Evans, Monica Ford, John Torrence, Shaundell Newsome, Cedric Crear, Harry Williams, and Kelly Woods. The consultant team which included Jeffrey Harris, also conducted two public meetings on Tuesday 23 July at 11 am and 6 pm the Westside School

The assessment, surveys, meeting notes, and interviews were consolidated into a draft narrative that served as the basis for the draft report and meeting. The meeting was held October 21, 2019. The objectives of the meeting were to review the findings of the assessment, to discuss best practices that are most applicable and relevant to the Society, and to set parameters for the business plan.

Revolving Funds

The term revolving fund encompasses a broad array of programs and in order to better assess the viability of a program for Nevada Preservation Foundation, it is important to define and delineate the type of revolving fund activities this report addresses.

A revolving fund is a program that uses a pool of money to lend to property owners to rehabilitate a building with the corpus then re-lent to another project as the first is finished; or a pool of money used to buy a property and sell it with the sale proceeds replenishing the fund for future purchases. In either case the initial funding pool is re-used for multiple projects thus it is a revolving fund. Revolving Funds operated by preservation nonprofits can be grouped into three categories: nonprofit as *lender*, nonprofit as *salesperson*, and nonprofit as *developer*.

With the nonprofit serving as a *lender*, funds are borrowed by a property owner who uses them to rehabilitate a property and the funds are repaid over time at a low interest rate. In this scenario the nonprofit does not take title to real property, the nonprofit must vet borrowers, and must monitor that work is finished and completed to specifications agreed upon. At this point, Nevada Preservation Foundation is not interested in the lender role but it is important to understand it as an option. Many preservation nonprofits with revolving funds shift between roles and this role may be germane to Nevada Preservation Foundation in the future.

Revolving funds used to buy or control a threatened property are more common. Even so there are many strategies used by purchase funds. The strategies outlined below are not necessarily mutually exclusive. They generally involve a program that uses a pool of money to buy a property, protect it, and sell it with the sale proceeds replenishing the fund for future purchases. The initial funding pool is re-used for multiple projects, thus it is a *revolving* fund. Revolving funds operated by preservation nonprofits can be grouped into many categories. Two relevant ones are: nonprofit as salesperson, and nonprofit as developer.

Some funds operate as *salespeople*. They purchase options on historic properties. An option allows the organization to purchase a property at a set price for a specific period. The option is an expense, but during the time the option is in place the nonprofit does not own the property thus has none of the associated liabilities. However, it also does not have control and property owners may make changes to the property during the option period. The nonprofit will market the property, find an ultimate buyer and when the buyer is found, exercise the option and then buy and re-sell the property, recovering the corpus, often during a single day. This process works well with statewide nonprofits that cover a larger geographic range and with large or complex properties that may tax the resources and capability of the nonprofit.

Other funds position the nonprofit as a *developer*. In this case the fund buys a property in a fee simple real estate transaction. The nonprofit must maintain the property, insure it, pay utilities, make loan payments if it is mortgaged, and pay taxes until it is re-sold. The nonprofit may stabilize the property or make significant improvements. There is more risk in this scenario but also more potential for return with the nonprofit including a developer's fee in the pro forma and adding value that can increase the sales price. Among other risks, there is the risk that the property may not sell quickly and the organization's capital may be tied up in the property for a considerable length of time.

Often when a preservation nonprofit re-sells a historic property they place an easement on it. An easement involves the transfer of certain property rights to an owner independent of the transfer of the real estate itself. For example, the right to demolish a building or to subdivide a large parcel can be separated from the real estate and transferred to a third party that monitors and defends the easement restrictions. In the conservation/ preservation context, these rights are often held by a land trust or government agency that has the ongoing responsibility to inspect the properties and to enforce the easements should a property owner try to take actions that are not in compliance with the easement agreement.

An easement document is drafted by an attorney and it is permanent. Because it is permanent and often involves a diminution of value in the real estate as it limits land use, the donation of an easement to a qualified nonprofit can result in a charitable gift deduction. The responsibility of the easement holder to inspect properties and enforce easements is significant. If it does not fulfill these responsibilities, there can be serious financial repercussions not only to the holder but to the easement donor. While other protection measures may be used, an easement is the most common, and the only permanent protection.

Revolving funds may have a strategic focus. Some revolving funds, particularly those operated by statewide organizations, have holdings and activities scattered over a broad area. They also often focus on securing the future of "landmark" properties or properties that are pivotal for a specific community.

Other funds, often those that have a limited geographical range, focus on specific neighborhoods. This allows for some economies of scale particularly when the fund rehabilitates the buildings prior to sale. Some operate in numerous communities, focusing on the "worst house on the block" to improve the community. Others focus in a single neighborhood at a time which allows staff to inspect and monitor progress efficiently in a circumscribed area. It also allows the fund's organization to begin to develop relationships within the community and develop allies who can also monitor the sites for vandalism, etc. Another benefit to this strategy is that the nonprofit can target a neighborhood that has historic assets but that is undervalued and be the catalyst for revitalization by leveraging its tools and nonprofit status to invest where the market will not assume the risk and build equity in a community that may have few other investors. In this scenario, the nonprofit revolving fund may ultimately be priced out of the neighborhood as the market recognizes the value the revolving fund has created and begins to invest.

Some funds focus on commercial and industrial properties which tend to be larger single projects in terms of both physical size and budget. Other funds focus on residential properties and specifically single family housing. As these projects are smaller, the funds that focus on residential generally have more projects in a given year and can turn over the funds to new projects quickly. Some revolving funds have ventured into partnerships to develop affordable housing. Those that have been successful generally have a strong affordable housing organization as a partner or have a staff member well versed in the federal programs and constraints associated with affordable housing.

Organizational Profile-Nevada Preservation Foundation

Nevada Preservation Foundation was founded in 2013. It is a state-wide, membership, preservation non-profit. It has provided programs and services in design assistance, downtown revitalization, historic resource surveys, designation, lectures, advocacy, publications, special events and tours. It also provides technical assistance for heritage tourism projects. Some of its programs offer professional continuing education credits.

The organization is highly collaborative and has worked with the Urban Land Institute, Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the UNLV Downtown design center and others. Its annual Home + History Las Vegas events have generated revenue while fulfilling a mission of education and heritage tourism.

