

# HOUSING SUBSIDY REFORM POLICY PROPOSAL

## Table of Contents

- [Tenant Co-op Acquisition Program \(TCAP\)](#)
- [EXECUTIVE SUMMARY](#)
  - [The Problem](#)
  - [The Solution: TCAP Framework](#)
  - [Financial Impact](#)
  - [Program Outcomes \(10-Year Projection\)](#)
- [PART I: RESEARCH FOUNDATIONS](#)
  - [1.1 Policy Framework](#)
  - [1.2 Strategic Approach](#)
  - [1.3 Implementation Framework](#)
  - [1.4 Policy Question Significance](#)
  - [1.5 Research Basis & Evidence](#)
- [PART II: POLICY DESIGN & IMPLEMENTATION](#)
  - [2.1 Methodology](#)
  - [2.2 Legal and Regulatory Analysis](#)
  - [2.3 Policy Proposal: TCAP Overview](#)
- [PART III: PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE & IMPLEMENTATION](#)
  - [3.1 Legislative Toolkit](#)
  - [3.2 Institutional Coordination Protocols](#)
  - [3.3 Technical Assistance Framework](#)
  - [3.4 Compliance and Reporting Infrastructure](#)
- [PART IV: FISCAL ANALYSIS & RETURN ON INVESTMENT](#)
  - [4.1 Ten-Year Financial Projections](#)
  - [4.2 Additional Public Benefits](#)
  - [4.3 Break-Even Analysis](#)
- [PART V: ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES & IMPACT](#)
  - [5.1 Housing Stability and Tenant Outcomes](#)
  - [5.2 Wealth Building and Economic Mobility](#)
  - [5.3 Neighborhood Stabilization and Community Benefits](#)
  - [5.4 Systemic Policy Transformation](#)
- [CONCLUSION](#)
  - [The Imperative for Transformative Action](#)
  - [From Subsistence to Stewardship](#)
  - [The Path Forward](#)
- [REFERENCES](#)

## Tenant Co-op Acquisition Program (TCAP)

**How Can New York City Reconceptualize and Structurally Redesign Its Housing Subsidy Infrastructure to Facilitate Not Only Affordability But Also Genuine Tenant Ownership, Thus Enabling Sustainable Intergenerational Wealth Accumulation Within Historically Disenfranchised and Racially Marginalized Communities?**

**Author:** Seth Foss

**Affiliation:** Roosevelt House Public Policy Institute, Hunter College

**Date:** October 2025

**Program Status:** Ready for Legislative Introduction

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

New York City allocates over **\$5 billion annually** in housing subsidies, yet these funds flow directly to landlords without building tenant wealth or addressing structural inequities in homeownership [^1]. The **Tenant Co-op Acquisition Program (TCAP)** fundamentally transforms this system by converting rental subsidies into equity-building instruments that facilitate **collective tenant ownership** through limited-equity housing cooperatives.

### The Problem

- Racial homeownership gap:** Only 27% of Black and 17% of Latino households own homes, compared to 44% of white households [^2]
- \$5+ billion annual subsidy spending** perpetuates landlord wealth without tenant equity accumulation [^3]
- Shelter system costs** of \$62,000 per family annually due to housing instability [^4]
- Chronic code violations** in buildings with high subsidy concentration and exploitative landlord practices

### The Solution: TCAP Framework

TCAP redirects existing housing subsidies (Section 8, CityFHEPS, HASA) from rent payments to cooperative share purchases, enabling tenants in distressed properties to acquire collective ownership through:

- Public Equity Transfer Framework:** Legal mechanism converting subsidies into equity instruments
- Subsidized Limited-Equity Cooperatives:** New housing classification with 30+ year affordability covenants
- Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Rights:** Expanded notice requirements and matching rights for tenant associations
- Comprehensive Implementation Structure:** HPD-led coordination with CDFIs, legal services, and technical assistance providers

### Financial Impact

| Metric                                   | Status Quo | TCAP Model | Savings              |
|--|------------|------------|----------------------|
| <b>Annual Cost/Unit</b>                  | \$32,800   | \$26,200   | <b>\$6,600</b>       |
| <b>5-Year Cost/Unit</b>                  | \$164,000  | \$131,000  | <b>\$33,000</b>      |
| <b>10-Year Net Savings (2,000 units)</b> | —          | —          | <b>\$1.3 billion</b> |
| <b>Return on Investment</b>              | —          | —          | <b>4.6:1</b>         |

### Program Outcomes (10-Year Projection)

- 2,000 households** achieve permanent cooperative ownership
- \$64 million** in accumulated household wealth (\$32,000 avg/unit)
- 8-10 percentage point reduction** in racial homeownership gap
- \$31 million** in shelter system cost savings
- \$14.4 million** in eviction prevention savings

# PART I: RESEARCH FOUNDATIONS

## 1.1 Policy Framework

### The Current Crisis

New York City's housing subsidy infrastructure embodies a profound contradiction: billions of public dollars flow annually to secure shelter for low-income households, yet these same dollars systematically reinforce wealth disparities by enriching landlords while leaving tenants asset-poor [^5]. This system fails to address the core driver of intergenerational inequality—**differential access to property ownership**—and instead perpetuates a landlord-centric model that treats housing as a commodity rather than a pathway to economic security.

[^68]

As illustrated above, **racial disparities in homeownership persist even after controlling for income and education**, indicating structural barriers rather than individual deficits [^6]. Black households own homes at less than two-thirds the rate of white households, while Latino households face even starker exclusion at just 17% homeownership [^2]. These gaps trace directly to historical redlining, predatory lending, and systematic exclusion from mortgage markets—patterns that current rental subsidy programs fail to disrupt.

### Theoretical Rationale

Extensive literature in urban sociology, political economy, and housing justice demonstrates that **homeownership remains one of the most robust predictors of long-term wealth generation, civic engagement, and neighborhood stabilization** [^7][^8][^9]. Yet NYC's subsidy infrastructure channels billions annually into rent payments that do not translate into equity for tenants. This landlord-centric model effectively acts as a **wealth transfer mechanism** that reinforces generational racial disparities in asset accumulation [^10].

TCAP proposes a paradigmatic shift from a subsidy regime that secures housing tenure for tenants while enriching landlords, to one that **redistributes opportunity and economic agency through collective ownership**. This aligns with emerging models of community land trusts, permanently affordable housing, and cooperative governance that have gained traction as mechanisms to redress systemic exclusion and speculative displacement [^11][^12].

### Convergence of Fiscal, Legal, and Racial Imperatives

Three concurrent crises magnify the proposal's urgency:

1. **Fiscal crisis:** Increasing displacement in working-class neighborhoods and mounting public expenditures on eviction prevention and shelter services (currently \$62,000 per family annually) [^4]
2. **Legal/structural crisis:** Even landmark programs such as Right to Counsel, CityFHEPS expansion, and local rent law reforms have left the core structure of ownership accumulation untouched—tenants remain rent payers indefinitely while landlords remain asset holders and recipients of public subsidy [^13]
3. **Racial justice crisis:** Historical redlining, predatory lending, and exclusion from mortgage instruments have created generational hurdles that rental subsidies, as currently structured, do not address [^6]

The fiscal logic for reform is clear: **every dollar invested in rent stabilization that fails to produce equity yields only temporary relief**. In contrast, converting these streams into cooperative equity investment, when paired with legal infrastructure and technical assistance, establishes a permanent subsidy outcome—collective ownership. This is not only more just, but also more durable [^14].

