

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Housing Production Trust Fund Advisory Board

Housing Production Trust Fund
Advisory Board Meeting

ORIGINAL

10:07 a.m. to 12:07 p.m.

Monday, February 2, 2015

Department of Housing and Community Development
1800 Martin Luther King Avenue, Southeast
Washington, D.C. 20020

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 Board Members Present:

2 DAVID BOWERS, CHAIRMAN

3 ROBERT POHLMAN

4 JAMES KNIGHT

5 SUE ANN MARSHALL

6 M. CRAIG PASCAL

7 CHRIS DICKERSIN-PROKOPP

8 BEATRIX FIELDS

9 OKE ANYAEGBUNAM

10 NATHAN SIMMS

11 Presenters:

12 POLLY DONALDSON, DHCD ACTING DIRECTOR

13 DAVE WILMARTH

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Good morning to
3 everybody. It is Monday, February 2nd, 2015. It
4 is 10:07 a.m. I'm calling the District of
5 Columbia Housing Production Trust Fund Advisory
6 Board Meeting to order. I am David Bowers, your
7 chairman. We're here at the Department of
8 Housing and Community Development. I want to
9 welcome everybody to the meeting.

10 A couple of housekeeping notes just to
11 start. If you do have a cell phone, we just ask
12 you put it on silent. The restrooms are right
13 out the door to the left.

14 So with the meeting having been called to
15 order, we are actually going to, as I like to do
16 each meeting, defer to the director and see if
17 there are any general welcoming comments or
18 remarks that the director would like to make
19 before we dive into it.

20 Director?

21 MS. DONALDSON: Thank you, Chairman
22 Bowers. I appreciate that. It is an anniversary

1 for me. It's one month ago that I think I joined
2 you for the first time in this role.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MS. DONALDSON: And it's been a really
5 wonderful four weeks. I want to commend all the
6 DHCD staff that's here who have been just so not
7 only welcoming, but also have been absolutely
8 wonderfully responsive. And it's been really a
9 pleasure getting to know all the various teams
10 inside the Agency.

11 I also want to say this is truly an
12 impressive turnout from the community. And I'm
13 very appreciative of that. No, I think it's
14 actually -- I think that the message is clear
15 that the trust fund and its potential this year
16 for expansion and for what that means for our
17 community as a whole, I think that there have
18 been several expressions of that by Mayor Bowser
19 over the past week.

20 I know at the Point in Time homeless
21 count, that that was a clear message that there's
22 a commitment to finding the funds to expand the

1 Housing Production Trust Fund and then to have it
2 prioritized towards the uses of our broader
3 community, including helping to address the
4 homeless issue here in our City.

5 I also want to say, I just want to share,
6 and I'll be able to share a little more when I'm
7 at our next meeting that I'm going to be actually
8 -- permission to travel, unbelievable, but I got
9 it for this week because I will be going to
10 Denver for the High Cost City Housing Forum,
11 sponsored by Enterprise -- thank you very much --
12 and contributing towards that.

13 But also, an opportunity because
14 Secretary Castro will be there as well, from HUD.
15 The Denver Housing Summit will be occurring.
16 I'll be watching, listening very carefully, and
17 talking with colleagues from other cities, and I
18 know that gaining some useful information to
19 share back. And I do plan to do that with both
20 the ICH Housing Solutions Committee, as well as
21 this board next month, because I think that's
22 going to help shape where we're going as a

1 community and all.

2 So, with that, I think I'm allowed to go
3 to Denver because it's colder than here.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MS. DONALDSON: And that's about it. But
6 in any event, I'm really appreciative. We have a
7 full agenda and a lot to do today. So, thank you
8 very much, Chairman Bowers.

9 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Absolutely. Thank you,
10 Director Donaldson. We know it's not a
11 boondoggle if you're sent to Denver.

12 MS. DONALDSON: In the middle of winter,
13 right. Exactly.

14 (Laughter.)

15 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Not a Miami trip.

16 MS. DONALDSON: No.

17 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: No. Thanks for the
18 welcoming remarks.

19 We will actually wait a little bit to go
20 to attendance, because we have a couple of
21 members who are missing, but before we move to
22 items that need action.

1 So we'll actually skip to item number 3
2 on the agenda. Let me say for the benefit of
3 those for whom this may be first-time attending
4 one of the meetings. The Production Trust Fund
5 Advisory Board has been charged by statute to
6 advise the administration and the director, the
7 mayor and the director, on issues related to the
8 Housing Production Trust Fund.

