FOUNDATION SPECIALTY FINANCE

Performance of U.S. Small-Balance Commercial Real Estate Loans (2000–2025)

Ron McMahan

May 29, 2025

Performance of U.S. Small-Balance Commercial Real Estate Loans (2000–2025)

Introduction

Defining the SBC Market: Small-balance commercial (SBC) real estate loans are typically defined as mortgages between \$500,000 and \$5,000,000, often used by individual investors, small businesses, and local developers. These loans finance a range of small income-producing properties – from 1–4 unit residential investment properties and small multifamily buildings, to neighborhood retail, small office, or mixed-use buildings. Common SBC loan products include short-term bridge loans (interim financing used to renovate, stabilize, or reposition a property), permanent loans underwritten to property cash flows (often measured by a debt service coverage ratio, or DSCR), and hybrid products like *bridge-to-permanent* loans that allow a transition from rehab financing into long-term debt once the property is stabilized. In residential investment lending, modern “DSCR loans” (underwritten to rental income rather than personal income) have emerged for single-family rental portfolios, serving a similar role to commercial mortgages for 1–4 unit properties. Generally, SBC loans are offered by community and regional banks, specialized private credit funds, and, in the multifamily sector, by agency programs (Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac small- balance loan programs launched mid-2010s). These loans tend to carry higher interest rates (and potentially higher lender returns) than large institutional CRE loans, reflecting the greater risk and lower economies of scale.

Scope of Analysis: The performance of SBC loans is examined across major economic cycles from 2000 to 2025, with an emphasis on how each downturn or stress period affected default rates, delinquencies, recoveries, and returns. We focus on four key periods: (1) the 2001 dot-com recession, (2) the 2007–2009 Great Financial Crisis (GFC), (3) the 2020–2021 COVID-19 pandemic, and (4) the recent 2022–2023 Fed interest rate hike cycle. In each period, we compare SBC loan performance to that of larger balance commercial loans and institutional investments (e.g. large-bank loans, CMBS portfolios, life insurance company loans, and REIT portfolios) to contextualize whether small loans behaved differently. We also note regulatory and monetary policy shifts (such as the implementation of Dodd-Frank and Basel III post-GFC, or pandemic-era relief measures) and how these influenced SBC lending and performance. Key performance metrics – default rates (loans that ultimately fail and enter foreclosure or charge-off), delinquency rates (loans past due on payments), loss recovery rates (percent of loan principal recovered in defaults), and return on investment (yields and realized returns for lenders/investors in these loans) – are highlighted for each period, where data is available.

Below is a summary comparison of the economic cycles and their impact on CRE loans:

Cycle (Year)	Economic Shock & Interest Rates	Peak Bank CRE Loan Delinquency	Notable Distress in CRE	Key Policy/ Regulatory Actions
2001 Recession (dot-com)	Mild recession; Fed cut rates from ~6.5% in 2000 to ~1.75% by 2002 to stimulate recovery.	~1.9% (Q3 2001) [1]	Tech offices (post dot- com bust); tourism/ hospitality dip after 9/11. Overall CRE values slipped slightly in 2001–02.	No major CRE-specific regulatory changes. Monetary easing (aggressive rate cuts) provided liquidity to borrowers.
2007–09 GFC (Great Recession)	Severe financial crisis; Fed slashed rates to ~0% by Dec 2008; credit markets seized up in 2008–09.	~8.7% (2010) [2] (historic high)	Broad CRE crash (~35–40% price drop from peak). High distress in construction & land development, housing investment properties, hotels and retail. CMBS delinquency >10% [3]. Many small banks failed due to CRE loan losses.	Dodd-Frank Act (2010) imposed stricter underwriting and risk retention; Basel III raised capital requirements (e.g. High Volatility CRE rule). Fed and Treasury interventions (TALF, TARP) to stabilize credit; near-zero rates and QE to spur recovery.
2020–21 COVID-19	Acute pandemic shock; Fed cut rates back to ~0% in Mar 2020; fiscal stimulus (CARES Act) and Fed liquidity (QE) were unprecedented.	~1.2% (Q4 2020) [4] (short spike, quickly reversed)	Sudden collapse in travel, retail foot traffic; hotels and brick-and-mortar retail saw highest delinquencies. CMBS delinquency spiked to ~10.3% in mid-2020 [3], then declined. Multifamily and small-business rentals saw stress but massive relief measures prevented worst outcomes.	Temporary loan forbearance programs and eviction moratoria; CARES Act let banks offer deferrals without counting as TDR (troubled debt). Huge fiscal support (PPP loans, etc.) kept many small borrowers afloat. Federal regulatory relief on reserve requirements; Fed backstops (TALF re-opened for CMBS).

Cycle (Year)	Economic Shock & Interest Rates	Peak Bank CRE Loan Delinquency	Notable Distress in CRE	Key Policy/ Regulatory Actions
	Rapid inflation led Fed to raise rates from 0% to ~5%+ (2022–23) – fastest hikes since 1980s; financing costs surged.	~1.6% (Q1 2025) [5] (rising trend)	Rising distress in office (remote work demand) – large office loan defaults up, some high-profile defaults on big loans. Refinancing crunch across CRE as values fall ~15–25% (higher cap rates). Small multifamily loans also starting to see uptick Freddie Mac small-balance MF delinquency jumped to ~2.3% in late 2023) [6].	No new major sector legislation yet; reduced regulators warning banks to manage CRE concentration and interest rate risk. Potential Basel III 2022–23 “Endgame” rules Rate could further boost Hikes CRE loan risk weights. Monetary policy remained tight; delinquency limited relief, forcing (e.g. private workouts or restructures (“extend and pretend” widespread).

Table: Overview of economic cycles and CRE loan performance. Delinquency = % of loans 30+ days past due or in nonaccrual (bank data).

In the sections below, we delve into each period in detail, examining how small-balance CRE loans – including bridge loans for 1–4 unit and small commercial properties, multifamily bridge loans, and DSCR-based investor loans – fared in terms of defaults, delinquencies, recoveries, and investor returns. We also compare their performance to large-balance CRE lending, as well as to public REITs and institutional CRE debt investments, to highlight similarities or differences.

Early 2000s and the 2001 Dot-Com Recession

The late 1990s saw a boom in technology and a surge in commercial real estate valuations, especially in tech-centric markets. By early 2001, the dot-com bubble burst and the U.S. entered a brief recession (Mar–Nov 2001). The 9/11 attacks that year compounded economic uncertainty, hurting travel and tourism-related real estate. Interest rates were sharply lowered by the Federal Reserve in response – from about 6.5% in 2000 to only 1.75% by end of 2001 – in an effort to stimulate growth and stabilize markets.

