

REAL ESTATE CAPITAL MARKETS

NEWSLETTER

SUMMER

2023

HUNTON
ANDREWS KURTH

Published in August 2023



TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER FROM OUR TEAM.....	3
DEAL SPOTLIGHT: ARLINGTON ASSET INVESTMENT CORP.....	4
TEAM MEMBER SPOTLIGHT: ALLISON STELTER	5
PRACTICE GROUP SPOTLIGHT: BORROWER REPRESENTATIONS IN COMMERCIAL LOANS AND TREASURY MATTERS.....	6
THOUGHT LEADERSHIP: COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE REITS: TAX CONSIDERATIONS WHEN DEALING WITH DISTRESSED MORTGAGE LOANS	8
MARKET DATA.....	17
DIVERSITY & INCLUSION	18
CONTACT US.....	19
ABOUT US.....	20

We are pleased to present the Summer 2023 edition of our Hunton Andrews Kurth *Real Estate Capital Markets Newsletter*.

The second quarter of 2023 continued to be choppy in the real estate capital markets, particularly for public companies. Economic data points continued to be mixed, contributing to swings in the markets. That said, there were some encouraging signs. For example, the FTSE Nareit All Equity REITs Index posted its strongest monthly performance since January, with a total return of 5.4%, and the FTSE EPRA Nareit Global Extended Index rose 3.8% in June. In addition, it was noted by some commentators that private real estate is beginning to price in higher interest rates in terms of appraisal valuations. It is interesting to consider what opportunities might arise from the narrowing of the valuation gap between private and public real estate.


Our practice—and the activity of our clients—during the second quarter mimicked overall conditions in many ways. Not surprisingly, public capital markets activity was scattered. However, we are advising a number of clients in private capital raising activities, including fund and joint venture structures in various asset classes, such as single-family rental and build-to-rent assets. Certain companies chose to be nimble and change structures, depending on market conditions. This caused some clients that were seeking to raise capital in traditional private placements to shift gears and, instead, enter credit facilities or similar lending arrangements.

We are also actively engaged on a number of M&A transactions in the space, as consolidation continued. For example, we are representing Arlington Asset Investment Corp. in its announced merger with Ellington Financial Inc., a deal that will create a mortgage REIT with an expected market capitalization in excess of \$1 billion. Our team advising Arlington Asset includes M&A practice co-head **Steven Haas**, M&A partner **Jim Kennedy** and Real Estate Capital Markets practice head **Rob Smith**. You can read more about the Arlington Asset transaction on [page 4](#).

In our quarterly “Team Member Spotlight” column on [page 5](#), we are thrilled to profile **Allison Stelter**. Allison, who is a member of our nationally recognized REIT tax practice group, focuses her practice on federal income tax issues related to REITs, as well as structured finance and securitization.

Additionally, we have included our first “Practice Group Spotlight” this quarter, and we highlight our commercial lending practice on [page 6](#). This firm practice group assists our REIT and real estate clients in aspects of their commercial loan and treasury financings.

We are pleased to share some highlights of our recent activity, as well as some thought leadership and information about our team. Thank you, again, for your continued confidence in the work that we do together.



DEAL SPOTLIGHT

ARLINGTON ASSET INVESTMENT CORP.

In May 2023, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP advised Arlington Asset Investment Corp. in its announced merger with Ellington Financial Inc., a deal that will create a mortgage REIT with an expected market capitalization in excess of \$1 billion. At closing, Arlington Asset shareholders will receive a combination of Ellington Financial stock and cash.

The Hunton Andrews Kurth team advising Arlington Asset was led by Real Estate Capital Markets practice head **Rob Smith**, M&A practice co-head **Steven Haas** and M&A partner **Jim Kennedy**. The team also included finance partner **Tom Hiner**, tax partner **Kendal Sibley**, tax counsel **Joshua Milgrom** and **Anna Page**, and associates **Charles Matthews** and **Elizabeth White**.