9 And when this version of the board was
10 impaneled, roughly 18 months ago, one of the
11 other things we were asked by the then-Mayor Gray
12 and his team was to look at some of the issues in
13 the Housing Task Force Report that was released a
14 couple of years ago and to see how this board
15 could be of assistance there.

16 And one of the things in particular that
17 was taken up was the issue around -- two issues,
18 really, around, one, how to leverage trust fund
19 dollars, and also how to look at issues related
20 to demand-side, issues related -- that put
21 pressures on.

22 So a lot of the work and the

1 conversations that the board has had over the
2 past 18 months have really been, as I see it,
3 really in kind of three buckets. One has been
4 just the basic functions and operations of the
5 trust fund.

6 Is it meeting its statutory obligations,
7 particularly as it relates to income targeting,
8 40 percent trust fund dollars supposing to
9 support units that serve people making less than
10 30 percent of AMI, 40 percent serving folks
11 making 31 to 50 percent of AMI? So we have a
12 focus on that, and again kind of general
13 operations of the fund.

14 Secondly, the issues around leveraging,
15 how to stretch the trust fund dollars. And then
16 thirdly, demand-side issues that have -- looking
17 at that led, in large part -- we appreciate the
18 work of board member Sue Marshall.

19 So with that, setting kind of a context
20 and a framework for what you'll hear a lot of as
21 we go into today, I want to go to item number 3,
22 the Leveraging Working Group Update. And so, if

1 it's okay, I'll turn it over now to Nathan Simms.

2 MS. DONALDSON: Absolutely.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yes, sir.

4 MR. SIMMS: Good morning, everyone. Just
5 as a recap to David's recap, last year the
6 department began to look at different ways we
7 could leverage our resources. And one central
8 piece that we thought was very important was to
9 focus on acquisition and predevelopment dollars
10 in the City.

11 Obviously, we're in a very competitive
12 market in terms of real estate. Cash is king.
13 So you have to be able to move swift for sites.
14 And we definitely wanted to do that. And the
15 current structure for which we gave out
16 acquisition and predevelopment dollars did not
17 necessarily lend itself to that.

18 So, we brought together a number of
19 different lenders, I think 10 total, from CDFI to
20 private banks. And we began to kind of craft an
21 acquisition loan program. So we couldn't come up
22 with a better name, and somehow ALP just came as

1 part of that.

2 So, what the department is proposing to
3 do is to do an RFQ to interested participating --
4 well, participating lenders, where we would
5 provide up to \$25 million for credit enhancement.
6 We're looking to leverage that three times, so
7 it's a complete, or total loan fund of about \$100
8 million-plus, that would focus on both
9 acquisition and predevelopment.

10 This is a little bit different from the
11 SAFI Program that we had because SAFI is
12 specifically for nonprofit developers. So this
13 would be open to for-profit and nonprofit
14 developers.

15 It would address a number of different
16 issues that we're unable to address at this time,
17 meaning that if you acquire a site or an existing
18 building with tenants, and the property is in
19 disrepair and you have a number of down units,
20 obviously down units means revenue that's lost.
21 So this allows you to kind of tap into resources
22 that will enable you to bring those units back

1 online relatively quickly.

2 We also, as part of the discussion, had
3 through this body a discussion with both lenders
4 and developers that was in the end of the summer.
5 It seems like a long time ago. And so, I think
6 that was very helpful as part of the process.
7 And so, at that point, we were able to move
8 forward and submit at least a concept of the
9 program to our general counsel, for legal
10 sufficiency. And so, we were able to receive
11 that probably in December.

12 We had a discussion just last week about
13 the next steps of the process. So, currently, we
14 are working on drafting the request for
15 qualifications. So, to our legal -- which will
16 be submitted to our legal by the end of February.

17 And then the next step, though we want to
18 do this in a concurrent fashion, is the loan
19 documents that are associated with the program.
20 So we want to get that in. We committed to early
21 March, but we're definitely striving for the end
22 of February to be able to do that. That gives

1 our legal essentially the month of March to do
2 its review.

3 We plan on doing a stakeholder engagement
4 probably early April. We have a schedule based
5 on, if everything goes well, to release the RFQ
6 in May, along with the selection of the
7 participating lenders between June and July, with
8 the hopes of starting the program in August or
9 September. So we definitely want to get it
10 completed before the end of the fiscal year.