SBC Lending Conditions: Heading into 2001, underwriting standards for commercial mortgages had been reasonable (nothing like the excesses of the later 2000s). Small-balance commercial loans were often held by local banks that knew their borrowers and markets. During the recession, credit availability tightened modestly – banks focused on monitoring existing loans, and new small CRE originations slowed for a few quarters. However, the low interest rates provided quick relief to borrowers able to refinance or reduce their debt costs.

Default and Delinquency Performance: The 2001 recession was mild for commercial real estate. CRE loan delinquency rates at banks rose only slightly, peaking around 1.9% in late 2001 from ~1.4% in 2000. By[1] 2003, delinquencies were already falling back near 1% as the economy recovered. This[7] uptick was far smaller than what would occur in the Great Recession. Most small-balance loans weathered the dot-com downturn without major losses. Some pain was concentrated in specific property types – office buildings in tech-heavy metros (e.g. Silicon Valley, Boston) saw higher vacancy as tech firms collapsed, which likely led to some loan defaults for both small and large office properties. Similarly, hospitality properties had a tough 2001–2002 (post-9/11 travel decline), so bridge loans on small hotels or motels may have experienced stress. Overall though, SBC loan default rates remained low. Banks reported that real estate loan delinquencies hovered in the 1–2% range through the early 2000s [8] [9], indicating limited distress.

Comparisons – Small vs. Large and REIT Experience: Large-balance CRE loans performed similarly in this period. Life insurance companies and CMBS trusts (the CMBS market was relatively small then) also saw only minor increases in late payments. Publicly traded equity REITs, as a gauge of real estate asset health, did see their stock values dip ~20% in 2001, but this was more due to broader market sentiment; fundamentally, REIT cash flows remained intact and few had trouble meeting debt service. No major regulatory interventions were needed specifically for CRE finance in 2001. In short, the dot-com recession caused a modest ripple in the small-balance CRE loan market – a temporary rise in delinquencies and a brief pause in new lending – but thanks to swift monetary easing, the real estate credit environment stabilized quickly. Most SBC lenders continued to achieve solid returns through the early 2000s, as loans made at higher late-90s interest rates kept performing and borrowers benefited from refinancing at lower rates (reducing defaults). By 2004–2005, the economy was growing robustly, and SBC lending volume picked up again, setting the stage for the credit boom of the mid-2000s.

The 2007–2009 Great Financial Crisis and Its Aftermath

The Great Financial Crisis was a defining stress test for commercial real estate debt of all sizes. In the mid-2000s, credit conditions had become very loose, with abundant capital flowing into both residential and commercial property markets. Small-balance CRE lending grew aggressively through 2006–2007 alongside large-balance lending: community banks and mortgage companies offered high leverage and short-term bridge loans, assuming ever-rising property values and easy refinancing. Many SBC loans in this era featured interest-only periods or were underwritten on optimistic rental income projections. For 1–4 unit investor properties, lenders often didn't verify borrower income (so-called "no-doc" or Alt-A loans), effectively treating these as DSCR-based loans (if the property's rent could cover the mortgage) – a precursor to today's DSCR loan products.

Crisis Onset: When the housing bubble burst and the credit crunch hit in 2007–2008, the impact on *commercial* real estate lagged slightly behind residential but was ultimately severe. By 2008–2009, property values plummeted 30–40% from their peak, and rentals faced rising vacancies and falling rents in many markets due to the deep recession (unemployment over 10%). Crucially, refinancing became extraordinarily difficult – CMBS issuance froze in 2008, and many banks (reeling from residential losses) stopped new CRE lending. This left countless bridge loans and maturing SBC mortgages stranded without take-out financing.

Default and Delinquency Surge: Small-balance CRE loans experienced a dramatic deterioration in performance. Delinquency rates on commercial real estate loans at banks climbed relentlessly from about 1% in 2006 to a peak of 8.75% by early 2010. This was an[2] unprecedented default wave – the worst since the 1990–91 commercial real estate crash, and far above the ~2% minor recession levels earlier in the decade. Many of these delinquencies turned into outright defaults and foreclosures, especially in construction and land development loans (often small and local projects) and in loans on income properties that had relied on high leverage. As one Federal Reserve analysis noted, *"delinquency rates on commercial mortgage loans shot up dramatically after 2008"* [10].

- Community Bank Failures: A number of community banks that had concentrated in small CRE loans failed during 2009–2011. These banks often had a high share of their portfolio in local commercial real estate (including small retail centers, small apartments, and land/construction loans). When real estate values collapsed, their loan losses wiped out capital. In fact, empirical studies found that *"small banks with <$5B in assets held over 27% of total bank CRE loans"* and had proportionately far greater exposure than large banks [11] [12]. Many of the 300+ bank failures in 2009–2011 were tied to outsized CRE loan losses. For example, aggressive small banks in Georgia, Florida, and Nevada – states with big real estate booms and busts – were among those most affected.

- Bridge Loans and Construction Loans: Short-term bridge financing proved especially vulnerable. Developers or investors with bridge loans maturing in 2008–2010 often could not refinance or sell the property at a price that would pay off the loan, leading to maturity defaults. Lenders were forced either to extend loans (if they could) or foreclose. Many projects under construction (funded by interim loans) were halted or abandoned. These construction/land loans had the highest default rates of any CRE category. Loss severities were brutal – often well over 40% of loan principal had to be written off once the property was disposed. An FDIC study of failed-bank loan recoveries found mean loss given default around 53% for bank commercial mortgage loans in that period [13], similar to the ~50% loss severities observed on defaulted CMBS loans [13].

- Investor-Owned 1–4 Unit Properties: Although the GFC started as a residential crisis, it's notable that *investor* mortgages on 1–4 unit rentals or flips defaulted at extremely high rates – even higher than owner-occupied homes. Many small investors had taken out "no doc" loans to buy multiple houses during the boom. As the crisis unfolded, investors were quick to default on underwater properties. Research by the Federal Reserve and CEPR showed the share of new mortgage delinquencies coming from investor-owned homes jumped from ~15% pre-crisis to between 25% and 40% during 2007–2009, despite investors being a smaller fraction of borrowers [14]. In other words, investor/DSCR-type loans were a disproportionate part of the default pool, contributing significantly to the bust [14]. This foreshadowed the need for more cautious underwriting on rental property loans (a lesson applied in modern DSCR loan programs, which now require decent credit scores and cash flow coverage).