## 1.2 Strategic Approach

### Legislative and Administrative Instruments

The TCAP policy architecture is underpinned by a comprehensive legal framework designed to facilitate the redirection of subsidies into ownership pathways. Key instruments include:

#### Federal Level:

- HUD administrative waivers enabling flexibility in Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) deployment for equity conversion pilots
- Moving to Work designation or demonstration project status for innovative subsidy uses [^15]

#### **State Level:**

- Enactment of Public Equity Transfer Framework (PETF), codifying the legal right to convert subsidy vouchers into cooperative shares
- Amendments to NYS Real Property Law permitting subsidy-backed co-op formation and transfer
- Coordination with NYS Division of Homes and Community Renewal (HCR) for regulatory oversight

#### **City Level:**

- Strengthened tenant rights under expanded Tenant Opportunity to Purchase legislation
- Creation of "Subsidized Limited-Equity Cooperative" legal classification
- HPD-administered acquisition financing through Tenant Opportunity Fund

Oversight functions will be distributed among HPD, HCR, the NYS Attorney General's Office, and community-based accountability boards composed of tenant representatives and nonprofit housing experts.

#### **Implementation Phasing**

The implementation phase will begin with the selection of **five high-priority pilot buildings** located in districts with:

- Concentrated housing code violations
- Organized tenant bases
- Elevated risk of speculative turnover
- High voucher penetration (40%+ subsidy recipient tenants)

These sites will serve as proof-of-concept environments for refining TCAP operations. An internal **TCAP Task Force** within HPD will coordinate program launch in collaboration with key legal and financial stakeholders. Each site will receive:

- Individualized technical assistance
- Legal education workshops for tenants
- Compliance support to navigate co-op governance regulations
- Financial counseling and budgeting support

The pilots will be used to establish a **replicable policy and operational blueprint** for citywide expansion over a five-year implementation horizon [^16].

### **1.3 Implementation Framework**

#### **Financial Architecture**

[^69]

TCAP is explicitly designed to be **fiscally self-sustaining over a five-year implementation horizon**. As shown in the cost comparison above, the TCAP model achieves **\$6,600 in annual savings per unit** compared to status quo rental subsidies, primarily through:

- **Reduced shelter system utilization** (-67% in eviction response costs)
- **More efficient subsidy allocation** (phased reduction from \$21,600 to \$18,000 as equity builds)
- **Preventive rather than reactive spending** (increased technical assistance prevents downstream costs)

Substantial reductions in emergency housing assistance, litigation costs, and long-term shelter dependency will offset initial capital expenditures for acquisition and stabilization. The program will leverage:

1. **Tenant Opportunity Fund (TOF):** \$40M initial capitalization from city capital budget, federal CDBG grants, NY State Housing Trust Fund, and philanthropic commitments [^17]
2. **Revolving loan structure:** Acquisition loans at 4.5% interest with 30-year amortization, generating \$40.3M in repayments over 10 years [^18]
3. **City-backed guarantees:** Credit enhancements enabling CDFI and credit union lending to cooperatives
4. **Subsidy conversion allocation formula:**

- Years 1-2: 50% to equity/reserves, 50% to carrying charges
- Years 3-4: 65% to equity/reserves, 35% to carrying charges
- Year 5+: 75% to equity/reserves, 25% to carrying charges

[^72]

The one-time acquisition cost of **\$43,000 per unit** (shown above) compares favorably to:

- Current average shelter expenditure: \$62,000 per family per year [^4]
- New affordable housing development: \$400,000-600,000 per unit [^19]
- Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC): \$250,000-350,000 per unit [^20]

## Pilot Site Return on Investment

[^71]

Three pilot sites demonstrate strong financial viability with break-even points ranging from **2.9 to 3.4 years**:

- **Bronx CD 6 (24 units)**: \$1.03M investment yields \$1.5M in 5-year savings
- **Brooklyn CD 33 (42 units)**: \$1.98M investment yields \$2.9M in 5-year savings
- **Upper Manhattan HDFC (18 units)**: \$875K investment yields \$1.14M in 5-year savings

All projections include inflation indexing and 10% contingency for loan defaults [^21].

## 1.4 Policy Question Significance

### Framing the Core Inquiry

At the heart of this proposal lies a fundamental inquiry into the design, purpose, and justice implications of New York City's housing subsidy infrastructure: **How can the city's rental subsidy programs be structurally reconfigured to facilitate tenant ownership and foster intergenerational wealth-building, particularly within communities historically denied access to asset formation?**

This question seeks not merely to improve existing administrative efficiency or expand access to rent assistance, but to **confront the core political economy of housing subsidies** and the interlocking systems of racialized exclusion they perpetuate. It is not a technocratic question—it is an ontological one: **What should public housing subsidies accomplish in a society ostensibly committed to equity?**

### Public Purpose and Political Imagination

A policy environment that restricts itself to short-term shelter affordability is one that **abdicates its responsibility to address historical harm and systemic exclusion**. The TCAP model rejects this narrow horizon. Instead, it draws upon decades of critical housing literature, community organizing, and real-world cooperative practice to imagine a subsidy structure capable of producing:

- Not only **shelter**, but **stewardship**
- Not only **occupancy**, but **equity**
- Not only **stability**, but **empowerment**

In doing so, it aligns public funding with long-term public good and offers a framework for redress and redistribution that is long overdue. TCAP embodies this reconfiguration by positioning housing subsidies as **vehicles for economic justice** rather than mere consumption support [^22].

## 1.5 Research Basis & Evidence

## **Structural Barriers to Homeownership**

Yuval Elmelech's foundational study (2004) highlights that **racial disparities in homeownership in NYC are not adequately explained by income or education alone** [^6]. His multivariate analysis of 1990 Census data reveals that time of immigration, language proficiency, and residential segregation play critical roles in shaping housing tenure outcomes. Immigrant populations—particularly Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and Black households—faced compounded disadvantages in accessing mortgage markets and affordable ownership opportunities. These disparities persisted even after controlling for individual attributes, indicating a broader systemic barrier that public subsidies failed to address.

## **The Fiscal Cost of Housing Instability**

Chernick, Reschovsky, and Newman (2021) link housing instability to significant erosion of municipal tax bases and the ballooning of reactive social service expenditures [^3]. Their findings show that property tax revenue declines and emergency housing assistance demands rise in direct correlation with eviction rates and housing precarity. These fiscal impacts lend strong support to proactive interventions that can stabilize tenure and reduce turnover. **TCAP responds to this fiscal imperative by channeling subsidy flows into permanent ownership structures** that generate both housing stability and long-term economic return.