The board is organized around a committee structure of finance, development, nomination, and program/membership. The organization has indentified skills and qualities they have and need in the board and they recruit new board members strategically. Additionally they have formed a revolving fund advisory committee.

Staff includes an executive director, deputy director, manager of heritage programs, and a historic preservation specialist. A second historic preservation specialist position is currently not filled. The organization has a large corps of volunteers which they manage effectively, particularly for Home + History.

In the three year period from 2016 to 2018 the organization's finances have grown from revenues of roughly $139,000 to $273,000. Revenue comes largely from consulting (fee for service), public support, government grants, membership dues, and event ticket sales. Having a small staff and low overhead helps keeps expenses down. The organization is lean which allows it to be efficient but also provides no cushion for unexpected opportunities.

Feasibility

In the private sector, a feasibility study is used to evaluate a proposed project's potential for success by observing an organization's current operations, anticipating program requirements, and analyzing a course of action. It looks at both external and internal factors including market factors, legal requirements, and financial data. Ultimately the feasibility is determined if the project will be profitable.

While nonprofits need to adopt prudent financial policies, profitability is not their ultimate goal and thus a nonprofit's feasibility study insures it fits the organization's **mission**, addresses whether there is **a need** for a service or program, considers what the program should **accomplish**, and gauges **the costs**.

MISSION

The Nevada Preservation Foundation is a non-profit, non-governmental membership organization established in 2013. Its mission is

> to preserve and revitalize historic buildings and places in Nevada and to cultivate a presence around cultural heritage and tourism. Retention and restoration of our built environment fosters not only a sense of place but also helps to build an engaged community for residents and visitors alike. (Nevada Preservation Foundation) know(s) that preserving our buildings is as much about our collective history as it is about strengthening neighborhoods, creating jobs, diversifying tourism, and boosting conservation.

A revolving fund fits within the mission " to preserve and revitalize historic buildings and places in Nevada."

NEEDS

In a typical study, stakeholders, members and board members are asked about perceived needs in the organization's service area. Nevada Preservation Foundation has already chosen the Historic Westside of Las Vegas as its initial area of interest. Additional areas of need were suggested and can be found in the raw survey data.

In terms of assessing the needs, board members and stakeholders were asked if there was a need for a revolving fund. All of the board members who responded to the online survey saw a need for a revolving fund. Observations included:

> I feel that it is a way of connecting with the community and revitalizing areas that have been neglected. It shows that places and neighborhoods matter. In a absence of any

investment by the city or county, I think the revolving fund is the best alternative. Also, the revolving fund aims to involve the community in the decision making which is essential for its success.

The plan to acquire properties, update them to still fit into the neighborhood, and sell them to current or former community residents with appropriate covenants, will position NPF to have great success.

Nevada is a state with a lot of build it up, tear it down, blow it up or desert it altogether mentality. but it has some really cool history that should be preserved before its gone

Over 91% of the membership respondents saw the need for a revolving fund. Some of their comments included:

Too much has been removed, to date

Absolutely, Vegas has so much history that is just going to waste

I definitely feel that these neighborhoods have so many great homes that just need to be brought back to life

Vegas has been slow to work to protect its history so even though this idea seems to be a bit in the experimental phase now, no time like the present to start preserving

our older residential building stock is often in neglected areas of Las Vegas

This is an excellent idea!

Housing in particularly would work well, as the resale market is stronger than commercial buildings

We haven't done enough to preserve our history, to date.

This cause is worthy of pursuing

Thinking about things like the unexpected fire of the El Cid, it does seem like it's worth it to have some money available to buy, restore, acquire pieces of, etc. when these unexpected things happen.

Las Vegas is so tear-down-happy that any attempt to preserve/remodel historic buildings and dwellings is worth the effort.

I think this is a crucial time to turn the tide of decay in key neighborhoods and areas.

I am seeing many flippers coming into older neighborhoods and using low-quality, non-period-specific materials to sell houses. Typically the construction is shoddy and the

> houses sit on the market as no one involved in preservation wants a home with character on the outside, and box store renovation on the inside.

> Because the State has not stepped into provide economic development funding for historic preservation, any tools the non-profit sector can bring to bear will be helpful - the passion "on the ground" in communities is there. They just need education and resources.

However the membership survey did reflect some discomfort with a focus on Las Vegas. It is not clear how widespread this concern is, but it should be noted. Respondents stated:

> While I appreciate the work the Nevada Preservation Fund is doing, it needs to branch out from Vegas. Northern Nevada deserves their attention too

> there are a lot of buildings in rural Nevada that most people don' know about.

> We could certainly use it here on the Comstock.

> If you drive outside of Las Vegas every town has old buildings and historic value

Additionally some responses indicated a need to continue with efforts to educate the public about how revolving funds work and support the organization's mission. Comments included:

> I don't think this is any different than real estate sales.

> Not sure I understand why the preservation society would purchase properties. I thought the goal was to showcase landmarks and serve as a guide for building owner's. Education. Outreach. Information.

Stakeholders and board members generally saw the need for a fund both in terms of specific buildings and types, as well as a tool to be employed in general.

ACCOMPLISHMENT/EVALUATION

In order to determine if a revolving fund has accomplished its objectives, the Foundation would need to define the needs and goals for the program; determine a methodology for measurement; establish a baseline; collect data; and report on a regular basis

The goals and purpose for a fund need to be further defined, though board members suggested the following:

revitalize the area and bring in other revitalization or new development... raise the prosperity of the surrounding area.

Acquiring the first property, and following the goals of the fund to refurbish the property and successfully re-selling the first property.

success would be the number of/importance of historic buildings preserved

recognizing an entire area and devoting resources not just to one building but an entire community that had a long and rich history.

help bring the community back to life.

save historic properties and strengthen the neighborhood(s) without betraying the long time residents by causing gentrification.

invigorate preservation, save structures that would have been lost

At the 21 October board meeting, goals were discussed but not finalized, though some parameters were established. Work will focus in the Historic Westside. No owner occupied housing will be included. Nevada Preservation Alliance will not build new infill construction. They will work to define historic and likely focus on smaller clusters of possible National Register eligible sections of the community. They will work to find an easement/covenant holder.