Recovery Rates (Loss Severities): With such a glut of distressed properties, recovery rates on defaulted loans were quite low in 2008–2012. As noted above, about half of loan principal on average was lost on defaulted commercial mortgages during the GFC [15]. Small-balance loans sometimes fared a *little* better in recovery than large loans, thanks to the efforts of community bankers to work out loans and local investors snapping up smaller properties. In fact, one study finds *"small banks that specialize in CRE have higher loan recovery rates than their larger competitors, even after controlling for property type and location"* [16] [17]. Local banks were often more proactive at restructuring loans or finding buyers for foreclosed assets (leveraging their community networks) to minimize losses. Nonetheless, the same study noted this comes at the cost of higher default frequency – *"loans by small banks default more often… but late-stage delinquencies and charge-offs are higher for large banks"* [18]. This implies small-balance loans went into delinquency at greater rates, but some were cured or resolved without full charge-off, whereas large loans in trouble tended to eventually turn into big losses. Freddie Mac's analysis of multifamily loan performance similarly found that small-property loans had roughly similar default incidence as large-property loans, but when defaults occurred, smaller loans had higher loss severities on average (total loss of 33% of principal for smaller properties vs 26% for larger) [19]. Fixed foreclosure costs (legal fees, etc.) eat up a bigger share of a \$1M loan than a \$10M loan, and in downturns investors prefer buying larger, "safer" assets – leaving small properties harder to sell at good prices [20] [19]. Thus, SBC lenders often recovered less of each dollar in default during the GFC.

Returns and Investor Impact: For those investing in or lending to the SBC segment, the GFC was obviously very painful. Many lenders faced negative returns in 2008–2010 as loan charge-offs mounted. Banks' net charge-off rates on CRE loans spiked (annual charge-offs around 2–3% of CRE loans in 2009–2010 [21]), erasing years of interest earnings. Specialized finance companies and mortgage REITs that focused on bridge or small commercial loans also suffered. For example, some mortgage REITs had to suspend dividends or were forced into fire-sales of assets. In the public markets, equity REITs (which generally own large properties but serve as a benchmark for CRE values) saw their stock prices plunge nearly 70% from 2007 peak to 2009 trough, reflecting investors' expectation of distressed asset values. REITs that held lots of debt (e.g. highly leveraged property owners) were hit hardest – notably General Growth Properties (a large mall REIT) even filed bankruptcy in 2009. However, compared to smaller private owners, REITs often had better access to capital to recapitalize. Many REITs issued new equity or secured financing once markets stabilized, enabling them to avoid liquidating properties at the bottom. By contrast, small private investors often lost their properties to foreclosure if they couldn't carry the mortgage during the downturn.

One bright spot for returns was for opportunistic investors who had dry powder to deploy at the bottom. Those who bought distressed SBC loans or REO properties in 2009–2010 often achieved excellent returns in subsequent years, as they were buying at deep discounts. For instance, private equity funds and vulture investors scooped up pools of small defaulted loans from failed banks via the FDIC and were able to work them out profitably. These high returns, however, came at the expense of the original lenders and investors who took the losses.

Comparisons – Large Balance & Institutional: Large-balance commercial loan performance was likewise poor in the GFC, though the exact patterns differed. CMBS (Commercial Mortgage-Backed Securities), which mostly contained loans larger than \$5M, had delinquency rates that went from under 1% in 2007 to above 10% by 2012 [3] – very similar to the bank small-loan experience in magnitude. Losses on defaulted CMBS loans averaged around 50% severity as noted. Some large iconic properties defaulted (e.g. Manhattan office towers, big hotels), contributing heavily to loss totals. Life insurance companies' mortgage portfolios fared somewhat better – life insurers tend to lend conservatively on high-quality properties. Indeed, life company commercial mortgage defaults peaked at only around 1% or less (estimates put cumulative life-co mortgage default at ~0.3–0.5% during 2008–2010, far below other lenders) [22] [23]. Life insurers avoided much of the risky construction lending and had lower LTVs, so even in value decline their loans stayed performative more often. Meanwhile, banks' losses were concentrated at smaller institutions, whereas the largest banks were hit more by residential and securities losses than by their corporate CRE loans. Still, the two largest sources of CRE debt – banks and CMBS – were severely impacted, and credit to the sector essentially dried up by 2009 ("banks are not lending, and the CMBS market is closed" as a 2009 REIT report summarized). [24] [25]

Regulatory Changes Post-GFC: The crisis prompted significant regulatory overhauls affecting commercial lending:

- Dodd-Frank Act (2010): This sweeping reform introduced stronger capital and liquidity requirements for banks, created stress testing (CCAR/DFAST) which often included CRE downturn scenarios, and imposed *risk retention* rules for securitizations (requiring issuers of CMBS to hold 5% of the deal, aligning their interest with loan performance). For small banks, Dodd-Frank's impact was indirect but real – higher compliance costs and supervisory scrutiny made many pivot to safer portfolios. There is evidence that post-2010, big banks cut back disproportionately on small business and small CRE loans [26], leaving a gap often filled by non-bank lenders.

- Basel III and Bank Capital Rules: U.S. regulators implemented Basel III gradually after 2013. A notable change was the creation of the *High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE)* category – essentially certain acquisition, development, or construction loans now carried a 150% risk-weight (requiring more capital) unless the borrower had substantial equity in the project. This made banks much more cautious in funding development and higher-leverage deals. In general, banks' risk-weighted assets increased, prompting them to tighten credit or seek more capital-light lending. By one estimate, the total outstanding small-balance CRE loan portfolios fell by ~25% from the 2008 peak in the ensuing years, even as the overall CRE loan market recovered and grew by over 60% [27]. In other words, small loans did not bounce back as quickly – a secular decline in small- balance market share occurred [27]. This was partly regulatory-driven and partly because many community banks disappeared in the consolidation wave after the crisis.

- Market Response: The post-GFC era also saw the rise of alternative lenders in the SBC space. Private debt funds, mortgage REITs, and crowd-funding platforms stepped in to provide bridge and mezzanine loans that banks shied away from. These non-bank lenders operate outside the traditional regulatory framework, allowing them to serve higher-risk borrowers (but often at higher interest rates). This shift set the stage for how SBC loans would be financed in the next decade.