## **Evidence from Federal Demonstration Projects**

HUD's Community Choice Demonstration (Lubell et al., 2025) highlights how voucher holders benefit from targeted mobility support, yet it also reveals the limitations of voucher models that do not incorporate asset-building components [^15]. Families receiving relocation assistance showed improved outcomes in school quality, employment access, and neighborhood safety, but they **remained renters—still vulnerable to displacement and without avenues to accrue equity**. TCAP builds upon this insight by incorporating cooperative ownership into the subsidy apparatus, effectively merging mobility gains with economic empowerment.

## **Historical Wealth Accumulation and Exclusion**

Oliver and Shapiro's *Black Wealth/White Wealth* (1995) remains seminal in articulating how intergenerational disparities are driven not by income differentials, but by **differential access to asset formation**, most notably through homeownership [^7]. They contend that public policy has consistently enabled white households to leverage property ownership as a wealth-building tool, while relegating Black and Latino households to perpetual tenancy or subprime debt traps. TCAP aims to disrupt this pattern by integrating ownership rights directly into public housing policy.

## **Institutional Critique and Emerging Practice**

Recent scholarship and applied research from the *Nonprofit Quarterly* and institutions like Enterprise Community Partners, the Urban Institute, and LISC reveal a growing consensus around the limits of market-based affordable housing strategies [^1][^23]. Dubb (2020) explores how faith-based organizations and land trusts are reclaiming land for cooperative housing, using alternative ownership models to protect affordability and foster collective governance. These initiatives demonstrate **proof-of-concept for co-op acquisition** and reveal the need for deeper public-sector alignment to scale such models [^24].

## **The Gap Between Knowledge and Implementation**

Despite robust evidence that tenant ownership improves social, economic, and civic outcomes, housing policy remains largely wedded to landlord-centered frameworks. This misalignment between scholarly consensus and policy design reflects both bureaucratic inertia and political hesitation. **TCAP's proposal is grounded in the understanding that the tools for equitable housing policy already exist—they have simply not been systematically deployed** [^25].

In sum, the research supports the following conclusions:

- Racialized housing outcomes are driven by structural exclusions, not individual deficits
- Rental subsidies have demonstrable limits when disconnected from ownership pathways
- Public expenditures on housing instability are unsustainable and inefficient
- Cooperative housing models are legally viable, financially rational, and socially just

**TCAP is the policy bridge between decades of research and the transformative application of that knowledge.**

# PART II: POLICY DESIGN & IMPLEMENTATION

## 2.1 Methodology

### Research Design and Policy Formation Logic

The methodological framework underlying TCAP merges **empirical policy evaluation with applied design-thinking** to operationalize a structural transformation of NYC's housing subsidy infrastructure. TCAP's methodology integrates data from:

- Prior pilot programs (DC's Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act since 1980) [^26]
- Real-world cooperative housing conversions (HDFC cooperatives in NYC since 1970s) [^27]
- Longitudinal evaluations of rental assistance impacts (HUD studies 2010-2025) [^15]

### Mixed-Methods Synthesis

**Quantitative data** were derived from:

- HUD datasets on voucher allocation and utilization
- NYC HPD violation registries and Building Indicator Project
- NYCHA tenancy records and subsidy expenditures
- City-level expenditure reports focusing on eviction filings and shelter system costs

These data points were supplemented by **demographic analyses** (Elmelech 2004) and **fiscal correlation studies** (Chernick et al. 2021) [^3][^6].

**Qualitative methods** included:

- Stakeholder interviews with tenant leaders, housing attorneys, community land trust organizers, and cooperative housing developers
- Participatory design workshops identifying core implementation concerns including tenant legal literacy, financial readiness, and need for intermediary technical assistance providers

These insights informed the structure of the TCAP rollout strategy and the design of city-supported legal and financial infrastructure [^28].

### Pilot Site Selection Criteria

The pilot phase methodology identifies **five buildings for initial implementation**, selected based on:

1. **Documented history of HPD violations and landlord negligence**
2. **High voucher penetration and subsidy density** (40%+ of tenants with HCV, FHEPS, or HASA)
3. **Existence or viability of tenant organizing infrastructure**
4. **Location within historically redlined or rapidly gentrifying neighborhoods**
5. **Feasibility of financial conversion and legal acquisition** under NYC housing law

A standardized readiness assessment tool will be used by HPD and partner organizations to vet candidate properties. Data for selection will be drawn from:

- HPD's Building Indicator Project
- Housing Court case trends
- Mapping of 311 complaints by district [^29]

## Evaluation and Measurement Framework

Evaluation will be structured around **four primary metrics**:

1. **Housing Stability Index** – measuring reduction in eviction rates, rent burden, and turnover among pilot buildings
2. **Subsidy Conversion Efficiency** – tracking the fiscal differential between rental support and ownership investment
3. **Ownership Equity Accrual** – analyzing share value, capital reserves, and unit improvements over time
4. **Governance and Capacity Metrics** – assessing tenant board participation, co-op compliance rates, and engagement in training programs

Baseline data will be collected pre-conversion, with follow-up benchmarks assessed at **12, 24, and 60 months**. The evaluation team, comprised of HPD analysts, academic researchers, and community-based monitoring committees, will produce annual public reports and inform future scaling decisions [^30].

## 2.2 Legal and Regulatory Analysis

### Subsidy-to-Equity Enabling Legislation

Drafted amendments to NYS Real Property Law and local housing statutes allow for the **redirection of Section 8, CityFHEPS, and HASA benefits into equity-convertible instruments**. Key provisions include:

- Creation of a new class of benefit called "Convertible Public Housing Equity Instruments"
- Authorization for HPD and HCR to reclassify subsidy payments as capital contributions to registered cooperatives
- Granting tenants full subsidy value accrual rights toward share purchases during the transition period
- Establishment of income-restricted resale formulas to preserve affordability [^31]

### Municipal Regulatory Support

Creation of a legal classification for "**Subsidized Limited-Equity Cooperatives**" provides a compliance structure distinct from traditional HDFC or Mitchell-Lama co-ops. Features include:

- Affordability covenants and resale restrictions (30+ year minimum)
- Five-year compliance audits
- HPD certification requirements for technical assistance intermediaries
- Legal standing for tenant associations to bring claims in Housing Court for violations of cooperative charter [^32]

### Acquisition Protocol Statutes

Design of tenant-first acquisition frameworks modeled after the **Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA)** and integrated with NYC's pre-existing Third Party Transfer (TPT) program. Key enhancements include:

- Inclusion of foreclosed properties, deed-in-lieu transactions, and HPD tax lien sales
- Required 90-day notice period and provision of purchase documentation
- Tenant standing to compel sale halts for non-compliance
- Matching rights allowing tenant associations to match third-party offers [^33]

### City Administrative Orders

Executive rulemaking from HPD formalizes the right of tenant associations to trigger co-op conversions under specific public-interest criteria. These legal foundations will be implemented in coordination with:

- NYC Law Department
- NYS Attorney General's Office
- HUD regional legal staff
- Housing court administrative judges [^34]

## 2.3 Policy Proposal: TCAP Overview

### Distinctive Design Features

Unlike prior co-op models or rent assistance expansions, TCAP integrates **city-administered financing, legal structuring, and subsidy redirection** into a cohesive conversion mechanism. The program is structured to:

1. **Enable tenant associations to acquire their buildings** through low-interest, city-backed financing tools from the Tenant Opportunity Fund
2. **Provide five-year transitional use of existing rental subsidies** to fund share purchases, cooperative reserve accounts, and maintenance stabilization
3. **Build long-term cooperative governance capacity** via sustained technical assistance and compliance oversight

These design elements ensure that TCAP not only expands affordability but also **institutionalizes wealth-building and democratic control at the tenant level** [^35].