COSTS

The costs of a revolving fund program vary greatly and can include more than financial considerations. Also the overall cost of a revolving fund program on a macro scale includes cost considerations for each project or component on a micro scale. Thus a cost determination is dependent on some overall decisions about the nature of the program that need to be determined by the board. With that in mind, this study provides observations and best practices which will give guidance and tools to the board in assessing costs and recommendations for assessing costs and making decisions. Costs will be further examined in a business plan to follow.

Best Practices

MANAGEMENT/STAFF

One person should be the manager with the ultimate responsibility of managing the process, keeping records, and being the central point for communications. Other responsibilities may be divided among other staff or board members (particularly financial and bookkeeping duties).

Early on it would be beneficial to have written job descriptions or project responsibilities so that no tasks are overlooked and everyone has a clear idea of his or her responsibilities and what they can expect from others. While seasoned organizations may not rely on these job descriptions as much, as the organization gains more experience with the program and working with each other, having written expectations can help when there is change on the board or when staff members are added to projects. As the program grows and evolves it is a good idea to review job descriptions to insure they continue to reflect the work that needs to be done and that they assign responsibilities appropriately. These informal job descriptions could be adapted for use to recruit permanent dedicated staff if and as the program expands.

Board members and volunteers as well as staff should track the hours spent on the revolving fund program and divide them between project specific tasks and programmatic tasks (i.e. spent 1 hour inspecting construction progress at 123 Main St-project specific, or spent 1 hour in committee discussing possibility of securing pro bono legal services for all of our closings--programmatic). This will give the organization a better idea of time costs, especially for those tasks that may be covered initially by board members but may eventually be assumed by staff.

Some tasks may also be outsourced either to professionals offering pro bono services or to paid contractors such as architects or realtors. Those must be accounted for as well and regular review can determine if the cost and quality are sufficient, and if some tasks may be brought in house with appropriate staff ability and capacity.

Some funds have started with no dedicated staff, notably Knox Heritage. The Palmetto Trust operates with one full time staff. And Preservation Greensboro provides staffing support to an affiliated revolving fund, Preservation Greensboro Development Fund which has no permanent staff.

Younger and smaller programs tend to rely more on an active board or committee. Historic Augusta claims that a good committee is vital. The Foundation has an advisory committee with good connections to programs and the community, but it may not be a working committee charged with implementation.

While Historic Fort Worth has had a staffer whose primary responsibility is the fund, a realtor on their committee is conducted a market study, and a contractor reviewed bids and provides project oversight. The L'Enfant Trust has a small staff but forty years of easement monitoring experience and a bookkeeper that understands construction finances. Preservation Greensboro Development Fund's board is hands-on and includes an attorney who handles many of the fund's legal issues, contractors who oversee rehabilitation work, and a realtor who assists with marketing. They also perform the easement inspections. Historic Macon divides the revolving fund responsibilities over several staff but only two, a designer and a carpenter/contractor, devote 100% of their time to the program. This organization rehabilitates 7-10 houses a year including new construction.

Experience and skill sets useful in revolving funds include finance, budgeting, and construction experience. Some have suggested that a real estate background is vital for someone managing a revolving fund and an advanced degree in historic preservation does not generally equip someone to manage a revolving fund. Especially if the fund is working in a focused area, community engagement and outreach would be good experience to have. The National Trust/National Development Council's Historic Real Estate Finance training comes highly recommended. And at least one organization focuses on broader attributes--to manage a revolving fund one must be creative, optimistic, and good at multitasking. In considering "non historic" properties, other skill sets may be needed--a landscape architect, a surveyor, an environmental planner, a farmer, a recreation specialist, or others. Management responsibilities, effort, and time will vary in terms of the complexity of projects and number of projects undertaken simultaneously.

NON-PERSONNEL RESOURCES

Resources include money but also encompass donations such as real property, materials for rehabilitation, and services. Most revolving funds use a combination of these resources to make each project work. Donation of a property itself is sometimes the impetus for a revolving fund. Palmetto Trust has accepted donations of real property. Offers of real property should be vetted to insure that there are not issues are overly burdensome such as outstanding liens, clouds on chain of title, hazardous material abatement requirements, etc. While these obstacles will not necessarily be a reason to reject an in-kind gift, an informed decision to accept real property should be based on information collected during a due diligence period and a consideration of the current expertise and capacity of the revolving fund program with the understanding that experience and capacity change and deals that were unadvisable at one point in the lifetime of the program may be possible at other times.

Many funds capitalize on donated materials. Donors to projects with Knox Heritage not only get a charitable deduction but extensive promotion by Knox Heritage. Donors are highlighted in project house tours, printed materials, web pages and media interviews. This exposure and association with successful projects allows manufacturers and hardware stores to reach an audience interested in rehabilitation and home improvement, thus sometimes donations (cash or in kind) are not drawn from a limited charitable contribution budget but from their marketing line item. Given the local scope of the Foundation's initial service area, there are good opportunities to build relationships with in kind donors in the area and involve them in a revolving fund. However be discerning in accepting gifts. L'Enfant Trust observed that some in-kind gifts end up being expensive--a donation of tile required skilled trades to install it and ultimately made the project more expensive.

Some board members can provide or have access to services needed for a revolving fund such as realtors, lawyers, accountants, insurance brokers, surveyors, home inspectors. Any of these services that can be donated or obtained at a discount saves funds for other aspects of the project and improves the ultimate bottom line.

The board will be defining the program's mission, determining its goals, creating policies and procedures for project selection and creating a methodology to measure results. People with experience and skills that would be helpful could include, but not be limited to: a banker, a home inspector, a surveyor, an insurance broker, a real estate attorney (with knowledge of easements, taxes), a title company representative, building suppliers, an accountant with construction finance experience, a human resource professional who works in construction, someone with communications and marketing experience, a realtor, a contractor, an architect, a historic preservation expert, a landscape architect, a surveyor, an environmental planner, and others.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

In operating a revolving fund, as in operating a nonprofit or any other sort of business, the Society needs to be aware of the context in which it operates. A weak local economy often means that historic properties are less likely to be threatened by demolition or development, but more threatened by neglect and lack of maintenance. It also means that it will be more difficult to sell a property in a revolving fund program, it may take more time (increasing carrying costs) or require a reduced sales price (cutting margins).