In summary, the Great Financial Crisis dealt a major blow to the performance of small-balance commercial loans, with default rates reaching historic highs and recovery rates low. SBC loans were hit as hard as, and in some cases harder than, large loans – especially because small properties had fewer refinancing options and smaller owners had shallower pockets. However, small local lenders showed a relative advantage in working out distressed loans efficiently, which helped avoid even larger losses [17]. The crisis prompted a tightening of credit standards and lasting changes in the market structure (more regulation for banks, and more non-bank capital in small CRE lending). By 2012–2013, conditions began to normalize: delinquency rates gradually fell (back under 5% by 2012 and under 1.5% by 2015) [28] [29], and property values started a long recovery. Lenders who survived the GFC emerged more conservative, and investors regained appetite for securitizations and REITs only once reforms were in place to prevent a repeat of such a collapse.

The COVID-19 Shock (2020–2021) and Quick Rebound

After a decade of expansion in the 2010s, with generally low delinquency across CRE loans, the world was blindsided in early 2020 by the COVID-19 pandemic. This black swan event caused an immediate, sharp economic contraction in Q2 2020. Many businesses were forced to close or curtail operations due to lockdowns, which had instant impacts on commercial real estate cash flows. Small businesses couldn't pay rent, hotels emptied out, and tenants of all kinds sought relief. However, the policy response was also unprecedentedly swift and strong, preventing a prolonged real estate depression.

Initial Impact on SBC Loans: Practically overnight, many SBC borrowers saw their income disrupted. For example, the owner of a 10-unit apartment building might have faced non-payment from tenants who lost jobs (especially with eviction moratoriums preventing removing non-payers), or a small retail property landlord saw shop tenants shutter. Borrowers with bridge loans suddenly had their business plans thrown off – property sales froze during the lockdowns and renovations were delayed. Delinquencies spiked in Q2 2020 as one would expect: by mid-2020 the overall commercial mortgage delinquency rate (all banks) jumped to about 1.01% (Q2 2020) from 0.67% at the end of 2019 [30] [4]. In securitized loans, the effect was larger – the overall CMBS delinquency rate shot up from ~2% in early 2020 to 10.3% by June 2020***** [3] ***, matching GFC peak levels. This was especially driven by lodging and retail loans in CMBS, which saw massive stress (at one point in 2020,*** *15% of hotel-backed CMBS loans were in special servicing according to Trepp data [31]).

However, crucially, many delinquencies were short-lived and did not turn into permanent defaults. Unlike 2008, asset values did not undergo a fundamental collapse – by late 2020, liquidity had returned and property prices were rebounding in many sectors (aided by record-low interest rates).

Relief Measures and Loan Workouts: A big reason SBC loan performance didn't crater was the breadth of relief measures:

- Banks and lenders granted forbearances and temporary payment deferrals liberally. Under the CARES Act, banks were allowed to offer COVID-related loan modifications without classifying the loan as "troubled" (no hit to capital or credit rating) – this encouraged lenders to work with borrowers rather than call defaults. Many small-balance borrowers took 3–6 month payment holidays in 2020, during which interest accrued but no default was recorded.

- The government's Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and other small business aid enabled tenants to keep paying rent and commercial mortgage borrowers to keep paying their lenders. A considerable portion of PPP money flowed to landlords or was used by small firms to cover rent/ utilities. This had a direct positive effect on SBC loan performance (e.g., a strip-mall owner's tenants got PPP, so the owner could continue servicing the mortgage).

- Eviction moratoriums and rental assistance programs, while challenging for landlords in the short run, eventually were accompanied by federal rent relief funds that helped many residential landlords recover lost rent. By late 2021, billions in Emergency Rental Assistance were distributed, disproportionately aiding small "mom-and-pop" landlords of 1–4 unit and small multifamily properties.

- The Federal Reserve's actions – slashing interest rates back to zero and flooding the market with liquidity via asset purchases – kept credit markets functioning. Notably, the Fed resurrected TALF to support securitizations, which helped revive the CMBS and CLO markets for commercial mortgages [32] [33]. This meant bridge and permanent loan take-out options came back faster. By late 2020, many debt fund lenders and CMBS shops were active again, refinancing loans that had been on pause.

Performance Metrics: Thanks to these supports, actual defaults remained much lower than feared. Delinquency rates that spiked in mid-2020 started improving by late 2020. At banks, CRE delinquencies fell from 1.15% in Q4 2020 to 0.78% a year later (Q4 2021) [34][35] – basically returning close to pre-pandemic normal. Many loans that went 30-60 days delinquent cured once businesses reopened and government funds arrived. In the CMBS universe, the overall delinquency rate likewise retreated from the 10% range in mid-2020 to under 5% by late 2021 [36][23].

Importantly, the types of loans and properties mattered in COVID's impact:

- Hospitality and Retail: These were by far the worst hit. A small hotel with a bridge loan, for instance, almost certainly went delinquent if it had the misfortune of coming due in 2020. Many hotel owners requested forbearance – and lenders often complied, extending loan maturities in hopes of a travel rebound (which did materialize somewhat in 2021). Retail strip centers saw tenants shut down; however, essential retail (grocery-anchored centers, etc.) held up, and many small retail property loans were surprisingly resilient after the initial shock, aided by stimulus.

- Multifamily and 1–4 Unit Rentals: These held up better than expected. Nationally, residential rents and occupancy dipped only slightly in 2020 and then rebounded strongly – helped by the rapid economic recovery and stimulus checks supporting household incomes. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's multifamily loan portfolios – including small-balance multifamily – had only minimal upticks in delinquency. For example, Freddie Mac's small-balance multifamily (FRESB) program delinquency was under 0.2% pre-COVID and rose to only around 0.3–0.4% at the peak (they did see an *increase* in late 2020, but still under half a percent) [37][23]. These agency loans benefited from federal tenant protections and the fact that multifamily demand bounced back quickly. On the other hand, loans on rent-regulated apartments in New York City saw more persistent stress (because those landlords faced rising costs and frozen rents) – an issue that by 2023 would become more evident (as discussed later, FRESB delinquencies in 2023 were driven in large part by NYC rent-controlled buildings lingering in special servicing) [38][39].

- Office: In the very short term, office loans didn't default en masse in 2020 – most tenants were locked into leases and kept paying through the pandemic even while offices were empty. Thus, office loan performance lagged the immediate COVID shock (office stress became more of a 2021–2022 story when leases began to roll and companies shrank space). Small-balance office loans (e.g., an owner-user office condo, or a suburban medical office building) generally continued to perform through 2020, often buoyed by low interest rates and longer lease terms.