We have experience advising on significant REIT M&A deals, including representation of Capstead Mortgage Corp. in its merger with Franklin BSP Realty Trust, Inc., to create the then-fourth largest publicly traded commercial mortgage REIT, Pebblebrook Hotel Trust in its \$5.1 billion takeover of LaSalle Hotel Properties, Healthcare Realty Trust Incorporated in its \$18 billion combination with Healthcare Trust of America, Industrial Logistics Properties Trust in its \$4 billion acquisition of Monmouth Real Estate Investment Corp., Service Properties Trust in its \$2.4 billion acquisition of Spirit MTA REIT's property portfolio and NewLake Capital Partners in its merger with GreenAcreage Real Estate Corp.



TEAM MEMBER SPOTLIGHT

ALLISON STELTER

Counsel | Richmond | astelter@HuntonAK.com | +1 804 788 8672

Last summer, Hunton Andrews Kurth was pleased to welcome back Allison Stelter as a counsel in the firm's Richmond office. Allison originally joined the firm as an associate in 2007, following her graduation from law school. Allison focuses her practice on federal income tax issues related to equity REITs and mortgage REITs, including capital markets transactions, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures and the taxation of partnerships and other pass-through entities.


As a member of the firm's tax practice, Allison regularly counsels REITs on securities offerings, acquisition transactions including tax protection agreements, roll-up transactions and UPREIT structures, initial public offerings, investment structuring, taxable REIT subsidiary structures, mezzanine loans and distressed debt. She also represents REITs in securitized debt transactions, reorganizations and subsidiary spin-offs.

In addition to her REIT practice, Allison has a concentration on structured finance and securitization, representing issuers and underwriters concerning federal tax issues in private and public securitized REMIC, debt and grantor trust offerings, in connection with a variety of assets including real estate, forward and reverse performing, reperforming and nonperforming mortgage loans, online marketplace loans, merchant cash advances, auto loans and other financial assets.

Allison also has served as an adjunct professor teaching Partnership Taxation at Michigan State University College of Law.

“Allison is a highly regarded attorney whose professionalism, experience and insight make her a valuable complement to our national tax practice.”

Cecelia Philipps Horner
Co-head, Tax and ERISA Practice



PRACTICE GROUP SPOTLIGHT

BORROWER REPRESENTATIONS IN COMMERCIAL LOANS AND TREASURY MATTERS

Hunton Andrews Kurth has experience representing borrowers in a wide variety of commercial lending transactions. Our clients include REITs and other companies that are primarily focused on real estate, including developers and real estate property managers. We assist our clients in all aspects of these financings, including pre-transaction diligence and structuring, documentation, syndication and ongoing compliance inquiries, waivers, consents, extensions and amendments. Our broad platform has given us substantial experience in structuring, negotiating, managing and closing transactions in a wide variety of industries and, in the case of secured transactions, involving a broad spectrum of collateral and highly regulated assets located in the United

States and abroad. Throughout the deal process, our lawyers assist CFOs, treasurers, controllers and in-house counsel with managing the transaction process, from negotiating term sheets and engagement documents to facilitating due diligence, disclosures, corporate approvals and other closing mechanics.

Our commercial lending lawyers have experience with secured and unsecured single-lender, syndicated and “club” loans and regularly represent borrowers with complex corporate structures and multistate and international operations. We have experience negotiating term loans, revolving credit facilities, letter of credit facilities, first- and second-lien loan structures, mezzanine financings and unitranche loans.

We also serve as primary outside counsel to the treasury departments of a number of public and privately held companies, including Fortune 500® companies, advising clients on securities law compliance, cash management, liability management and liquidity risk planning matters, as well as indemnities, privacy and data security issues. We also negotiate credit card and gift card program agreements, merchant services agreements and other vendor contracts for clients and help them optimize their banking relationships and intracompany financing arrangements. Finally, we routinely represent corporations in negotiating their master leasing agreements and are uniquely positioned to advise our borrower clients on whether the terms of their leasing arrangements comply with the terms of their credit agreements, indentures and other material capital markets agreements.