A hot real estate market generally undercuts purchase options though most cities have some areas that are not as active as others. In Charleston, a program initially developed to save threatened properties in the Ansonborough neighborhood can no longer afford to operate there. The private sector now appreciates this community. The real estate prices prohibitively expensive for their revolving fund, and that neighborhood no longer needs a revolving fund.

INITIAL AND OTHER FUNDRAISING

There is no one single formulaic approach to fund development. A 2013 survey of historic preservation revolving funds showed fourteen different sources of funds and many of them were used in combinations with each other.

			SOURCES OF FUND CAPITAL							
	National Grants	Local,Regional Grants	Capital Campaign	Individuals	Govt	Bequests	Gifts of Property	Easement fees	PRI	Other
A	20.0%			5.0%	25.0%		50.0%			
B	5.0%		40.0%				40.0%			
C										100.0%
D									65.0%	35.0%
E		25.0%							75.0%	
F		25.0%	20.0%	10.0%	30.0%					
G							100.0%			
H	20.4%	21.7%	19.2%	11.5%						27.1%
I	22.5%	2.5%	35.0%	25.0%				5.0%	10.0%	
J		30.0%								70.0%
K	15.0%	5.0%	80.0%							
L	20.0%			4.0%						76.0%
M				50.0%	50.0%					
N	13.0%	6.0%						81.0%		
O	25.0%									75.0%
P	30.0%	30.0%		10.0%						30.0%
Q	60.0%	40.0%								
R										
S	100.0%									
T	25.0%	25.0%							50.0%	
U		10.0%					60.0%	5.0%	20.0%	
V					100.0%					
W				40.0%		40.0%	20.0%			
X	12.8%	4.2%		65.0%						18.0%
Y		5.0%	5.0%		10.0%				80.0%	
Z										
AA		77.0%		33.0%						
	13	**14**	**6**	**10**	**5**	**1**	**5**	**3**	**6**	**8**
	other included: endowment, endowment loan, general fund, invenstments, and a return of an option purchased									

Knox Heritage used a line of credit with a patient lender to start their revolving fund. Historic Galveston Foundation received a large initial grant tied to work in The Strand area. Historic Fort Worth has worked with city government to identify houses in target areas that are in foreclosure due to tax liens and are raising funds to buy a house from the city for the cost of the lien. Preservation Greensboro has received a donation of a house and funds from the city in recognition of the savings to the city of demolition and landfill costs. It has also conducted capital campaigns. Historic Macon had a gala in the 1970s and undertook a campaign in the 1980s to provide monies for their program. They also received a loan from the National Trust in the 1990s under a program that unfortunately no longer exists.

LEGAL

One external set of parameters is state and local law. An attorney should review the organization's bylaws and incorporation status to see if any amendments are required in order to establish a program or any of its components (owning property, borrowing and/or lending, etc).

PUBLIC POLICIY

Political changes can create an environment that is more or less friendly to preservation and conservation. Elected officials and senior staff in local government shape public policy which in turns establishes priorities for public spending and programs. Some of these priorities may directly engage in preservation issues but others may have unintended consequences and it is important to monitor federal, state and local governments, changes in policies, and elections.

In Tennessee, legislation was passed that allowed a local government to enter into a negotiated sale of real estate with nonprofits rather than require them to put a property out for bids through a Request for Proposals (RFP). This gave Knox Heritage the opportunity to purchase properties directly from local governments without having to prepare an RFP and compete with the larger market. In Galveston, programs established to provide relief in the aftermath for Hurricane Ike provided additional funding opportunities within specific location and time parameters. The availability of tax credits have made properties marketable in many communities, and Historic Macon even includes a tax credit consulting fee in their pro forma.

The Foundation should be aware of local and state policies and programs that could impact their program directly as well as those that could help donors and purchasers including tax credits, facade grants, loans, TDRs, impact fees, use taxes, and estate taxes. and down payment assistance programs. While these are generally government programs others may involve housing, redevelopment, and economic development authorities. A good example of public policy and its impact on a revolving fund is Nevada's partial abatement of real estate taxes. Tax increases are capped annually, however the taxable basis is re-set with the sale of a property.

The Foundation has a close connection to the state legislature and land bank and other legislation should be closely monitored. Local government policies also merit study particularly as the initial focus of the program will be in Las Vegas.

POLICIES, STRATEGIES & ROLES

Nevada Preservation Foundations should consider developing policies to serve as guidelines to evaluate potential properties and to guide the program overall. That said, it is important to know when to break the rules. Contrary to its general policy, Preservation Greensboro managed a few projects in a "non historic" neighborhood in order to form a partnership with the University of North Carolina Greensboro-a relationship that they believe will reinforce their core program in the long term.

Palmetto Trust considers projects with two criteria in mind--is the property significant enough that its demolition will be a loss to the region and the state, and is there local action and energy to support Palmetto's Trust investment.

The Foundation may also develop a strategy or philosophy for engagement with the understanding that this will likely change over time. Knox Heritage works over a multi-county region. They tend to "pick the worst house in the neighborhood." By improving the worst house in the block, the whole community improves by a ripple effect. Indeed Kim Trent of Knox Heritage adopted an informal measure of success after one neighbor told her that after Knox Heritage had rehabilitated the worst house in his block, pizza companies would now deliver to the neighborhood.

Other local revolving funds focus on specific neighborhoods seeking economies of scale and looking to secure neighborhood stability. Historic Macon Foundation has used this approach and has found that it also allows them to target donors and partners that have a specific interest in certain communities. Their work has expanded to include not only the rehab of historic properties but the construction of new infill on vacant lots that is sympathetic to the character of the neighborhood. However this policy is not always popular as other neighborhoods feel left out.

Focusing on a single neighborhood allows for economies of scale and synergy. It also requires a large investment of time and resources to work with the community and its civic league or neighborhood organizations. Preservation Greensboro noted it was key to understand how they were perceived in the communities in which they worked. The L'Enfant Trust was able to allay fears once they realized that the Anacostia neighborhood was concerned about gentrification and "flipping" houses.