Overall, the pandemic's CRE loan crisis was cushioned and abbreviated. By mid-2021, commercial property prices were climbing again, in some segments exceeding pre-pandemic peaks (especially industrial and multifamily). Many small-balance lenders actually saw *lower* losses in 2020–2021 than they had feared in the spring of 2020. The experience was very different from the GFC: this time, aggressive intervention prevented a downward spiral. In fact, some credit rating agencies had initially warned in April 2020 that *commercial mortgage defaults could approach Great Recession levels*, absent support [40]. But that worst-case never materialized, primarily due to policy measures that *"proven resilient, with delinquency rates and credit losses remaining low"* in CRE finance through the pandemic [41].

Returns and Market Dynamics: From a return on investment perspective, the pandemic created winners and losers:

- Lenders' Yields: With the Fed cutting rates to zero, interest yields on loans fell to historical lows in 2020–21. Many floating-rate bridge loans saw their base rate drop to near 0%, providing relief to borrowers (and reducing lenders' interest income). New permanent loans were being made at very low coupons (multifamily 10-year loans in 2021 could be under 3% rates with agency backing). So, investors in new SBC loan originations during this period accepted lower yields in exchange for what was perceived as strong credit (given the rebounding economy and low default rates). Mortgage spreads did widen briefly in 2020 (increasing the yield premium), but by 2021 competition drove spreads back down – making it a low-yield environment. For example, private debt funds in late 2020 could originate bridge loans at maybe 6–7% (with SOFR near zero), but by mid-2021, some bridge loans were pricing at even 5% range for low-risk multifamily flips, as capital flooded back in.

- Actual Loan Performance/ROI: Despite lower interest rates, actual loan performance was solid, so *realized* returns for investors in SBC loans were decent – virtually all their performing loans kept paying (after any forbearance, payments resumed with accrued interest). Many lenders avoided major write-offs. Some took an income hit due to forbearance (few months of no payments), but most structured it so that interest was paid later or the loan term was extended. By late 2021, SBC lenders enjoyed not only resuming payments but also often saw early payoffs – as property values surged in 2021, many borrowers sold or refinanced, repaying loans in full. This meant some bridge lenders got their principal back faster than expected (sometimes an IRR boost, though also ending the stream of interest). In short, the default rate on SBC loans originated pre-pandemic remained quite low after the dust settled.

- REITs and Institutional Players: Public REITs initially plunged ~40% in stock value in March 2020, but recovered within a year as investors recognized the support in place. REITs with portfolios in multifamily, industrial, etc., actually emerged stronger (raising equity at high prices in 2021 to fund growth), whereas hotel and mall REITs lagged. On the debt side, mortgage REITs and CLO funds had a scare in March 2020 with margin calls (some had to be rescued or restructured), but the Fed's liquidity injection calmed that – by late 2020, even high-risk CMBS and CRE CLO bonds recovered to near par, delivering huge gains to those who bought at the bottom. For life insurance lenders, 2020 was a non-event in terms of losses – life cos reported minuscule delinquency (0.04% by Q3 2021) [22][23], as they were largely insulated in top-tier assets and any troubled loans were restructured quietly.

Summary: The COVID-19 recession was intense but short for the CRE debt market. Small-balance loans had a spike in late payments but ultimately few permanent defaults in 2020–21 due to aggressive intervention and the rapid macroeconomic recovery. This cycle highlighted that liquidity and policy support can drastically alter default outcomes. It's worth noting that some problems were simply kicked down the road (e.g., loans extended in 2020 would face refinancing later), but many SBC borrowers used the strong 2021 market to stabilize or exit their investments successfully. By the end of 2021, SBC loan performance metrics were back near record strength (delinquencies under 1%). Lenders' focus now turned to new risks on the horizon – namely, inflation and rising interest rates, which indeed materialized in 2022.

The 2022–2023 Interest Rate Hike Cycle and Emerging Stress

In 2022, the economic environment shifted dramatically. Inflation spiked to 40-year highs, and the Federal Reserve embarked on an exceptionally rapid series of interest rate hikes. The Fed Funds rate rose from effectively 0% in early 2022 to over 5% by mid-2023. This marked the end of an era of cheap money and introduced a new kind of stress test for real estate: the refinancing and interest rate risk cycle. Unlike earlier downturns driven by recession and demand collapse, the challenge now is higher debt costs and tighter credit potentially pushing loans into default, even as the economy by some measures continued to grow in 2022–23.

Rising Rates and Property Values: Commercial property values, which had hit all-time highs in 2021, started falling in 2022 as cap rates expanded (the present value of future cash flows dropped when discounted at higher interest rates). By early 2023, many property types saw 10–20% value declines from 2021 peaks, with sharper drops (20–30% or more) in sectors like office and class-B/C multifamily in over- supplied markets. This immediately raised concern for lenders: loans made in 2019–2021 at, say, a 75% loan-to-value could now be effectively 85–95% LTV on the new lower values. If such a loan matured, a refinance would likely not cover the old balance, creating a “maturity default” risk even if the borrower had kept payments current.

Credit Tightening: Compounding the challenge, lenders became much more conservative in 2022–2023. Banks, facing regulatory pressure and anticipating a downturn, tightened CRE lending standards to the most stringent since 2008. Several notable bank failures in March 2023 (Silicon Valley Bank, Signature Bank, and later First Republic) heightened scrutiny on regional banks, which hold the bulk of SBC loans. Small and mid-sized banks began actively reducing CRE exposure or at least being extremely selective (many stopped new lending on office or other troubled asset classes). Non-bank lenders, which had been very active in bridge loans, also faced difficulties – rising rates meant higher cost of capital and some debt fund managers saw investor outflows. As a result, refinancing options for small borrowers became scarce, especially in late 2022 and 2023. For example, a borrower with a maturing bridge loan on a small apartment building might find no bank willing to take out the loan unless the borrower injects fresh equity to lower the LTV.

Emerging Performance Indicators: After hitting historic lows around 0.6–0.7% in 2022, delinquency rates on CRE loans have started to tick up. By Q1 2024, bank CRE loan delinquencies reached 1.40% and continued to rise to 1.59% in Q1 2025 [42] [43]. While still low in absolute terms, that is a ~2.5x increase from the trough and the clear uptrend signals growing stress. Industry analysts expect this figure to continue climbing as more loans hit maturity and need refi at higher rates. Notably, the pattern of stress is a bit different this time:

- Large Loans vs Small Loans: Historically, smaller-balance conduit loans had higher default rates than giant loans (small properties are generally riskier) [44]. But in 2023 an interesting inversion occurred. Delinquency rates on large loans (>$50M) started rising faster than on sub-$50M loans, a phenomenon observed only in severe downturns [45]. In July 2023, Trepp reported that loans ≥\$50M were actually showing a higher delinquency rate than smaller loans – an inversion seen only during peak stress moments like 2012 (post-GFC) and June 2020 (COVID shock) [3]. The driver is big office loan defaults: several large office owners (often institutional investors or office REITs) have defaulted on huge mortgages rather than refinance, due to crashing office values and inability to service new higher rates [46] [47]. For example, the \$690 million Rosslyn, VA office portfolio loan (100% of a CMBS deal) defaulted in 2023 when its DSCR fell below 1.0 and no refi was available [48] [49]. These big loan failures pushed up the "large loan" delinquency stats significantly.