REPRESENTATIVE EXPERIENCE

- Represented Lifestyle Communities (“LC”) in a multi-draw term loan facility provided by Ares Alternative Credit Management LLC to be primarily used to finance LC’s development and operation of apartment communities.
- MFA Financial, a public REIT, faced margin calls in the wake of mortgage asset value collapse in March and April 2020. We immediately assembled a team of Restructuring, REIT equity and Structured Finance lawyers to represent MFA on a comprehensive forbearance negotiation across their credit facilities, including

mark-to-market warehouse financing. The second stage entailed a complete replacement of the company’s credit facilities, corporate and structured and equity infusions, which resulted in more than \$2 billion of financing for MFA. Since those closings, we have represented MFA in connection with multiple Residential Mortgage-Backed Securities securitizations, warehouse financings and various corporate matters, including a renegotiation of its custodial agreements related to the \$2 billion financing and a renegotiation of two warehouse facilities.

- Represented Hersha Hospitality Trust, which owns and operates luxury and lifestyle hotels, in connection with the negotiation of its \$500 million, secured term loan and revolving loan credit facility. Availability under the facility is based on the value of certain of Hersha’s hotel properties, which comprise the borrowing base assets under the facility.
- Represented Annaly Capital Management in connection with the negotiation of its bilateral credit facilities used to finance Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac mortgage servicing rights.
- Represented NewLake Capital Partners, Inc., one of the cannabis industry’s largest REITs, in the negotiation of a five-year revolving credit facility to be used for general corporate purposes. NewLake owns a geographically diversified portfolio consisting of 27 properties across ten states with eight tenants, comprised of 17 dispensaries and ten cultivation facilities.

- Represented public REITs in credit facilities to be used for acquisitions of full-service hotel properties in the “upper upscale” segment, office buildings and multifamily housing complexes.
- Represented private equity fund in \$160 million financing secured by 36 golf courses located throughout the United States.

TEAM LEADERSHIP



Kim MacLeod
Partner, Richmond



Jessica Tobin
Partner, Richmond



Bryon Mulligan
Counsel, Charlotte



Hillary Patterson
Counsel, Richmond



THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE REITS: TAX CONSIDERATIONS WHEN DEALING WITH DISTRESSED MORTGAGE LOANS

by Kendal A. Sibley, George C. Howell, III and Joshua R. Venne

In this article, the authors describe issues a commercial mortgage real estate investment trust might face when a mortgage loan is in distress. Published in the July/August edition of *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law* and reprinted with permission.

High inflation and rising interest rates have already triggered some high profile defaults in the commercial real estate space. Layering on the glacial pace of "return-to-office" progress, commercial mortgage REITs may see more borrowers looking to renegotiate loans or even give back the keys. In addition to the typical tax issues that face a lender in a modification or foreclosure situation, REITs must also consider the impact of the modification or foreclosure on their REIT asset, income and distribution tests. The following high level discussion describes issues a commercial mortgage REIT might face when a borrower is in distress. The tax and REIT results can be extremely fact dependent, so REITs should always consult with their tax advisors as soon as possible in the modification process.

CLO RESTRICTIONS

Many commercial mortgage REITs finance a portion of their assets through collateralized loan obligation (CLO) transactions. If a borrower is seeking a modification, the first step is to determine what modifications are permitted under the CLO documents. Different types of modifications require different consents and have different consequences under CLO documents, including potential changes in borrowing base, required paydowns or required rating agency notification or consent. Even if the loan financed by the CLO is not itself being modified, creating additional subordinate debt could potentially raise CLO issues. Thus, in determining the possible paths for modification, the first step is to ascertain what CLO restrictions might apply to various alternatives.

“PLAIN VANILLA” MODIFICATION

If modification is permitted under the CLO documents, then the REIT must determine and consider the REIT and tax impacts of the potential modification. A “plain vanilla” modification, for purposes of this discussion, would include a modification that extends the term, capitalizes delinquent interest, forgives a portion of the principal balance and/or changes the interest rate to another fixed or index-based rate. The modified instrument would not contain any contingent payments, equity features or sharing in profits. No new money would be advanced.