It is difficult for statewide nonprofits to serve as developers given the sheer scope of their service area unless they adopt a proscribed service area. For a local preservation nonprofit their roles may be more dependent on the volatility of a local real estate market. Preservation Greensboro has found that purchasing options is difficult in a hot real estate market thus moving them towards a developer role. But even those funds that act as a developer have some variations. Historic Macon generally sells houses that are "move-in ready" whereas Preservation Greensboro often leaves bathrooms and kitchens roughed in allowing purchasers to make decisions on areas of the house where design preferences may vary and there is more flexibility under preservation standards. Historic Fort Worth anticipates its inaugural project will involve fee simple ownership and limited rehab to include a new roof, cleaning, perhaps some landscaping.

Some policies were developed in response to negative experiences. Preservation Greensboro does not make grants from their fund nor do they finance purchases. It also requires buyers to sign a restoration agreement that lays out specific aspects of the rehabilitation of properties including timing. And Historic Fort Worth plans to install an alarm system (for theft and fire) into each property purchased. The Society should develop policies for real estate and engagement and should revisit them on a regular basis to insure they continue to address current needs.

Madison-Morgan Conservancy has a tool to assist in setting policy and determining procedures, the Conservation Easement Priorities document based on the Conservation Easement Mapping and Prioritization (CEMAP). The CEMAP, built on earlier city and county greenprint projects, is an evaluation and assessment of 11,606 parcels--the entirety of the county--based on natural, agricultural and cultural and historic resources. This document was adopted as part of the Conservancy's most recent strategic plan. Developed to guide easement decisions, it should also guide revolving fund decisions. While some information such as purchase price and property condition may shift, the underlying data of the CEMAP can help the Conservancy evaluate real estate opportunities and make informed decisions about strategic interventions.

The board survey asked how candidate buildings would be prioritized for a revolving fund. Suggestions included :

> starting in an area is a good idea rather than just one house here and there.
> there must be multiple factors taken into consideration such as potential positive impact, where candidate buildings sit in the bigger picture, ability to complete the projects, etc.
>
> There should be an overall strategic plan first, and then candidate buildings must be assessed based on how they fit into the strategic plan.
>
> Prioritize buildings that have been re-possessed by the city or county, that can be updated to community standards and resold.
>
> by historical significance, saveable features, location and need/desire of the community.

<u>EDUCATION</u>

While not every audience needs to have a detailed explanation of the nuts and bolts of how the program will work, a general set of talking points should be developed and delivered through multiple delivery systems to numerous audiences. In developing education/outreach materials there needs to be a consideration of the overall program which may develop and evolve over time and for each specific deal/property.

Another key issue to be addressed in education is that a revolving fund is generally not a fund per se. Many people picture them to be some large liquid bank account like a war chest being saved up and doled out to projects. A revolving fund is more of a program and indeed Preservation North Carolina now calls their revolving fund their threatened properties program. By being clear on this point it can encourage donors who may have been hesitant to donate to a "fund" but who are interested in the activity in a program that saves threatened properties.

PARTNERS

As with many programs, partnerships can be used to leverage resources. The key is to find where a potential partner's areas of interest intersect with the revolving fund's mission, activity or impact.

The city can be a valuable partner. Cities sometimes seize properties that have outstanding liens or are condemned. They may have a list of properties that have been foreclosed on that are up for auction. This could provide leads for properties or in the case where the city has taken title to real estate, relieve the city of the burden demolition of re-sale. The Society could negotiate for the waiver of liens if they will develop a plan for a property. The local historic preservation commission may also be a good source for leads on threatened historic properties. In Washington DC, a city council member who was impressed with L'Enfant Trust's their first two projects in the Anacostia neighborhood is looking for other houses in the neighborhood owned by the city to donate or sell at a reduced price to the Trust.

Often suppliers are looking to market their goods to a cohort interested in construction and rehabilitation, such as those who partner with Knox Heritage.

Large institutions can be valuable partners. Duke and Yale Universities among others have real estate and community outreach ventures that not only help secure real estate for university functions but also purchase and rehabilitate buildings for University use to invest in programs that help create and preserve work force housing for University staff. Mercer University has been a strong partner with Historic Macon Foundation, investing in revolving fund projects in neighborhoods close to the campus to make them safe and attractive communities. They also have a grant program to University employees to assist with home purchases in targeted communities where HMF is working. Preservation Greensboro has worked with the University of North Carolina-Greensboro to develop workforce housing near the university. High Point University is an obvious potential partner. Other large employers such as hospitals can also be prospective partners.

Montana Preservation Alliance's model has been to partner with developers to tackle larger scale buildings. The alliance can provide technical support and capacity to purchase the building through donations and various municipal programs, at which point the developer can draft a pro forma and implement rehabilitation. Both organization share risk and return while leveraging their unique contributions. On occasion, additional equity partners are included. Each project is established as a unique legal entity shielding the Alliance from extended exposure and liability.

Affordable housing nonprofits and Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO) can be partners. Other partners could be Community Development Corporations (CDC), retail and Main Street associations, and self taxing districts. Suggestions for potential partners from surveys and interviews included:

- City of Las Vegas
- UNLV
- Health department
- Youthbuild
- Workforce development
- neighborhood small businesses
- churches
- banks
- transit organizations
- think tanks
- Urban Chamber
- Economic Opportunity Board
- Las Vegas Urban League
- NAACP
- historians
- KCEP radio
- MLK Foundation
- Habitat
- Nevada Partners
- Trade organizations
- Banks
- Elected officials

These partners can provide funding, or in kind support. They can also serve as audiences and sounding boards for outreach and education campaigns and for developing polices and priorities. Targeted input can bring expertise on specific issues and potential target parcels.

<u>REPUTATION</u>

One challenge that the Foundation will face is reputation. The foundation has a good reputation overall, though it is not a "household name." It is planning to operate in a neighborhood where it is physically located. However its reputation in the community is mixed. There are still some concerns, many based on a neighborhood history that pre-dates the Nevada Preservation Foundation. The Foundation has held regular community meetings to increase transparency and to communicate its intentions. It has also assembled an advisory board that includes people that are involved in the neighborhood, if not residents. In addition to its reputation within the service area, the Foundation as a young organization will have to continue to establish its reputation outside the service area as well in order to bring resources to bear on the program.