In contrast, many small-balance loans are being handled via extensions. Community banks have generally opted to extend maturities for capable borrowers, often switching loans to interest-only and hoping rates come down. This "extend and pretend" approach means that as of 2023, relatively few small- balance borrowers had been forced into default, outside of obviously non-viable situations. That said, the pressure on small loans is growing – especially those backed by properties with weakening performance (e.g. an older office building with vacancies, or a rent-regulated apartment building with capped rent increases and rising expenses).

- Freddie Mac SBL Delinquencies: A bellwether for small multifamily loans is Freddie Mac's Small Balance Loan (SBL) program. After years of minuscule defaults, the SBL program saw a notable uptick in late 2023. Delinquency on Freddie SBL mortgages jumped from 1.45% in Nov 2023 to 2.25% in Dec 2023 [50] [6] – the highest in the program's history. Much of this was concentrated in New York City, where dozens of small loans on rent-stabilized apartment buildings fell behind [39] [51]. These properties' values have plummeted due to 2019 laws restricting rent increases, meaning owners can't raise income to match inflated expenses (exacerbated by high interest). As a result, even before maturity, some of these loans are no longer cash-flowing enough at higher rates, hence delinquency. Freddie Mac's data showed a cluster of about 56 small multifamily loans (~\$240M total) in NYC going 60+ days delinquent together – likely all tied to a few stressed borrowers [52] [53]. This suggests regional pockets of stress can impact small loan pools. Freddie SBL servicers also note that workouts on these small NYC loans could be tough with potentially high loss severities [38] [54] (since values may have halved in extreme cases).

- Office and Other Commercial SBC Loans: By 2023, even smaller offices (say a \$3M loan on a suburban office building) are coming under strain. As leases roll, occupancy declines and higher interest eats into any cash flow, some such properties are ending up on the market as distressed sales. Lenders are bracing for losses on office-heavy portfolios. *Empty offices increased risks for banks,* a GAO report warned in 2023 [55], especially for those smaller banks that had bet heavily on office CRE. On the flip side, industrial and warehouse properties remain mostly healthy, and many small retail centers anchored by essential businesses are still doing fine – performance is now very sector-dependent.

- DSCR Loans on 1–4 Units: The newer generation of DSCR loans (originated 2018–2022 mostly by non-bank lenders and packaged into private-label RMBS) face their first high-rate environment. Many of these loans were written with interest rates in the 4–7% range on the assumption of continual home price and rent growth. Now, with mortgage rates for investor properties often 8–9%+, property values off recent peaks in some areas, and expenses up, the refinanceability of these loans is in question. Thus far, actual default rates on DSCR loan securitizations have remained relatively low (in part because most have yield maintenance or prepayment lockouts, so they haven't turned over much). But prepayments have fallen sharply – investors are "stuck" with these low-coupon loans in a high-rate market. The real test will come if housing markets soften or if lenders tighten credit further. One mitigating factor: the strong rent growth in 2021 means many DSCR loans originated then still have healthy coverage and are fixed-rate, so they'll perform as long as tenants pay rent. Unlike 2008's investor loans, today's DSCR loans usually had decent credit borrowers and 25–30% down payments, so we don't expect a default tsunami like the 2008 investor-loan scenario [14]. Still, this segment bears watching as higher financing costs cut into investor profits.

Recovery and Loss Outlook: With interest rates high, if a loan does default now, the loss severity can be significant because market values are depressed and there are fewer buyers able to step in. For example, an office building valued at \$10M in 2019 might fetch only \$6–7M in 2024, a 30–40% drop, implying a major loss for the lender if the loan was \$7.5M originally. *Lengthy workout times* are also expected for some assets (like those NYC apartments Freddie mentioned, which may languish in special servicing) [51] [54]. On average, however, other property types like multifamily or industrial may see less severe losses – maybe 10–20% off peak value, so a moderately leveraged loan could still be made whole. Banks have so far been trying to avoid fire-sales, preferring to extend loans in hopes that either interest rates come down or the borrower can inject capital. This could mean recoveries might play out slowly over 2024–2025 rather than a sudden wave of foreclosures.

Regulatory Environment in 2022–2023: Although no new crisis-driven law has passed (since we haven't had a full crash), regulators are increasingly vocal. In late 2022 and into 2023, U.S. banking regulators reminded banks of the 2006/2015 CRE Concentration Guidance – banks with CRE loans exceeding certain thresholds of capital may face heightened supervision. They have also proposed Basel III Endgame rules (mid-2023 proposal) which, if enacted, would significantly raise risk weights on CRE loans (potentially treating all CRE loans more like HVCRE with 100%+ risk weight). The result could be a further pullback by banks from CRE, especially construction and small CRE loans, given the higher capital cost. Banks under $100B in assets – many of which are key SBC lenders – had previously enjoyed some relief from strict stress tests (due to a 2018 Dodd-Frank rollback), but after the 2023 bank failures, there's talk of imposing more stress testing and capital rules on banks >\$100B, which indirectly affects their appetite for all lending, including CRE.

Additionally, the Fed's continued quantitative tightening (QT) is draining liquidity, and risk-free Treasury yields (around 4%–5%) provide a more attractive alternative to some investors compared to illiquid real estate loans, meaning private capital is more selective. All these factors mean the SBC lending market in 2023–2025 is more constrained, and borrowers face higher costs: bridge loan interest rates have soared into the low teens (%) in some cases, and even stabilized loans might be quoted in the 7–8% range (double the rate from two years prior). This raises the required ROI for investors in new SBC loan originations – higher coupons and fees can boost lender returns if the loans perform, but also the heightened default risk can quickly erase gains. Lenders are responding by lowering leverage (requiring more borrower equity) to improve loan safety.