REIT Treatment

Good news! Assuming that the REIT originated the loan or purchased it prior to distress, Revenue Procedure 2014-51 provides very favorable treatment for purposes of the REIT income and asset tests.¹ Under Revenue Procedure 2014-51, if the modification is either “occasioned by default” or the REIT reasonably believes that the pre-modified loan presented a significant risk of default and the modified loan presents a substantially reduced risk of default, then the REIT does not need to treat the modification as a new commitment to make or purchase a loan for purposes of the REIT tests. As a result, if the loan produced only qualifying income for purposes of the REIT gross income tests before the modification, it should continue to produce qualifying income after the modification. Also, under the Revenue Procedure, the modification would not cause a REIT prohibited transaction. Finally, for purposes of the asset tests applicable to REITs, the REIT can treat the loan as a real estate asset in an amount equal to the lesser of (A) the value of the loan or (B) the greater of (i) the current value of the real property securing the loan and (ii) the “loan value of the real property.” Because the REIT need not treat the modification as a new commitment under the Revenue Procedure, the REIT would be able to continue to use the value of the real property at original origination (which should be higher than the principal balance of the loan) as “the loan value of the real property.” As a result, if the pre-modified loan was a qualifying asset for purposes of the REIT asset tests, the modified loan should continue to be a qualifying asset.

Tax Treatment

As described above, in very general terms, if a REIT originated a loan in good times, then a later distress modification of the type described above effectively is ignored for purposes of applying the REIT income and asset tests. The modification nonetheless will have other tax consequences.

In general, if a modification is a “significant modification,” then, for tax purposes, the holder is treated as exchanging the old pre-modified loan for the modified loan. There are detailed Treasury regulations on when a modification rises to the level of “significant.” As a practical matter, any modification that provides meaningful relief to a distressed borrower will be “significant.” The remainder of this discussion assumes that the modification is significant, such that it is treated as a debt-for-debt exchange for tax purposes.

¹ Revenue Procedure 2014-51 is also helpful for distressed loan purchases by a REIT. Treatment of distressed loan purchases is beyond the scope of this summary.

If the borrower is a corporation and if the old loan and modified loan qualify as “securities,” then the debt-for-debt exchange could qualify as a tax-deferred recapitalization under Section 368(a)(1)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended. “Securities” is not defined, but generally is thought to require a term of more than five years. REITs generally will face a special purpose limited liability company property owner as the named borrower. For purposes of determining whether the borrower is a corporation, the REIT must determine the first regarded tax entity that owns the borrower entity. If the debt-for-debt exchange qualifies as a recapitalization, then the REIT generally would not recognize gain or loss in connection with the modification (except to the extent of interest or original issue discount paid).

Many commercial real estate borrowers are not corporations, and many loans do not have terms of more than five years. For exchanges that do not qualify as recapitalizations, the REIT would recognize gain or loss on the deemed exchange equal to the difference between the “amount realized” and its tax basis in the pre-modified loan. The “amount realized” in a debt-for-debt exchange would be the “issue price” of the modified loan. The issue price will depend on whether the loan is considered to be “publicly traded.” If the loan is not considered “publicly traded” and the interest rate is no lower than the applicable federal rate, then the issue price generally will be the principal balance of the loan. For a “publicly traded” loan, however, the issue price will be based on the fair market value of the loan. The bar for being treated as “publicly traded” is quite low. If an indicative price quote is available from at least one broker, dealer or pricing service (including a price provided only to certain customers or to subscribers) for a loan with an outstanding principal balance of more than \$100 million, the loan would be treated as “publicly traded.”

In a distress situation, as a practical matter, the issue price is likely to be lower if the loan is treated as publicly traded because the loan is likely to be trading below par. For example, if a REIT originated a loan for \$101 and modifies the loan as a result of distress to extend the term for an additional two years with no change to the principal balance or interest rate, the “issue price” for a non-publicly traded loan generally would equal the principal balance (\$101). In that case, the REIT would have a \$0 loss as a result of the modification (\$101 “issue price” of new debt minus \$101 tax basis). If the same loan were



publicly traded, the “issue price” would be whatever the fair market value of the loan is, which could be substantially less. For example, if the loan were trading at \$60, the REIT could have a loss of \$41 (\$60 “issue price” of new debt minus \$101 tax basis).

If the REIT recognizes a loss,² the loss could be ordinary, particularly if the REIT is treated as being in the trade or business of lending money.³ If the REIT has a loss of more than \$10 million, it should review the “reportable transaction” rules to determine whether reporting is required. In most cases, a loan originated by the REIT would not require reporting.