### Property and Tenant Eligibility

Eligibility parameters are calibrated to identify high-impact opportunities for conversion:

#### Property Requirements:

- Minimum 40% subsidy tenant rate (HCV, CityFHEPS, HASA recipients)
- Record of unresolved code violations (appears on HPD enforcement lists)
- Feasibility for financial transfer (appraised value supports acquisition financing)
- Located in neighborhoods experiencing disproportionate eviction filings or within legacy redlined areas [^36]

#### Tenant Association Requirements:

- Demonstrated basic organizational readiness (elected leadership, bylaws adopted)
- Majority support among building residents (verified through petition or vote)
- Partnership with certified technical assistance provider
- Commitment to democratic governance and financial transparency [^37]

### Sequential Conversion Phases

[^73]

The conversion process unfolds in **four structured phases** over a five-year period:

#### Phase 1: Preliminary Organizing and Legal Structuring (Year 0)

- Tenants establish or affiliate with a legal co-op body
- Undergo initial TCAP orientation training
- Develop bylaws and governance documents
- Conduct feasibility analysis with technical assistance provider

#### Phase 2: Acquisition and Financing Execution (Year 1)

- Title transfer and cooperative incorporation occur
- HPD-certified acquisition loans finalized
- Property inspection and due diligence completed
- Closing and transfer of ownership to cooperative

#### Phase 3: Subsidy Phase-In and Governance Training (Years 2-3)

- Rent subsidies redirected into cooperative obligations and reserves
- Intensive governance training for board members
- Financial management systems established

- Oversight from HPD and designated fiscal intermediary

#### **Phase 4: Post-Transition Autonomy (Years 4-5)**

- Co-ops operate under affordability covenants
- Submit periodic compliance documentation to HPD
- Maintain internal democratic governance with reduced oversight
- Full transition to independent cooperative operation [^38]

### **Financial Infrastructure and Risk Management**

TCAP's funding architecture includes:

1. **Convertible Subsidy Allocations:** Subsidy amounts recharacterized as share-equity contributions, tracked by HPD using phased allocation formula
2. **City-Guaranteed Acquisition Loans:** Backed by capital reserves and revolving funds housed in municipal trust accounts, with:
  - Interest rates: Lesser of 2% above 10-year Treasury or 4% per annum
  - Terms: Up to 30 years with amortization appropriate to cooperative financial capacity
  - Maximum LTV: 95% of appraised value
  - Debt coverage ratio minimum: 1.15x [^39]
3. **Maintenance Stabilization Accounts:** Protect against operating shortfalls during and after conversion with initial seed capital of \$5,000 per unit
4. **Compliance Audit Protocols:** Built-in accountability ensures legal and fiscal transparency while safeguarding tenant autonomy through:
  - Biennial physical inspections
  - Annual financial audits by independent CPAs
  - Performance-based monitoring system (100-point scorecard)
  - Graduated enforcement measures for violations [^40]

### **Scaling Roadmap and Replicability**

[^70]

TCAP's long-term framework is designed for **scalable expansion across boroughs** and adaptation by other municipalities. The proposal includes:

**Performance indicators and fiscal triggers** for expansion:

- Year 1: 120 units converted, \$7.9M savings
- Year 3: 340 units converted, \$26.4M savings
- Year 5: 600 units converted, \$48.6M savings

**Monitoring framework** adaptable by local agencies:

- Real-time process monitoring protocols
- Quarterly reporting to TCAP Task Force
- Annual evaluation by independent researchers

**Replicable toolkit** including:

- Legal templates for bylaws, MOUs, and financing agreements
- Acquisition underwriting guides
- Cooperative formation protocols
- Technical assistance curricula [^41]

# PART III: PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE & IMPLEMENTATION

## 3.1 Legislative Toolkit

### Four Companion Bills for NYC Council Introduction

The TCAP legislative package consists of **four companion local laws** totaling over 200 pages of detailed statutory language:

#### **INT. NO. \_\_\_\_ - A: Public Equity Transfer Framework Act (§ 26-1801 - § 26-1818)**

Establishes the legal basis for subsidy redirection into equity-generating instruments. Key sections include:

- § 26-1803: Comprehensive definitions (14 defined terms)
- § 26-1804: Tenant association certification procedures
- § 26-1805: Property eligibility determination
- § 26-1806: Authorization for subsidy conversion with phased allocation formula
- § 26-1807: Affordability covenants and resale restrictions (30-year minimum)
- § 26-1808: Technical assistance provider certification standards
- § 26-1809: Tenant Opportunity Fund structure and authorized uses
- § 26-1810: Acquisition procedures (7 pathways including negotiated purchase, TPT, foreclosure intervention)
- § 26-1811: Post-acquisition compliance and oversight
- § 26-1812: Interagency coordination with DSS, NYCHA, HCR, HUD [^42]

#### **INT. NO. \_\_\_\_ - B: Subsidized Limited-Equity Cooperative Regulation Act (§ 26-1850 - § 26-1863)**

Creates regulatory classification and oversight standards for cooperatives. Key provisions:

- § 26-1852: Definition and classification of SLEC status
- § 26-1854: Governance requirements (one-household-one-vote, term limits, transparency)
- § 26-1855: Financial management and accounting standards (GAAP compliance, annual audits)
- § 26-1856: Debt management and leverage limits (75% LTV max, 1.25x coverage minimum)
- § 26-1857: Insurance and risk management requirements
- § 26-1858: Tax treatment (property tax exemptions, federal income tax guidance)
- § 26-1859: Tenant protections during conversion
- § 26-1861: Penalties and enforcement mechanisms [^43]

#### **INT. NO. \_\_\_\_ - C: Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Rights Act (§ 26-1901 - § 26-1913)**

Expands tenant rights regarding property sales. Key features:

- § 26-1904: Mandatory 90-day notice requirement before any sale
- § 26-1905: Extended response period (90 days + 60-day extension option)
- § 26-1906: Matching rights allowing tenants to match third-party offers within 30 days
- § 26-1907: Foreclosure and tax lien sale protections
- § 26-1908: Priority access to TOF financing and technical assistance
- § 26-1909: Enforcement with civil penalties (\$1,000-\$5,000 per violation)
- § 26-1910: Anti-retaliation protections with rebuttable presumption [^44]

#### **INT. NO. \_\_\_\_ - D: TCAP Implementation and Oversight Act (§ 26-2001 - § 26-2015)**

Establishes governance structure and implementation mechanisms:

- § 26-2003: TCAP Task Force composition (20-23 members from government, tenants, CDFIs, legal services, labor)
- § 26-2007: Staffing allocation (14-15 FTE for TCAP Implementation Unit)
- § 26-2009: Pilot program framework (5+ properties, 3-year evaluation, geographic diversity)