Heidi Swank the executive director, is well known and well-respected. Her reputation accrues to the organization. This can be a benefit, though the organization should not rely on this at the expense of establishing a reputation independent of the director.

PROJECT BY PROJECT FEASIBILITY

Each project should have its own feasibility study and these range from checklists to lengthy reports. Each organization has its own parameters for determining feasibility and the Society should draw on local expertise with legal and real estate backgrounds to determine its own process however it should consider in purchase and rehabilitation, at least the following issues

- ownership, deed and title review,
- land surveys,
- zoning,
- property inspection (structural, hazardous materials, condition),
- appraisals,
- insurance,
- easements or covenants
- building code,
- purchase price,
- taxes and tax liens,
- acquisition costs (including financing if applicable),
- utilities (condition and costs),
- drainage,
- access,
- parking,
- encroachments,
- encumbrances,
- construction permitting,
- environmental regulations
- potential uses
- carrying capacity of land
- agricultural or forestry yield
- other special considerations specific to each project

As the program evolves, the Foundation should establish policies and procedures for real estate acquisition and development and a checklist for evaluating prospective properties. Each property will be unique and the goals of each property in terms of financial return and impact will be unique. Knox Heritage now includes property taxes in its pro formas. Though as a nonprofit they are exempt from these taxes, they pay them as a gesture to the city and as a public relations effort. When they measure their impact and communicate the return to the city, they include these taxes.

MARKETING

As a developer or seller of real estate, the Foundation will need to develop a good understanding of the local real estate market in order to vet potential projects in terms of their ability to be turned over and the corpus made available for the next project. Unless the Foundation wants to carry and rent properties, there need to be buyers. At some point it may consider obtaining or commissioning market studies to understand the customer base for the properties it is trying to sell.

In housing markets the traditional supply-demand type of market research draws heavily on historic data and like with any other investment carries the caveat that "past performance is not a reliable indicator of future results." This research is being supplanted by more sophisticated models that look at demographics and behavioral models and preferences for those cohorts that live or are coming to an area. Historic Macon commissioned a housing study to help them understand the needs and preferences of the Macon market and to make decisions about the design and size of units accordingly.

For each individual project there needs to be a marketing plan on how to eventually sell the real estate. Some revolving funds advertise through their website or websites such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation particularly when marketing large, architecturally significant and expensive buildings which may attract buyers from outside the local market. There may be websites and venues specific to farm and timber properties as well. Different properties will attract different types of buyers. The Society should consider all sorts of private and public sector buyers. Some funds work with realtors or brokers to market properties, sometimes with donated or reduced priced services by the realtor and sometimes with the realtor charging market rate for his or her services.

Some revolving funds partner with other nonprofits to stage real estate as part of a joint fundraising Designer Show House. This can be a fun social event that can raise funds while getting exposure for a specific subject property. Other revolving funds that operate numerous projects within a specific neighborhood or region have staged hard hat tours of works in progress. Again this allows for an element of a social event/party/ fundraiser while showing off a property. It can also be used to make presentation on rehabilitating wooden windows or improving energy efficiency in older homes, thus fulfilling an educational mission and perhaps securing sponsors such as manufacturers of say, tankless hot water heaters or efficient HVAC systems or the local electrical or gas utility.

Preservation Greensboro advocates a large sign at every project with a logo and a positive message like "Restoration in Progress."

RISK TOLERANCE

A revolving fund manager once said that a revolving fund is like parenthood. If you really understood how hard it would be, you may have never had children. But having had children, you realized it was the best and most important thing you had done.

It is important to realize that the revolving fund will likely NOT be a source of large, recurring, general operating revenue. In a 2013 survey of 28 historic preservation revolving funds across the country, when asked about the initial catalyst or funding for their program, none listed revenue potential.

Historic Galveston Foundation generally tries to break even on projects. Revenue while appreciated, is not expected. Knox Heritage has a $35,000 CD designated as a loss reserve to be drawn upon as needed. The L'Enfant Trust lost money on its first two projects but sees that as an investment or a loss leader as the projects have purchased enough credibility and good will that they may well receive several property donations from the city.

Historic Macon illustrates the risk/return pattern in investing. They assume a greater risk in purchasing properties outright and acting as a developer but stand to earn a greater financial return. However that return is rarely a profit on the sales price but is built into to the project itself with a developer's fee, a tax credit consulting fee, and construction management fee now that they have a contractor on staff. All are a percentage of the sales price. Any profits from a sale itself are divided with 1/2 going to the organization's operating budget and one half going to an endowment.

Preservation Greensboro generally breaks even on projects however they are comfortable with losing money as the project is mission driven. The Palmetto Trusts' program is predicated on a "risk culture," filling the gap where others cannot, including the costs of holding slave cabin in Anderson for eight years now as it is "the right thing to do."

ACOUNTABILITY

As with every program of the Foundation there needs to be accounting and reporting. Specific reporting requirements should be developed and could include balance sheets, income statements, budgets, and other reporting on a case by case basis. Board members surveyed desired frequent and transparent reporting. One suggested "regular reporting on the health of the fund, current and potential property candidates, community surveys, and some regular impact reports." Another requested, "quarterly reporting on progress and next steps." And another proposed reporting, "project by project, and then quarterly or upon major milestones." Most organizations are focused on accountability to the board, the membership and to funders. In the case of NPF's proposed Historic Westside project an additional layer of accountability to the community needs to be added. The regular community meetings are a good start, but email, website, newsletters and additional meetings, perhaps at other venues as part of others' agendas, should be considered and a communications plan developed.

PROTECTION/EASEMENTS

Most programs require an easement on a property as it is sold. The L'Enfant Trust is an organization that for forty years has held easements and is only now starting a revolving fund. Their easement program requires a one-time donation of 1% of the sales price of the property which goes into a fund to support easement inspection and maintenance. They hold 11,000 easements which are inspected annually.