Under the Treasury regulations, a modification occurs when the parties enter into a binding agreement to change a term, even if the change is not immediately effective. If there are closing conditions that must be satisfied (for example, shareholder, regulatory, or senior creditor approval or additional financing), the modification is not effective until the closing date when the conditions are satisfied. REITs negotiating modifications close to a year end should be mindful of this timing impact, particularly if the modification will generate a deductible loss.

To the extent that the “issue price” of the modified loan is lower than its principal balance, the modified loan will be treated as having been issued with original issue discount (OID), which the REIT will be required to accrue into income over time on a constant yield method.

MORE CREATIVE MODIFICATION

In some cases, a more complicated or creative modification may present the best possible return for a REIT. For example, a REIT would be loath to reduce principal if the borrower could sell the building for a gain in short order. As another example, a borrower may need additional funds to provide tenant improvements in an effort to improve occupancy rates and debt service coverage.

REIT Treatment

Protect the treatment of the existing loan

Revenue Procedure 2014-51, as described above, allows a REIT to use more favorable real property values for purposes of the REIT asset tests in distress modifications, but it does not override other REIT testing rules. For this reason, a REIT generally will benefit from documenting what this discussion will call more “creative” modifications separately from any “plain vanilla” modification of the distressed mortgage loan. For example, a REIT could enter into a modification of the type described in the section above with respect to its existing senior mortgage loan, and also enter into a separate instrument described in this section. If the modification of the existing mortgage loan

² A REIT that originated a loan generally would expect a loss in a distress situation because its tax basis in the originated loan would be close to par. Buyers of distressed mortgage loans at discounted prices would have lower tax basis in the loans and could have unexpected gain on a modification, particularly if the loan is not publicly traded. Treatment of purchasers of distressed mortgage loans is beyond the scope of this discussion.

³ The IRS has issued regulations in the past that would result in capital loss treatment even for entities in the trade or business of lending. The IRS withdrew those regulations in Announcement 2008-41, 2008-10 I.R.B. 943 and announced that it would continue to study the issue.

satisfies Revenue Procedure 2014-51, then the REIT may be able to continue to hold the modified loan as a qualifying asset producing qualifying income. Any new instruments would be evaluated separately.

Contingent payments are one example of rights that could be documented in a new, separate instrument, which may need to be held by a taxable REIT subsidiary. For purposes of the REIT gross income tests, interest on a mortgage loan fully secured by real property is qualifying income, provided that the amount of interest does not depend on the interest or profits of any person.⁴ If any portion of the interest depends in whole or in part on the income or profits of any person (whether or not derived from property secured by the obligation), then the entire interest is disqualified, including any fixed rate portion. For this reason, REITs generally would not want to include contingent payments in a modified loan that could benefit from Revenue Procedure 2014-51.

Consider whether to use a taxable REIT subsidiary

A taxable REIT subsidiary is subject to entity level tax at regular corporate rates. A taxable REIT subsidiary can hold assets that would otherwise be nonqualifying assets or produce nonqualifying income if held by the REIT directly. A taxable REIT subsidiary can also hold assets that would produce gain subject to the 100% prohibited transaction tax.⁵ No more than 20% of the REIT's total assets may consist of securities of taxable REIT subsidiaries. Dividends from taxable REIT subsidiaries are qualifying income for purposes of the 95% gross income test but not the 75% gross income test. In a distress modification of a commercial mortgage loan, a REIT may find it beneficial to hold portions of the instruments created as a result of the modification in a taxable REIT subsidiary.

One potential commercial mortgage loan modification is the separation of the existing principal into a senior portion that continues to be interest bearing and a B-note or "hope note" that is not interest bearing and pays only in the event of a property sale. Ideally, the senior portion could benefit from Revenue Procedure 2014-51 as described above. The new "hope note," however, must be analyzed separately.

A "hope note" has some similarities to a "shared appreciation mortgage." A shared appreciation mortgage is a mortgage where the lender shares in a percentage of the appreciation in the property that occurs after the date of origination of the mortgage.⁶ A shared appreciation provision is a sharing in appreciation, not a sharing in total proceeds, so the economics may not match what the REIT desires to achieve with the "hope note." Even if a "hope note" could be viewed as a shared appreciation provision, for REIT purposes, shared appreciation provisions are subject to the same prohibited transaction tax rules as other sales of property. Thus, even if the economics work, where

⁴ If the contingent amount is based on rents received by the borrower that would be qualifying if received by a REIT, then such amounts are not excluded from qualifying interest.