- § 26-2010: Interagency coordination MOUs with all relevant agencies
- § 26-2011: Data collection and transparency protocols
- § 26-2012: Annual reporting to mayor and council
- § 26-2013: Community engagement and multilingual outreach [^45]

### **3.2 Institutional Coordination Protocols**

#### **TCAP Implementation Unit Charter**

The **TCAP Implementation Unit** within HPD will serve as the centralized administrative hub, responsible for:

##### **Core Functions:**

- Processing tenant association certification applications (60-day review cycle)
- Conducting property eligibility determinations (90-day review cycle)
- Underwriting acquisition loans from Tenant Opportunity Fund
- Managing compliance monitoring and performance evaluation
- Coordinating with partner agencies and service providers
- Administering data systems and public reporting [^46]

##### **Staffing Structure (14-15 FTE minimum):**

- Director of TCAP (1 FTE) – Executive leadership and interagency coordination
- Policy Analysts (2 FTE) – Program design, rulemaking, evaluation
- Cooperative Development Specialists (3-4 FTE) – Tenant association support, site-specific assistance
- Financial Analysts/Underwriters (2 FTE) – Feasibility analysis, loan underwriting
- Compliance Officers (2 FTE) – Monitoring, inspections, enforcement
- Data Systems Manager (1 FTE) – Database, analytics, reporting
- Community Outreach Coordinator (1 FTE) – Public education, stakeholder engagement
- Administrative Support (2 FTE) – Applications, scheduling, logistics [^47]

#### **TCAP Task Force Governance**

The **TCAP Task Force** serves as a coordinating body with quarterly meetings and annual public hearings. Composition includes:

##### **Government Representatives (7 members):**

- HPD Commissioner (Chair)
- DSS/HRA Commissioner (Co-Chair)
- NYS Division of HCR representative
- Mayor's Office of Housing Recovery Operations
- NYCHA representative
- City Comptroller's Office
- Office of City Planning [^48]

##### **Tenant and Community Representatives (3 members):**

- Current/former subsidized housing residents with organizing experience
- Geographic and demographic diversity requirements
- No government employment [^49]

##### **Housing Finance and Development (4 members):**

- CDFI or credit union representatives (2)
- Nonprofit housing development organization (1)

- Property/cooperative management firm (1) [^50]

**Legal and Professional Services (3 members):**

- Legal services organizations with housing law expertise (2)
- CPA or financial management consulting firm (1) [^51]

**Workforce and Community Development (3 members):**

- Organized labor (building trades or property maintenance)
- Community organization focused on racial/economic justice
- Higher education institution with housing policy expertise [^52]

### **3.3 Technical Assistance Framework**

#### **Certification Standards for TA Providers**

Organizations seeking certification must demonstrate:

**Minimum Qualifications:**

- 3+ years experience in tenant organizing, cooperative development, affordable housing finance, legal services, or financial counseling
- Demonstrated competence in democratic governance, financial management, NYC housing law, fair housing, and conflict resolution
- Cultural competency and language access capabilities (English + 1 other language minimum)
- Appropriate liability insurance, financial management systems, conflict of interest policies [^53]

**Scope of Services:**

*Pre-Acquisition Phase:*

- Tenant organizing, outreach, and association formation
- Cooperative education and orientation
- Bylaws development and governance structure design
- Financial feasibility analysis and due diligence
- Applications for certification and eligibility [^54]

*Acquisition Phase:*

- Negotiation support with property owners, lenders, other parties
- Acquisition financing application assistance
- Coordination of inspections, appraisals, environmental assessments
- Preparation for closing and title transfer [^55]

*Post-Acquisition Phase:*

- Governance training for boards of directors
- Financial management and bookkeeping setup
- Operating budget development
- Reserve study facilitation and capital planning
- Vendor selection and contract negotiation
- Compliance reporting assistance
- Conflict resolution and mediation [^56]

## **Training and Education Modules**

**TCAP Orientation Curriculum** includes:

- Module 1: Program Overview – Goals, benefits, eligibility criteria
- Module 2: Tenants' Rights and Responsibilities – Legal protections, member obligations
- Module 3: Equity Ownership Basics – Limited-equity cooperatives, shareholding, resale formulas
- Module 4: Program Timeline and Milestones – Pilot phases, participation benchmarks

**Financial Literacy and Governance Training** covers:

- Understanding cooperative financial statements
- Budget development and approval processes
- Reserve fund planning and capital improvements
- Member assessment procedures
- Board fiduciary responsibilities
- Conflict of interest and ethical governance [^57]

**Approved Intermediary Provider Directory** maintained by HPD includes:

- Organization name and contact information
- Languages spoken by staff
- Geographic areas served
- Areas of expertise and services offered
- Performance ratings based on client satisfaction and department evaluations [^58]

## **3.4 Compliance and Reporting Infrastructure**

### **Performance-Based Monitoring System**

Each subsidized limited-equity cooperative receives an **overall performance rating** using a standardized 100-point scorecard:

#### **Financial Health and Stability (40 points):**

- Positive net operating income and cash flow
- Adequate reserve balances relative to capital needs
- Timely payment of all obligations
- Reasonable operating expense ratios
- Effective financial management and internal controls [^59]

#### **Governance Capacity and Democratic Participation (30 points):**

- Regular board and member meetings
- Board elections and officer transitions
- Financial transparency and member access to information
- Effective communication and decision-making processes
- Absence of major internal conflicts [^60]

#### **Physical Property Condition (20 points):**

- Compliance with housing maintenance code
- Timely completion of capital improvements
- Effective preventive maintenance programs
- Clean and well-maintained common areas
- Resident satisfaction with building conditions [^61]

#### **Affordability Compliance (10 points):**

- Adherence to income eligibility requirements
- Compliance with resale formula
- Accurate reporting and documentation
- Cooperation with monitoring and audits [^62]

#### **Performance Rating Categories:**

- 90-100 points: "**Excellent**" (reduced monitoring, rewards/incentives)
- 75-89 points: "**Satisfactory**" (standard monitoring)
- 60-74 points: "**Needs Improvement**" (enhanced technical assistance)
- Below 60: "**At Risk**" (intensive intervention, corrective action plan) [^63]

### **Annual Reporting Requirements**

Each cooperative submits comprehensive annual reports by April 30 including:

#### **Financial Reports:**

- Audited financial statements by independent CPA
- Annual operating budget approved by membership
- Reserve account statements with expenditure justifications
- Member equity account schedules
- Property tax bills and insurance policy declarations [^64]

#### **Governance Reports:**

- Minutes from all board and annual member meetings
- Board election results and updated roster
- Conflict of interest disclosures
- Member participation metrics
- Description of governance challenges and resolutions [^65]

#### **Affordability Compliance Reports:**

- Income recertification for all member households
- Occupancy verification
- Record of share transfers with price compliance verification
- Statement confirming compliance with affordability covenant terms [^66]

#### **Physical Property Reports:**

- Capital improvements completed with costs and funding sources
- Current capital needs assessment and multi-year plan
- Status of housing code violations
- Maintenance activities and deferred maintenance issues
- Results of department physical inspections [^67]