Preservation Greensboro requires easements and the inspections are performed by their board. They place plaques on easement properties to help remind new buyers of the restrictions on the property. They have also learned to review easement documents carefully, once having restrictions on the number of residential units on a parcel that was zoned for other uses and where the owner eventually built multiple storage units (which were not limited in the easement language).

Historic Macon also has plaques on easement properties and extracts a 1% fee at the property's re-sale to support monitoring, though this may not be legal in all places. Their easements generally only apply to maintenance and they rely on the local district designation and historic preservation commission to enforce design issues.

The Palmetto Trust holds easements but has a challenge to monitor them given the statewide scope of the program. It is considering partnerships with local groups to either monitor or assume easements.

Historic Augusta also requires easements and they make it a condition of the sale or as part of the transfer process having been misled in the past by a purchaser who said he would donate an easement but did not. Their easements are exterior and are inspected annually.

Easement monitoring and enforcement is a large responsibility. Many organizations that have older easements, often did not extract funding to reserve for monitoring and thus those easements have created a financial liability. Cazenovia Preservation Foundation is reviewing its operations in light of the monitoring responsibilities it has accumulated.

Some organizations look to other tools for protection. Historic Macon works within locally designated historic districts and relies on the local preservation commission to regulate exterior changes to buildings it has rehabilitated and sold. This assumes that the designation will remain and the commission is well run, with good guidelines, all of which are subject to change. Foothills Conservancy has sold or transferred property to government agencies that have a preservation or conservation mandate.

EVALUATION

One of the first tasks the organization will have to undertake in developing a revolving fund is to define its objectives and then determine a means to measure and evaluate success. In the survey, the board was asked in two ways how it would evaluate a revolving fund.

First, they were asked how they would measure success for a revolving fund. In another way to visualize success, the board was asked if the Foundation were to receive an award five years from now for its successful revolving fund, how would the awarding agency describe what it had accomplished. The answers reflected qualitative and quantitative measures. Measures of success as indicated by the board survey include:

- revitalize the area and bring in other revitalization or new development... raise the prosperity of the surrounding area.
- Acquiring the first property, and following the goals of the fund to refurbish the property and successfully re-selling the first property.
- success would be the number of/importance of historic buildings preserved
- recognizing an entire area and devoting resources not just to one building but an entire community that had a long and rich history.
- help bring the community back to life.
- save historic properties and strengthen the neighborhood(s) without betraying the long time residents by causing gentrification.
- invigorate preservation, save structures that would have been lost

On an annual basis, the program should be analyzed for measures of success. How many properties have been obtained? How many have been sold? What have been the holding and rehabilitation costs in aggregate and individually? How much time has elapsed from purchase to sale? What have been the unexpected obstacles? How can they be avoided, anticipated or overcome in the future? What best practices have we developed internally and how can they be expanded across the program? What other resources could benefit the program and how can we acquire them? Some of this data can be drawn for the evaluations conducted for each project at its conclusion.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The board was asked how the community at large would perceive a revolving fund at the Foundation. All respondents thought it would be seen positively overall. Comments included,

- I think there would be some skeptics at first. But if they saw how well it worked, it may encourage more support and contributions from other sources.
- I think the success rides on how this is approached with the community. We won't be able to please everyone, but we still must have a strong partnership with the community. If we are able to proceed with training community members and providing valuable skillsets moving forward, this could be seen very positively.
- If it is simple, understandable and actionable by residents, it would be well received.
- I think it would be appreciated, but we would want to be sensitive in reaching out to and taking feedback from the communities where we would be working

Historic Augusta, Preservation Greensboro and L'Enfant Trust have recognized the merits of early quick, successes or low hanging fruit or even initial projects operating at a loss in order to move quickly and make a mark in the community.

Positive annual data should be promoted. This can be done in a variety of ways--through an annual report or a luncheon or event where annual report data is shared. Before and After photographs are powerful tools and can augment the numbers and statistics that indicate fund performance. Story telling can also add a qualitative aspect to fund reporting--who has moved into the rehabilitated buildings, why did they buy the property, and what does the property mean to them? As with photographs of the buildings, this "puts a face" on the program. Another way to measure and communicate the impact of the program is to look at the larger economic impact on the community--for preservation projects, how much was spent on construction and what does that translate into jobs, what is the increase in the value of the property and how has that contributed to tax rolls. What has been the environmental impact of the fund--how many tons of demolition waste have not gone to the local landfill?

In communicating this value and impact, it is important to consider the audience and to find the methods and the facts that will resonate with that specific audience. It is also important to preach beyond the choir. How can the message meet new audiences? Cultivating a relationship with the media, making presentations at civic clubs or city council meetings, and equipping board members with talking points that can be used at impromptu meetings are all methods of taking the message to the broader community. Knox Heritage counted it as a measure of success when their revolving fund projects were no longer profiled in the features section of the paper, but in the business section. In addition to an annual report, a marketing plan for the program should include regular opportunities to reach out through the year to donors, membership and/or the community at large, to promote specific and timely stories.

Preservation Greensboro highlights their revolving fund and easement properties on their walking tours. They credit the program with a lot of positive press and believes it has been transformative for the organization.

Given Nevada Preservation Foundation's plan to work in Historic Westside, there are specific audiences to consider, metrics to develop, and stories to tell.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

Members surveyed expressed a few concerns. One was concerned about external market factors, citing " Concerns regarding the strength of commercial real estate market, should NPF traffic in that arena." Others expressed a desire to know more about how a fund would actually operate:

- how does loan "revolve" how are projects generating revenue to return dollars to the fund?
- Would it be managed similar to an endowment?
- Who will be in charge of overseeing the fund?
- What will be parameters and/or protocol for distribution?
- The word "revolving fund" is very unspecified. I think some would be hesitant to contribute to a fund that lacks detail as to what project it would cover.
- Where would funds come from?
- How much max would be taken from fund?
- What happens if not enough funds are secured for your purposes?
- How does it work?
- How much help or interference do you expect we will get from local, state and federal government
- Work closely with GOED and local governments to insure higher ROI for the Fund at point of NPF sale to new owner.
- Program will need a lot of technical review and support by folks who know SOI standards. Staff with technical expertise and a big travel budget recommended.