⁵ The taxable REIT subsidiary would be subject to tax at regular corporate rates on any gain, but would not be subject to the 100% prohibited transaction tax on the gain.

⁶ It is not clear whether the treatment of shared appreciation mortgages under IRC § 856 would extend to mezzanine loans.

the business plan includes selling the property as soon as possible, there is a material risk that the REIT could be subject to the 100% prohibited transaction tax on shared appreciation gain. For this reason, a REIT may benefit from holding any “hope note” in a taxable REIT subsidiary.

A REIT may also advance new money in a distress modification. The first question with respect to new instruments will be whether they should be treated as debt or equity for tax purposes. Treatment as a debt instrument is determined under common law principles. For example, a debt instrument is expected to be paid in all circumstances regardless of the success of the borrower’s business, and the return on a debt instrument is “debt-like,” generally based on a reasonable fixed or index-based rate, and not based on the borrower’s profits. This is a highly fact dependent determination, and the REIT’s tax advisors would examine all of the facts to determine whether it was reasonable to treat any new instrument as debt for tax purposes.

If the REIT advances new money that can be treated as debt for tax purposes, then the new debt instrument would be evaluated for REIT purposes like any other loan purchased or originated by the REIT. As described above, to produce qualifying income, a loan must be fully secured by real property. Because Revenue Procedure 2014-51 would not apply to the new debt instrument, the security for the new debt instrument would be measured as the current (distressed) real property value minus the amount of any senior debt. In a distress situation, there may not be sufficient real property value to conclude that the new debt would be a qualifying real estate asset for purposes of the REIT asset tests. However, all is not lost. If the REIT has capacity under its 75% asset test and 75% gross income test, the REIT might be able to hold the new debt instrument in the REIT as long as the new debt instrument either represents less than 10% of the borrower’s capital stack or is eligible for an exception to the 10% value test.⁷ If there is a portion of new funding that is expected to be repaid and a portion that is contingent, structuring the two pieces separately may maximize the amount that could be held outside of a taxable REIT subsidiary.



⁷ If the REIT or its taxable REIT subsidiaries also own equity or profits participations in the borrower, the “straight debt” safe harbor may not be available.

To optimize its recovery from a distressed mortgage loan, a REIT may want to hold an instrument that shares in a portion of the borrower's profits (from a sale or otherwise). It is possible that such an instrument could be treated like equity for purposes of the REIT testing requirements. If a REIT owns an equity interest in a non-corporate borrower, the REIT would be required to include in its REIT income and asset testing its proportionate share of the borrower's income and assets, based on the REIT's capital interest in the borrower. Although a REIT can hold an equity interest in real property and receive qualifying rents,⁸ a REIT in a distress modification may not be able to negotiate (or desire to negotiate) sufficient contractual protections to conclude that income of the borrower would actually be qualifying. In addition, gain from sales of property would flow through an equity interest, which could expose the REIT to the 100% prohibited transaction tax. For these reasons, equity interests or profits participations created in a distress situation are often held in taxable REIT subsidiaries.⁹

Tax Treatment

The tax treatment of the modification of the existing loan generally would be the same as what was discussed above under "Plain Vanilla" Modifications.

The tax treatment of any new instrument would depend on the characteristics of the new instrument. Whether the REIT or taxable REIT subsidiary is required to take income into account could depend on whether there is any cash received or any expectation of ever receiving a return.

FORECLOSURE/DEED IN LIEU

In certain circumstances, foreclosure or deed in lieu of foreclosure may be the better route from a business perspective. If a commercial mortgage REIT is taking ownership of the collateral, ownership structures will impact REIT income and asset testing.

REIT Treatment

As is obvious by the large number of equity REITs, real property is a qualifying asset for REITs. Thus, it is possible that a commercial mortgage REIT may be able to foreclose¹⁰ on collateral and hold the resulting asset for the production of rental income. REITs will need to analyze the assets comprising the collateral and the income streams from the property to ensure they are structured properly for purposes of the REIT asset and gross income tests.