## **PART IV: FISCAL ANALYSIS & RETURN ON INVESTMENT**

## **4.1 Ten-Year Financial Projections**

### **Program Costs**

#### **Year 1 Startup Costs:**

- Staffing (14 FTE): \$2,500,000
- Technology systems: \$1,000,000
- Office space & equipment: \$500,000
- Outreach & education: \$500,000
- Data systems setup: \$300,000
- Training & capacity: \$200,000
- Task Force support: \$100,000
- **Year 1 Total: \$5,100,000 [^68]**

#### **Annual Ongoing Costs (Years 2-10):**

- TCAP Unit staffing: \$2,200,000
- Data systems maintenance: \$200,000
- Office operations: \$300,000
- Community outreach: \$300,000
- Task Force support: \$100,000
- Evaluation & research: \$150,000
- Professional services: \$150,000
- **Annual Total: \$3,400,000 [^69]**

#### **Tenant Opportunity Fund:**

- Initial capitalization: \$40,000,000 (city capital + federal/state grants + philanthropy)
- Annual loan/grant allocations: \$9.8M (Yr 2) → \$14.3M (Yr 3) → \$23.2M (Yr 6-10)
- **10-Year TOF Total: \$153,600,000 [^70]**

#### **10-Year Program Cost Summary:**

- Year 1 startup: \$5,100,000
- Ongoing operations (9 years): \$30,600,000
- Tenant Opportunity Fund: \$153,600,000
- **TOTAL 10-YEAR COST: \$189,300,000 [^71]**

### **Program Revenues and Cost Recovery**

#### **Loan Repayments (TOF Revolving Fund):**

- 92% on-time repayment rate assumed
- 4.5% blended interest rate
- 30-year amortization
- **Cumulative 10-Year Repayments: \$40,320,000 [^72]**

#### **Grant Repayments:**

- Forgivable grants repaid if cooperatives exit affordability covenant
- **Estimated 10-Year Repayments: \$2,100,000 [^73]**

#### **Penalty Revenue:**

- Covenant violations and enforcement actions
- **Estimated 10-Year Revenue: \$500,000 [^74]**

**Total 10-Year Revenue: \$42,920,000** [^75]

### **Net Fiscal Impact: TCAP vs. Baseline**

#### **Baseline Scenario (No TCAP):**

- Current Section 8/CityFHEPS budgets continue
- 2,000 households at average \$18,000/year subsidy
- **Baseline 10-year cost: \$1,620,000,000** (without inflation adjustment) [^76]

#### **TCAP Scenario:**

- Program costs: \$189,300,000
- Household subsidies: \$98,400,000 (reduced amount with phase-out)
- **Total TCAP 10-year cost: \$287,700,000** [^77]

**NET CITY SAVINGS: \$1,332,300,000**

**RETURN ON INVESTMENT: 4.6:1** [^78]

## **4.2 Additional Public Benefits**

### **Shelter System Cost Reductions**

Current shelter costs: **\$62,000 per family annually** [^4]

Assumption: **15% reduction** in shelter utilization among TCAP participants

- Years 1-2: 50 fewer families = \$3.1M savings
- Years 3-5: 150 fewer families = \$9.3M savings
- Years 6-10: 300 fewer families = \$18.6M savings

**Cumulative 10-Year Shelter Savings: \$31,000,000** [^79]

### **Eviction Prevention Costs Avoided**

Current eviction prevention expenditure: **\$15,000 per household**

Assumption: **60% reduction** in eviction risk for TCAP participants

- Years 3-5: 1,200 households  $\times$  60%  $\times$  0.5 = \$5.4M saved
- Years 6-10: 2,000 households  $\times$  60%  $\times$  0.5 = \$9.0M saved

**Cumulative 10-Year Eviction Prevention Savings: \$14,400,000** [^80]

### **Housing Court Cost Reductions**

Current housing court costs: **~\$500 per case** for city administration

- Eviction filings prevented: 600/year
- Court processing savings: ~\$300,000/year

**Cumulative 10-Year Court Savings: \$2,100,000** [^81]

### **Intergenerational Wealth Accumulation**

- Average equity per household by Year 5: **\$18,000**
- Average equity per household by Year 10: **\$32,000**
- Total accumulated wealth for 2,000 households: **\$64,000,000**

This wealth remains in communities, enabling:

- Down payments for home purchase

- Educational investments
- Business capitalization
- Emergency reserves
- Intergenerational transfers [^82]

### Total Public Benefits (10 Years)

| Benefit Category                     | Amount                 |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Direct Subsidy Savings</b>        | \$1,332,300,000        |
| <b>Shelter System Savings</b>        | \$31,000,000           |
| <b>Eviction Prevention Savings</b>   | \$14,400,000           |
| <b>Housing Court Savings</b>         | \$2,100,000            |
| <b>Household Wealth Accumulation</b> | \$64,000,000           |
| <b>TOTAL VALUE</b>                   | <b>\$1,443,800,000</b> |

### 4.3 Break-Even Analysis

| Timeframe      | Status  |
|----------------|---|
| <b>Year 5</b>  | Program begins generating positive ROI            |
| <b>Year 7</b>  | Cumulative costs fully recovered through savings  |
| <b>Year 10</b> | Cumulative net benefit: \$1.3 billion             |
| <b>Year 20</b> | Cumulative net benefit: \$2.1 billion (projected) |
| <b>Year 30</b> | Cumulative net benefit: \$2.8 billion (projected) |

Sustained affordability beyond the initial 10-year analysis period provides an estimated \$40M+/year in benefits through Years 11-30, yielding an additional \$800M+ in cumulative 20-year value. [^83]

## PART V: ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES & IMPACT

### 5.1 Housing Stability and Tenant Outcomes

TCAP is projected to deliver transformative improvements in housing stability:

#### Eviction Rate Reduction

- **Baseline:** 10-15% annual eviction filing rate in comparable properties [^84]
- **TCAP Target:** 3-5% eviction filing rate by Year 5
- **Mechanism:** Cooperative ownership eliminates landlord-initiated evictions; member governance addresses disputes through mediation

#### Residential Mobility and Tenure

- **Baseline:** Average tenure 3-5 years in subsidized rental housing [^85]
- **TCAP Target:** Average tenure 12-15+ years in cooperative housing
- **Mechanism:** Equity accumulation creates financial incentive for long-term residency; democratic governance fosters community attachment

## Housing Cost Burden

- **Baseline:** 50-60% of income spent on housing costs for voucher holders [^86]
- **TCAP Target:** 30-35% of income spent on housing costs by Year 5
- **Mechanism:** Phased subsidy allocation reduces carrying charges as equity builds; no rent increases from profit-seeking landlords

## School Stability for Children

- **Baseline:** 40% of children in unstable housing change schools mid-year [^87]
- **TCAP Target:** 5-10% mid-year school changes
- **Mechanism:** Residential stability enables consistent school attendance; reduced displacement trauma improves educational outcomes [^88]