While some members were enthusiastic supporters ("I love this idea!" "it is a good idea to explore") at least one was opposed to a program that involved purchase and re-sale:

> This sounds very much like buying and flipping homes. I don't think it makes sense to be in the business of doing so. I think it makes more sense to establish a revolving fund that provides funds for homeowners to rehab these homes, with advice from the NPF.

Board members' concerns were focused first on organizational capacity ("Mismanagement of funds due to lack of experience;" "taking on a new area, making errors that harm the fund's chances of success due to inexperience" " I would be concerned about our capacity to manage the fund."). Others mentioned the specific plan to work in Westside. NPF needs to "(insure) that the community is on board. The Westside has been neglected so much over the years, promises have been made and not kept. I am concerned about how this is approached so that we ensure that the community values our involvement." Part of that has to do with communication and managing expectations, as none board member suggested "we have a clear and concise plan that the community supports." Others were attuned to outside influences both positive--desiring " that we have access to advisors from banks, real estate executives, etc."; and negative that "our efforts (may be) supplanted by large redevelopment projects."

Participants at the community meetings were vocal and had strong opinions. Many decried the demolitions in the neighborhood and expressed concerns about outside players with deep pockets (city, developers, etc) having plans for the community. Several property owners conceded that they needed assistance with their properties but were reluctant to sell even if the houses were vacant. For many, continuing to own the property in the community was of great importance to them. Many were frustrated that the program was not designed to help owner -occupied housing as there is a clear need for that sort of program. There was a great concern about outsiders profiting off the community with put contributing back or being a part of the community. The demolition of buildings for surface parking was decried. Any efforts that NPF makes need to be part of larger issues such as sidewalks and job training. Some suggested loans for un occupied housing or a right of first refusal for homes purchased and re-sold. There was a desire for some of the investment and expenditure to stay in the community and that community contractors be sued. There was concern that NPF would "profit" off such a program at the community's expense and NPF should find a way to differentiate itself from a "flipper." Some see NPF as having a "sweetheart deal at the school." Job training and preservation education was desired. There needs to be a way to communicate the benefits to the community at large. Additional concerns specific to Westside drawn from interview and community meetings are found in the Westside Considerations section of the report.

Recommendations/Conclusions

In interviewing preservation organizations that operate revolving funds and reviewing the literature on these funds there a number of very basic, overarching recommendations.

First, start small. Even with a well-considered, well-funded program design there are always unanticipated situations as well as a learning curve as an organization transitions from a theoretical understanding to practical experience. A small initial project can allow the organization to refine its procedures with limited exposure while building financial capacity and expertise.

Second, be nimble. It appears that every preservation revolving fund has a different origin story. While there may be commonalities across the spectrum of fund programs, each is unique as a result of the flexibility that is required to run such a program. Unanticipated opportunities and pitfalls are the norm and while overriding policies and guidelines are important, the ability to adapt quickly to conditions on the ground is the hallmark of a successful program. A revolving fund is not for a group that is hidebound or that refuses to change its course when presented with new facts and options.

Third, evolve. Many of the recommendations and best practices presented here are aspirational. They are a compilation and distillation of the aggregate knowledge drawn from years of work and sometimes have been learned through bitter experience. Indeed every fund manager has at least one war story of a nightmare project. If the organization cannot tolerate at least one of these, they should not embark on a revolving fund program. Successful programs start small but evolve and create new infrastructure as they grow.

Fourth, keep your objective in mind. The objective of the fund needs to be defined. What is the fund designed to accomplish in the short and long term? That does not mean that the objective cannot change in time and adapt as situations do (be nimble, evolve), but without an overarching objective, measurement standards are arbitrary. It is important to note that providing a source of revenue for the organization is never a good objective for a preservation revolving fund.

The Nevada Preservation Foundation meets the feasibility standard for a nonprofit revolving fund if it can define what the program should **accomplish**, as there is a **need** for a fund, the **costs** are flexible, and it fits the organization's **mission**.

Westside Considerations

In that Nevada Preservation Foundation will begin its program in Historic Westside, it is important to understands specific features and concerns of the community. These considerations were drawn from stakeholder interviews and community meetings.

There has been a great deal of demolition which has resulted not only in the loss of historic properties but in a general unraveling of the urban fabric that supports the remaining buildings and that create opportunities for new construction that could vary widely in quality and impact on the existing community.

"Gentrification" which means different things to different people was also mentioned frequently. Part of that concern is the perceived threat to the majority African-American community by newcomers particularly whites and Hispanics. Also there are concerns for a large elderly population that may be threatened by changing demographics. It also includes improvements that may "price out" existing residents or speculation that could result in further demolition of historic structures and institutions and the diminution of a collective community identity.

There was also a concern that the benefits to a project in Historic Westside would not accrue to the long time residents but to new comers and to outside contractors.

Existing historic homes tend to be small and there is a challenge to "preserving" those places while rehabilitating them to serve families or others who may need larger accommodations.

Misunderstandings about potential involvement of the city or other agencies threatens investment as there is uncertainty about what investments may or may not be made in the neighborhood.

There are many churches in the neighborhood and they have a big influence on properties and people.

Many existing house are vacant and susceptible to squatters.

Many owners have a long connection to the neighborhood and are reluctant to sell even if they do not occupy or rent their properties.

There is a great desire for economic development and workforce development in the community and perhaps an opportunity to teach building trades to Westside citizens.

Work done in Westside should conform to the 100 Plan

Westside has a high concentration of poverty, homelessness, and unemployment.

How can Westside be a model for other historically African American communities? For other communities that are economically stressed?

How will saving the architecture in Westside tell the story of the community?

Some meeting participants stayed that if the city condemned property and then gave it is NPF, that would be "unfair."

Residents want to see an improved neighborhood and also an economic benefit.

Property owners may perceive of NPF as having "deep pockets" and may hold out for a high sale price

NPF board and staff need to include minorities, perhaps some from Westside.

Many children and grandchildren of those who first lived there are not moving back as there is "nothing for them" in Westside. Getting younger people engaged is important.

Westside should not just be a photo opportunity for NPF.

NPF cannot and arguably should not have a program that meets all the community's needs and must be able to manage expectations. Should they have a referral network for resident needs they aren't addressing?

The history and legacy of the place is a key asset that needs to be a key focus of the project