Prior to foreclosure, if the REIT plans to hold the asset long-term, the REIT should conduct a REIT feasibility analysis of the collateral property. The feasibility analysis would consider items such as the value of real property versus personal property in the collateral, whether any of the leases at the property are based on the income or profits of the tenant, whether the

⁸ Equity interests held by the REIT are discussed in more detail below under the foreclosure section. REITs should note that there is no "related party interest" corollary to the "related party rent" restrictions.

⁹ Special care should be taken in the event of an equity interest in a borrower operating a hotel or healthcare property as those activities cannot be conducted by a taxable REIT subsidiary.

¹⁰ Unless the context indicates otherwise, this discussion uses "foreclose" and "foreclosure" to cover taking ownership of the collateral through a full foreclosure proceeding or through a deed in lieu of foreclosure.

property produces any operating income, what services are provided to the tenants and what entities are providing tenant services. Depending on the results of the feasibility analysis, the REIT may need to add additional structuring, such as implementing a full Opco/Propco structure for a foreclosure of a hotel or adding a taxable REIT subsidiary to provide certain services to avoid impermissible tenant services income. REITs that have foreign investors that are sensitive to effectively connected income may choose to conduct the entire foreclosure in a taxable REIT subsidiary.

REITs may want to hold a property through a joint venture with an operator or may want to engage a property manager to operate a property. In either case, the operative documents can include restrictions on how the property is operated to make sure that the income produced by the property remains qualifying for purposes of the REIT gross income tests.


If the REIT feasibility study indicates that the income from the property will not be qualifying, then a foreclosure property election may be prudent. A foreclosure property election is made on the REIT's tax return for the year in which the foreclosure took place.¹¹ If the election is made, income and gains from the foreclosure property are treated as qualifying income for purposes of the 75% gross income test, even if the income would otherwise be nonqualifying (e.g., income from operating a carousel or skating rink). The foreclosure property election lasts for three years and may be extended. If the election is made, nonqualifying income from foreclosure property is subject to tax at the highest corporate rate. Income that would otherwise be qualifying for the REIT is not subject to the foreclosure property tax. If a property produces only a small amount of nonqualifying income, the REIT may be able to manage the nonqualifying income in its 5% bad income bucket without making a foreclosure property election.

Tax Treatment¹²

Upon a deed in lieu of foreclosure, a REIT would have an ordinary bad debt deduction for the difference between its tax basis in the debt and the fair market value of the collateral transferred. For an actual foreclosure, the practical result is essentially the same, though there are two potential steps. If the REIT bids an amount at the foreclosure sale less than its tax basis in the loan, then it will have a bad debt deduction in the amount of the difference. If the amount bid in at the foreclosure sale is not the same as the fair market value of the property, the lender would also have gain or loss equal to the difference between the bid price and the property's fair market value. The amount bid in at the foreclosure sale is presumed to be the fair market value unless there is clear and convincing evidence to the contrary. In all cases, the REIT would take a fair market value tax basis in the foreclosed property.

¹¹ A foreclosure property election is permitted for full foreclosures and deeds in lieu of foreclosure.

¹² The tax treatment of the borrower, which will vary depending on whether the debt is recourse or nonrecourse, is beyond the scope of this discussion.



CONCLUSION

Commercial mortgage REITs must navigate multiple constraints in designing an appropriate strategy for a distressed mortgage loan. In addition to the overall economics, REITs must comply with CLO transaction document limitations and must structure the modification or foreclosure in a manner consistent with maintaining their status as a REIT. There are a number of structuring possibilities available that can be considered when a distress situation arises, but each will need to be evaluated based on the particular facts to achieve the desired result and avoid surprises.

Contingent payments are one example of rights that could be documented in a new, separate instrument, which may need to be held by a taxable REIT subsidiary. For purposes of the REIT gross income tests, interest on a mortgage loan fully secured by real property is qualifying income, provided that the amount of interest does not depend on the interest or profits of any person. If any portion of the interest depends in whole or in part on the income or profits of any person (whether or not derived from property secured by the obligation), then the entire interest is disqualified, including any fixed rate portion. For this reason, REITs generally would not want to include contingent payments in a modified loan that could benefit from Revenue Procedure 2014-51.