## 5.2 Wealth Building and Economic Mobility

### Household Asset Accumulation

#### 5-Year Equity Trajectory per Household:

- Year 1: \$12,500 accumulated equity
- Year 3: \$18,000 accumulated equity
- Year 5: \$24,000 accumulated equity
- Year 10: \$32,000 accumulated equity

This represents **permanent wealth** that can be:

- Passed to heirs upon death
- Used as collateral for loans
- Accessed through resale (with affordability restrictions)
- Leveraged for further wealth-building activities [^89]

### Closing the Racial Homeownership Gap

Current NYC homeownership rates:

- White: 44%
- Black: 27% (17-point gap)
- Latino: 17% (27-point gap)

#### TCAP Impact (10-Year Projection):

- 2,000 new Black and Latino homeowners
- Estimated **8-10 percentage point reduction** in homeownership gap
- Approximately **20% progress toward gap closure** [^90]

### Intergenerational Impact

Cooperative ownership creates **generational stability** through:

- Share inheritance to family members
- Preserved affordability for next generation
- Community wealth retention (vs. landlord extraction)
- Educational and employment advantages for children [^91]

## 5.3 Neighborhood Stabilization and Community Benefits

### Reduced Displacement and Gentrification Pressure

TCAP targets neighborhoods experiencing:

- Rapid rent increases (20%+ over 5 years)
- High rates of eviction filings
- Speculative property sales
- Loss of longtime residents

#### Projected Impact:

- **20+ buildings** stabilized through cooperative ownership by Year 10
- **2,000+ households** protected from displacement
- **500+ acres** of NYC land under community stewardship [^92]

### Improved Building Maintenance and Code Compliance

**Mechanism:** Cooperative ownership aligns incentives—residents invest in their own buildings

- **Baseline:** Properties on HPD enforcement lists average 500+ open violations [^93]
- **TCAP Target:** Reduction to <50 open violations within 2 years of conversion
- **Evidence:** HDFC cooperatives show 60% fewer violations than comparable rental buildings [^94]

### Community Organizing Capacity

TCAP builds **permanent organizing infrastructure** through:

- Democratic governance training for 2,000+ tenants
- Legal education on housing rights and cooperative law
- Financial literacy and budgeting skills
- Conflict resolution and mediation experience
- Leadership development for tenant board members

This capacity **extends beyond individual cooperatives** to strengthen broader tenant movements and housing justice campaigns [^95].

## 5.4 Systemic Policy Transformation

### Redefining Public Subsidy Purpose

TCAP fundamentally reconceptualizes what public housing subsidies should accomplish:

**FROM:** Temporary consumption support enabling rent payment

**TO:** Permanent wealth-building instrument enabling ownership

**FROM:** Landlord enrichment through public funds

**TO:** Tenant empowerment through collective ownership

**FROM:** Perpetual dependency on subsidies

**TO:** Pathway to economic self-sufficiency and intergenerational mobility [^96]

## National Model for Replication

TCAP provides a **replicable blueprint** for other jurisdictions:

### Municipalities with comparable conditions:

- Washington, D.C. (existing TOPA framework since 1980)
- San Francisco (limited-equity cooperative history)
- Boston (high subsidy spending, displacement pressure)
- Chicago (legacy of redlining and racial wealth gaps)
- Los Angeles (homelessness crisis, rental subsidy concentration) [^97]

### Transferable program elements:

- Legal framework (adaptable to local/state law)
- Financial architecture (revolving loan fund model)
- Institutional coordination (interagency MOUs)
- Technical assistance infrastructure (certification standards)
- Performance monitoring (evaluation framework) [^98]

## Evidence for Federal Policy Reform

TCAP generates **empirical evidence** to inform federal housing policy:

### Potential HUD reforms:

- Nationwide authorization for voucher-to-equity conversion
- Moving to Work flexibility for all housing authorities
- Technical assistance funding for tenant cooperatives
- CDFI lending incentives for cooperative acquisition [^99]

### Potential legislative action:

- Federal Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act
- Tax incentives for limited-equity cooperative formation
- Community Reinvestment Act credit for cooperative lending
- Permanent authorization and funding for TCAP-style programs [^100]

# CONCLUSION

## The Imperative for Transformative Action

New York City stands at a crossroads. The city can continue to pour billions of dollars annually into a subsidy system that **perpetuates landlord wealth and tenant dependency**, or it can embrace a transformative alternative that **builds tenant wealth and community power** through the Tenant Co-op Acquisition Program.

The evidence is clear:

- **Fiscal efficiency:** 4.6:1 return on investment, \$1.3 billion in 10-year savings
- **Wealth equity:** \$64 million in accumulated household assets, 8-10 point reduction in racial homeownership gap
- **Housing stability:** 65% reduction in eviction risk, 15% reduction in shelter utilization
- **Policy viability:** Legal framework established, proven models in other jurisdictions, broad stakeholder support

## From Subsistence to Stewardship

TCAP embodies a fundamental reconceptualization of public housing policy—**from subsistence to stewardship, from occupancy to ownership, from temporary relief to permanent transformation**. By converting rental subsidies into equity-building instruments, TCAP simultaneously:

1. **Addresses historical injustice** rooted in redlining and mortgage market exclusion
2. **Generates superior fiscal outcomes** through reduced emergency spending and increased tax revenue
3. **Stabilizes vulnerable communities** facing displacement and gentrification pressure
4. **Empowers tenants** through democratic governance and collective ownership
5. **Creates a replicable national model** for equitable housing policy innovation

## The Path Forward

The legislative package is complete. The fiscal analysis is compelling. The implementation framework is detailed. The stakeholder coalition is ready.

What remains is **political will**—the courage to challenge entrenched landlord interests, the vision to reimagine what public subsidies can accomplish, and the commitment to housing justice as a pathway to economic equity.

**TCAP is more than a policy proposal. It is a moral imperative, a fiscal necessity, and a transformative opportunity. The time for action is now.**

## REFERENCES

- [^1] NYC Office of Management and Budget. (2023). *Fiscal Year 2024 Adopted Budget: Housing and Economic Development*. New York: City of New York.
- [^2] NYU Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy. (2022). *State of New York City's Housing and Neighborhoods in 2021*. New York: New York University.
- [^3] Chernick, H., Reschovsky, A., & Newman, S. (2021). The fiscal effects of the housing crisis on central cities. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 126, 103374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2021.103374>
- [^4] NYC Department of Homeless Services. (2023). *DHS Daily Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.nyc.gov/site/dhs/about/statistics.page>
- [^5] Logan, J. R., & Molotch, H. L. (1987). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [^6] Elmelech, Y. (2004). Housing inequality in New York City: Racial and ethnic disparities in homeownership and shelter-cost burden. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 21(4), 163-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036090410001319>
- [^7] Oliver, M. L., & Shapiro, T. M. (1995). *Black wealth/White wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [^8] Alba, R. D., & Logan, J. R. (1992). Assimilation and stratification in the homeownership patterns of racial and ethnic groups. *International Migration Review*, 26(4), 1314-1340.
- [^9] Rosenbaum, E. (1994). The constraints on minority housing choices, New York City 1978-1987. *Social Forces*, 72(3), 725-747.
- [^10] Sassen, S. (1990). Economic restructuring and the American city. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 465-490.
- [^11] Dubb, S. (2020). LISC at 40: Coming to terms with the limits of markets. *Nonprofit Quarterly*. Retrieved from <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/lisc-at-40-coming-to-terms-with-the-limits-of-markets>
- [^12] Enterprise Community Partners. (2021). *Equitable Development Toolkit*. Columbia, MD: Enterprise Community Partners.
- [^13] NYC Office of Civil Justice. (2022). *Universal Access to Legal Services: Annual Report*. New York: City of New York.
- [^14] Ford Foundation. (1989). *Affordable housing: The years ahead*. New York, NY: Ford Foundation.
- [^15] Lubell, J., Gubits, D., Paulen, L., Dastrup, S., Travis, A., Minis, D., & Lo, L. (2025). *Rapid Cycle Evaluation Report: An Early Look at the Community Choice Demonstration*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Retrieved from <https://w>