Comparative Outcomes: At this stage (mid-2025), the stress has been more about potential losses than realized ones. Compared to large institutions, small-balance loans have not yet seen as many headline defaults – rather it's the skyscrapers and mega-loans making news. But smaller loans could be creeping up in trouble as the refinancing cliff continues. Life insurance companies still report almost no delinquencies (their conservative underwriting and long-term fixed rates shield them – as of Q2 2024 life co mortgage delinquencies were just 0.43% vs 1.15% for banks [56]). Agency multifamily loans also remain low in default (Fannie Mae multifamily DQ around 0.5% or less). Banks and CMBS are where issues are emerging: by mid-2023 CMBS delinquency overall was ~4.5% (led by office at nearly 7% and climbing) [57] [58]. Public equity REITs, on the other hand, have seen their stock prices decline ~20–30% since 2022 due to higher cap rates, but REITs generally restructured debt well (e.g., many extended maturities or fixed their rates earlier). Only a few highly-levered office-focused REITs have defaulted on loans (opting to turn over keys on specific buildings); most diversified REITs are in decent shape. Thus, institutional CRE investors may take a valuation hit but avoid widespread default, whereas SBC loans – especially held by smaller owners – might see more outright distress if high rates persist into 2024–25.

Forward-Looking: If the Fed begins to cut rates in late 2024 (as some expect), that could relieve some pressure – improving refinance math and shoring up property values. Conversely, if rates stay "higher for longer," we may see a slow bleed of increasing SBC loan defaults. Banks are already increasing loan loss reserves in anticipation. The next phase could involve more loan sales – we might see banks selling pools of small-balance loans at discounts to reduce exposure. That in turn could create opportunities for investors (similar to post-GFC) to purchase distressed SBC debt at attractive yields. Indeed, some analysts in 2023 pointed out that small-balance CRE loans might be relatively safer or offer better risk-adjusted returns than big loans, because smaller properties (like neighborhood apartments, smaller warehouses, etc.) often have more resilient demand and less dramatic valuation swings than trophy offices [44] [59]. For instance, a \$2M apartment building's value is anchored by local affordable rents, which didn't plummet like office rents did; so that loan might hold up better than a \$200M office loan in a dead downtown. This perspective argues that there may be hidden stability in diversified small-balance portfolios, and some investors are "hiding" in that segment during the big-loan turmoil [44].

Conclusion and Key Takeaways

Over the last quarter-century, the U.S. small-balance commercial real estate lending market has experienced wide swings across economic cycles:

- Resilience in Mild Recessions: In periods like 2001, SBC loans showed resilience with only minor upticks in defaults. With supportive monetary policy, small commercial borrowers generally managed through brief downturns, and lenders maintained solid returns.

- Severe Stress in 2008–2010: The Great Financial Crisis was a watershed, sending SBC loan defaults to record levels (near 9% delinquency) [2]. Small loans were deeply affected, much like larger ones, as underlying property values collapsed. Community banks shouldered heavy losses – many failed – and recovery rates on defaults were low (~50¢ on the dollar) [13]. Post-crisis reforms led to a retrenchment in small-balance lending (25% contraction from the peak) [27] and a migration of this lending activity partly to non-bank actors. The GFC underscored that small CRE loans are not immune to big macro shocks and indeed can be a point of vulnerability for the banking system given their concentration in smaller banks.

- Quick Shock/Recovery in 2020: The COVID-19 crisis, while devastating in the short run, was mitigated by extraordinary intervention. SBC loans had a spike in delinquencies but relatively few lasting defaults, as emergency measures kept borrowers afloat. Lenders' portfolios emerged from the pandemic largely intact, and many even benefited from the low interest/refinancing boom of 2021 that followed. It highlighted that liquidity support and fiscal aid can prevent a real estate credit crunch – a very different outcome than 2008. However, it also perhaps masked underlying issues that can resurface once supports are removed.

- Rising Rate Era Challenges: The current 2022–2025 cycle presents a slow-developing challenge: high interest rates straining debt service and refinancing. While not a sudden crash, this period may erode loan performance gradually, particularly for those properties that cannot maintain cash flow under higher rate burdens or need to refinance at much lower leverage. Already, we see early signs of stress in both small and large loans (e.g., Freddie Mac SBL delinquency up, big offices defaulting) [6] [3]. The full impact is still unfolding. Banks and regulators are on alert, and adjustments (like extending loans or policy tweaks on capital requirements) may yet shape the outcome.

Comparative Insights: In many respects, small-balance CRE loans follow the same fundamental drivers as the overall CRE market – economic growth, interest rates, and real estate values. When the tide goes out (as in 2008), both small and large loans can drown. However, there are nuanced differences: - Small loans often have higher default frequency (more small borrowers run into trouble) but can sometimes be managed case-by-case to avoid ultimate loss (local banks finding solutions) . - Large loans default less[60] often in normal times, but when they do default, they create big headlines and can incur very large losses (one big office tower can mean a \$100M loss). - Recovery rates on small loans tend to be lower percentage-wise, because of fixed workout costs and less institutional buyer interest in distressed small assets . Large institutional loans may recover[19] a bit more proportionally (and are more likely to be worked out via sophisticated restructurings or even bailouts, e.g., a life insurer might restructure a mega-loan to avoid formal default). - In terms of returns, small-balance loans usually carry higher interest rates (a spread premium for illiquidity and risk). Historically, private commercial mortgage investments have delivered a spread of around 90–100 bps over comparable corporate bonds on average , and small-balance loans would be on the higher end of spreads.[61] For example, a life company loan on a stabilized office might be 4% while a small bank loan on a similar smaller property might be 5.5%. In boom times, this meant excellent yields for SBC lenders, but in busts those excess yields can be wiped out by defaults. Institutional players (lifecos, agency lenders) have lower yields but also very low loss rates, giving them a good risk- adjusted return through cycles. Public equity REITs, conversely, experience high volatility – but they generally use moderate leverage, which helped them mostly avoid mortgage default during both GFC and COVID (aside from a few outliers). Thus, equity investors absorbed property value swings, whereas debt investors (banks, CMBS) took hits when value fell below loan balances.

Impact of Regulation: Regulatory changes have gradually made the bank segment of SBC lending safer but smaller. Higher capital requirements and better underwriting (e.g., no more “low-doc” investor loans like pre-2008) mean new vintage SBC loans are, on average, less likely to default than those made in 2006. We see evidence of this in, for instance, the very low delinquency rates on agency and bank loans in 2018– 19 (before COVID) – many banks stuck to lower LTVs and required personal guarantees on small CRE loans, learning from the GFC. Yet, the risk hasn’t vanished; it may have shifted partly to non-banks who are not bound by the same rules and may take on higher leverage deals. This shadow banking aspect will be something to watch in the current cycle – if many private debt funds face losses, will that have broader ripple effects or will it be contained away from the insured banking system?