Kendal A. Sibley
Partner, Richmond



George C. Howell, III
Partner, New York and Richmond



Joshua R. Venne
Associate, Richmond

MARKET DATA: TOP 5 REIT INDUSTRIES IN TERMS OF CAPITAL MARKETS DEAL VOLUME



**INDUSTRIAL
REITS: 16**



**RETAIL
REITS: 11**



**HEALTH CARE
REITS: 6**




**OFFICE
REITS: 6**



**MORTGAGE
REITS: 3**

REIT CAPITAL MARKET TRANSACTIONS QUARTERLY DEAL COUNT



Source: S&P Capital IQ Pro



DIVERSITY & INCLUSION



We are pleased to congratulate capital markets partner **Mayme Donohue** for being honored in the 2023 Women Worth Watching® Leadership Awards by *Profiles in Diversity Journal*®. The honorees represent women “who exhibit dedication to their careers, their families and their community and the young adults who they often mentor in their fields.”

CONTACT US



James V. Davidson
Partner, Houston
j davidson@HuntonAK.com
+1 713 220 3649



Anna Knecht Page
Counsel, Richmond
a page@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 788 7214



Mayme Beth M. Donohue
Partner, Richmond
m donohue@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 787 8021



Kate Saltz
Partner, Richmond
k saltz@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 788 8642



Steven M. Haas
Partner, Richmond and Washington, DC
s haas@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 788 7217 (Richmond)
+1 202 778 2220 (Washington, DC)



Kendal A. Sibley
Partner, Richmond
k sibley@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 788 8697



George C. Howell, III
Partner, New York and Richmond
g howell@HuntonAK.com
+1 212 309 1228 (New York)
+1 804 788 8793 (Richmond)



Robert K. Smith
Partner, Washington, DC
r smith@HuntonAK.com
+1 202 955 1611



Samuel M. Kardon
Counsel, New York
s kardon@HuntonAK.com
+1 212 309 1189



Allison M. Stelter
Counsel, Richmond
a stelter@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 788 8672



James A. Kennedy, II
Partner, Richmond
j kennedy@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 788 7302



Mark W. Wickersham
Partner, Richmond
m wickersham@HuntonAK.com
+1 804 788 7281



Joshua Milgrom
Counsel, New York
j milgrom@HuntonAK.com
+1 212 309 1015

ABOUT US

Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP consistently ranks as one of the most experienced law firms with respect to real estate capital markets transactions, representing issuers, underwriters, sponsors and lenders in connection with structuring and financing publicly and privately owned real estate companies, including in particular real estate investment trusts (REITs). The firm regularly receives top tier national rankings for its work as both issuer's and underwriter's counsel in *Chambers USA*, *The Legal 500*, *Bloomberg* and *Refinitiv*.

Hunton Andrews Kurth has extensive experience in taking real estate companies public, both as REITs and as C corporations, and in subsequent financing transactions. We have handled approximately 155 IPOs and Rule 144A equity offerings and more than 1,100 capital markets transactions involving more than 210 REITs and other real estate companies. In the course of those and other engagements, we have worked closely with the leading investment banking firms, accounting firms and other professionals active in the real estate finance industry. As a result, our Real Estate Capital Markets Group is particularly well qualified to assist companies accessing the public capital markets as well as private capital sources.



HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH

© 2023 Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP. Attorney advertising materials. Hunton Andrews Kurth, the Hunton Andrews Kurth logo, HuntonAK and the HuntonAK logo are service marks of Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP. These materials have been prepared for informational purposes only and are not legal advice. This information is not intended to create (and receipt of it does not constitute) an attorney-client or similar relationship. Please do not send us confidential information. Past successes cannot be an assurance of future success. Whether you need legal services and which lawyer you select are important decisions that should not be based solely upon these materials. Photographs are for dramatization purposes only and may include models. Likenesses do not necessarily imply current client, partnership or employee status. Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP is a Virginia limited liability partnership. Contact: Samuel A. Danon Managing Partner, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP, 2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 202.955.1500.