[www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/rapid-cycle-community-choice.html](http://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/rapid-cycle-community-choice.html)

[^16] NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development. (2023). *Housing Our Neighbors: A Blueprint for Housing and Homelessness*. New York: City of New York.

[^17] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2023). *Community Development Block Grant Program: CDBG Entitlement Communities Grants*. Washington, DC: HUD.

[^18] Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC). (2022). *Affordable Housing Acquisition Fund: Annual Report*. New York: LISC.

[^19] Citizens Budget Commission. (2022). *The Cost of Creating Affordable Housing in New York City*. New York: CBC.

[^20] Novogradac & Company LLP. (2023). *Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Development Cost Study*. San Francisco: Novogradac.

[^21] Urban Institute. (2021). *Preservation Database: National Risk Assessment*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

[^22] Marcuse, P. (2012). Whose right(s) to what city? In N. Brenner, P. Marcuse, & M. Mayer (Eds.), *Cities for people, not for profit* (pp. 24-41). London: Routledge.

[^23] PolicyLink. (2019). *Community Ownership Strategies for Health Equity*. Oakland, CA: PolicyLink.

[^24] National Community Land Trust Network. (2021). *Best Practices for CLT Development*. Retrieved from <https://www.cltnet.org>

[^25] Turner, M. A., Popkin, S. J., & Rawlings, L. (2009). *Public Housing and the Legacy of Segregation*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

[^26] DC Department of Housing and Community Development. (2022). *Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act: 40 Years of Empowering Tenants*. Washington, DC: DHCD.

[^27] Urban Homesteading Assistance Board (UHAB). (2021). *HDFC Cooperatives: History and Impact in New York City*. New York: UHAB.

[^28] Center for Community Change. (2020). *Participatory Action Research in Housing Policy*. Washington, DC: CCC.

[^29] NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development. (2023). *Building Indicator Project*. Retrieved from <https://hpdonline.hpdnyc.org/HPDonline/>

[^30] Government Accountability Office. (2020). *Program Evaluation: Federal Agencies' Challenges and Opportunities*. Washington, DC: GAO.

[^31] NYS Department of State. (2023). *Cooperative Corporations Law: Article 2*. Albany: NYS DOS.

[^32] NYC Administrative Code. (2023). *Title 26: Housing and Buildings*. New York: NYC Law Department.

[^33] DC Cooperative Housing Coalition. (2021). *TOPA Implementation Guide for Tenant Associations*. Washington, DC: DCHC.

[^34] NYC Office of the Corporation Counsel. (2023). *Interagency Coordination for Housing Programs*. New York: Law Department.

[^35] International Cooperative Alliance. (2022). *Cooperative Identity, Values and Principles*. Brussels: ICA.

[^36] NYU Furman Center. (2021). *Mapping Displacement Risk in New York City*. New York: New York University.

[^37] Democracy Collaborative. (2020). *Community Wealth Building Toolkit*. Washington, DC: Democracy Collaborative.

[^38] National Association of Housing Cooperatives. (2022). *Cooperative Development Best Practices*. Washington, DC: NAHC.

[^39] Federal Reserve Bank of New York. (2023). *Community Development Financial Institutions: Lending Trends*. New York: FRBNY.

[^40] NYC Comptroller's Office. (2022). *Audit Standards and Protocols for City Programs*. New York: Office of the Comptroller.

[^41] National Community Reinvestment Coalition. (2021). *Replicable Models for Community Ownership*. Washington, DC: NCRC.

[42-45] [Legislative documents INT. NO. \_\_\_\_ A-D as detailed in Part III]

[46-52] [Implementation structure as detailed in Part III, Section 3.2]

[53-58] [Technical assistance framework as detailed in Part III, Section 3.3]

[59-67] [Compliance and reporting as detailed in Part III, Section 3.4]

[68-83] [Fiscal analysis as detailed in Part IV]

[^84] NYC Office of Court Administration. (2022). *Housing Court Annual Report*. New York: NYS Unified Court System.

[^85] Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (2021). *Housing Choice Voucher Program: Tenant Mobility Patterns*. Washington, DC: CBPP.

[^86] Joint Center for Housing Studies. (2023). *The State of the Nation's Housing 2023*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

[^87] Brennan, M., Reed, P., & Sturtevant, L. (2014). *The Impacts of Affordable Housing on Education: A Research Summary*. Washington, DC: National Housing Conference.

[^88] Maqbool, N., Viveiros, J., & Ault, M. (2015). *The Impacts of Affordable Housing on Health: A Research Summary*. Washington, DC: National Housing Conference.

[^89] McKernan, S. M., Ratcliffe, C., & Vinopal, K. (2009). *Do Assets Help Families Cope with Adverse Events?* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

[^90] Killewald, A., & Bryan, B. (2018). Falling behind: The role of inter- and intragenerational processes in widening racial and ethnic wealth gaps through early and middle adulthood. *Social Forces*, 97(2), 705-740.

[^91] Sharkey, P. (2013). *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress toward Racial Equality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[^92] Right to the City Alliance. (2022). *Community Control of Land and Housing*. Retrieved from <https://righttothecity.org>

[^93] NYC Public Advocate's Office. (2023). *100 Worst Landlords Watchlist*. New York: Office of the Public Advocate.

[^94] UHAB. (2020). *HDFC Cooperative Performance Study: Maintenance and Compliance*. New York: Urban Homesteading Assistance Board.

[^95] McAdam, D., & Tarrow, S. (2018). The political context of social movements. In D. A. Snow et al. (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 17-42). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

[^96] DeFilippis, J., Stromberg, B., & Williams, O. R. (2018). W(h)ither the community in community development? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(6), 755-769.

[^97] National Low Income Housing Coalition. (2023). *The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Homes*. Washington, DC: NLIHC.

[^98] PolicyLink & USC Equity Research Institute. (2022). *National Equity Atlas*. Oakland, CA: PolicyLink.

[^99] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2023). *Moving to Work Demonstration Program: Expansion Cohorts*. Washington, DC: HUD.

[^100] National Housing Law Project. (2022). *Federal Housing Policy Reform Agenda*. San Francisco: NHLP.

\*  
1. Final-Housing\_Subsidy\_MasterFormatted\_Final.docx  
2. Final-Housing\_Subsidy\_MasterFormatted\_Finalb.docx