In conclusion, from 2000 to 2025 the SBC loan market has seen boom, bust, recovery, and now a tightening cycle. Each episode provided lessons: 2001 showed the value of rapid Fed easing; 2008 taught hard lessons in credit discipline and spawned regulatory overhaul; 2020 showcased the power of liquidity and fiscal backstops; 2022–2023 is teaching (again) that interest rate risk is real and can expose weaknesses slowly but surely. Investors and lenders in the small-balance space must manage a delicate balance – pricing loans to yield enough to compensate for higher default risk, maintaining underwriting standards especially late in economic expansions, and being prepared for illiquidity in downturns. Those that have navigated these cycles successfully (e.g., certain community banks or specialized funds) often did so by *sticking to fundamentals*: reasonable LTVs, understanding local markets, and not assuming the good times last forever.

As the market heads further into 2025, the performance of SBC loans will largely depend on the path of interest rates and the economy. If inflation abates and rates ease, we could see a rebound in transaction activity and an improved refinancing outlook – alleviating the current stress. If rates stay high or a recession hits, defaults may climb more steeply, and we will test just how much more resilient the post-GFC underwriting really was. Regardless, the past 25 years have proven that small-balance commercial loans are a vital yet vulnerable segment of the CRE finance world – they fuel entrepreneurship and local development in good times, but require prudent risk management and sometimes regulatory support to withstand the bad times. The comparative performance across cycles underscores that while size matters (in terms of diversification and flexibility of large loans vs. small loans), ultimately real estate is cyclical and all lenders must prepare for those cycles appropriately.

Sources:

- Federal Reserve data on bank loan performance (delinquency rates) [2] [7]
- Trepp research on CMBS delinquency trends by loan size [3] [44]
- Boxwood Means (SmallBalance.com) analysis of SBC loan market trends [27]
- Academic study on small vs. large bank CRE loan outcomes (default and recovery) [60] [16]
- Freddie Mac Multifamily small-balance loan performance research [19] [20]
- CEPR analysis of investor-driven mortgage defaults in GFC [14]
- FDIC study on loss given default in CRE loans (GFC era) [15]
- Fitch Ratings and MBA reports on delinquency by lender type (e.g. life insurers vs banks vs CMBS) [22] [23]
- Santander US Capital Markets report on Freddie Mac SBL delinquencies (2024) [6] [52]
- Curious Cat Economics Blog (quoting Fed data) on 2011 loan delinquency improvements [8] [9].

---

[1] [2] [4] [5] [7] [28] [29] [30] [34] [35] [42] Table Data - Delinquency Rate on Commercial Real Estate Loans (Excluding Farmland), Booked in Domestic Offices, All Commercial Banks | FRED | St. Louis Fed
https://fred.stlouisfed.org/data/DRCRELEXFACBS

[3] [44] [45] [46] [47] [48] [49] [57] [58] [59] Looking For a Place to Hide Amid Growing CRE Distress? Think About Small Balance CRE Loans
https://www.trepp.com/trepptalk/looking-for-place-hide-amid-growing-cre-distress-think-about-small-balance-cre-loans

[6] [38] [39] [50] [51] [52] [53] [54] SanCap Portfolio Strategy
https://portfolio-strategy.apsec.com/2024/02/09/rip-currents-emerge-in-small-balance-multifamily-cmbs/

[8] [9] Consumer and Real Estate Loan Delinquency Rates from 2001 to 2011 in the USA at Curious Cat Investing and Economics Blog
https://investing.curiouscatblog.net/2012/03/06/consumer-and-real-estate-loan-delinquency-rates-from-2001-to-2011-in-the-usa/

[10] [PDF] The NAIC's Capital Markets Bureau monitors developments in the ...
https://content.naic.org/sites/default/files/naic_archive/The_55.pdf

[11] [12] [16] [17] [18] [26] [60] Small Banks and the Recovery Advantage in Commercial Real Estate
https://afajof.org/management/viewp.php?n=65632

[13] [15] Loss Given Default for Commercial Loans
https://www.fdic.gov/analysis/cfr/working-papers/2015/2015-06.pdf

[14] Mortgage default during the Great Recession came from real estate investors, not subprime credit holders | CEPR
https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/mortgage-default-during-great-recession-came-real-estate-investors-not-subprime

19 20 Small Balance Loans
https://mf.freddiemac.com/docs/research_perspectives_small_balance_loans.pdf

21 Default of Commercial Mortgage Loans during the Financial Crisis
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1717062

22 23 31 36 37 Commercial property loan delinquency rates decline | Yield PRO
https://yieldpro.com/2021/12/commercial-property-loan-delinquency-rates-decline/

24 25 Microsoft PowerPoint - Commercial Real Estate - General Purpose.ppt
https://www.reit.com/sites/default/files/portals/0/PDF/CommercialRealEstateGeneralPurpose(10-7-09).pdf

27 PowerPoint Presentation
https://www.boxwoodmeans.com/assets/pdf/JMP_Presentation_Jun_2017.pdf

32 33 [PDF] The Federal Reserve's Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility
https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/research/epr/12v18n3/1210ashc.p

40 MBA Commercial/Multifamily Research
https://www.mba.org/news-and-research/research-and-economics/commercial-multifamily-research

41 U.S.: commercial real estate delinquency rate 2025 - Statista
https://www.statista.com/statistics/1200066/commercial-mortgage-backed-securities-delinquency-rate-usa/

43 Delinquency Rate on Commercial Real Estate Loans (Excluding Farmland), Booked in Domestic Offices, All Commercial Banks (DRCRELEXFACBS) | FRED | St. Louis Fed
https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/DRCRELEXFACBS

55 Empty Offices Increase Risks for Banks Lending to Commercial Real ...
https://www.gao.gov/blog/empty-offices-increase-risks-banks-lending-commercial-real-estate

56 [PDF] CRE/Mortgage Loans YE 2023 - NAIC
https://content.naic.org/sites/default/files/capital-markets-special-reports-cre-mortgage-loans-ye2023.pdf

61 [PDF] Commercial Mortgage Lending: - MetLife Investment Management
https://investments.metlife.com/content/dam/metlifecom/us/investments/insights/research-topics/real-estate/images-new/Article/commercial-mortgage-lending/moodys-and-mim-examination-of-60-years-of-cm-history.pdf