11 That's where we currently stand.

12 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Great. Thank you,
13 Nathan; appreciate that.

14 Let me actually pause before we take
15 questions and actually do a roll call now of
16 board members, seeing that we have a quorum. So,
17 if board members could announce themselves, their
18 name, and then we'll move back into the
19 discussion of ALP.

20 So, David Bowers.

21 (Roll call was taken.)

22 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Great. So seeing we

1 have a quorum here has been established -- so,
2 thank you, Nathan, for that.

3 Oh, by the way, board members, if you
4 have questions or comments, please make sure to
5 use the microphone so that we can make sure it
6 gets caught in the system, captured by the
7 system.

8 So, any questions board members have?
9 Comments or questions on the Leveraging Working
10 Group update?

11 (No audible response.)

12 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yes, Bob.

13 (Laughter and pause.)

14 MR. POHLMAN: The stakeholder engagement
15 in early April, is that the discussion about the
16 -- kind of, what a good project is going to look
17 like? I mean, is it helping define the criteria
18 for projects that will be selected for under ALP?
19 Or what is that, exactly, the stakeholder
20 engagement?

21 MR. SIMMS: Oh, the stakeholder
22 engagement, essentially, is it's kind of two

1 parts. I mean, we have to -- I mean, so there's
2 one just to say, "Here's where we are." We have
3 continued to have conversations along the way
4 since the larger discussion about particular
5 issues. And so, as part of what we will put out
6 is general guidance as to key points to look at.

7 I think it's important to know -- I mean,
8 when you're having participating lenders be part
9 of that, they too have their own credit committee
10 rules. So you have to take that into account.
11 Though we are going to try to address -- similar
12 to SAFI, I think. SAFI has about 10 specific
13 points that it hits on. So it will be similar to
14 that.

15 So that will be a way for us to have a
16 discussion about where we stand, where we are,
17 and where we plan to go.

18 And then a secondary piece of that is,
19 obviously, for any lender interested in
20 participating, you know, as a pre-solicitation
21 type of workshop as well.

22 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Nathan, a follow-up

1 question on that.

2 MR. SIMMS: Sure.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: This may be related.
4 In one of those earlier meetings with the
5 lenders, there had been discussion about -- and
6 maybe this is what you refer to as kind of some
7 of those points -- some thought of a general
8 framework of the box.

9 MR. SIMMS: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Is that what we're
11 talking to here?

12 MR. SIMMS: Correct. Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Another question.
14 There had been some discussion about the
15 development of a permanent debt pool of capital.

16 MR. SIMMS: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: And so, we knew that
18 one was going to be coming kind of after the one
19 on the predevelopment and acquisition. But with
20 this mindset of kind of a managed pipeline, had
21 been part of the distinction?

22 MR. SIMMS: Correct. Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Any updates in terms --
2 for the board and for the public about where we
3 stand in terms of the development of the perm
4 debt pool capital or the program or initiative?

5 MR. SIMMS: Sure. So, one of the things,
6 and this is what I was working on yesterday, so
7 it's in my in-box to send to my boss --

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. SIMMS: -- is permission to start
10 down that road. So we're not going to commit --
11 we're not going to use this forum to commit her
12 to a decision right away. But I definitely think
13 we want to --

14 (Cross-talk.)

15 MR. SIMMS: You're my boss. That's what
16 I'm supposed to do.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. SIMMS: So, the general thought, I
19 think, would be to begin to bring people
20 together, starting somewhere between March and
21 April. There are a number of different thoughts
22 around the particular space that we want to plan

1 in on the permanent side. And so there are a lot
2 of different factors that we have to take into
3 account.

4 So, I think we want to -- we learned the
5 lessons of going down the ALP road. We're
6 probably going to stick within that space, and
7 going to probably start with the lenders first
8 ~~and then bring~~ the developers in. The only
9 reason because -- and everybody knows this -- we
10 can have a more open conversation in certain
11 spaces and collect ideas, and then massage them
12 and bring them together. Bring everyone together
13 so that we can talk through it.

14 So I think it is a piece that we
15 definitely want to see where we can get bang for
16 our buck. I imagine part of that discussion is
17 going to be with the Housing Authority as well,
18 because subsidies are a huge part of the deals
19 that we do now.

20 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Questions or comments
21 on this from members of the board?

22 (No audible response.)

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: One other update I
2 would give is, there is a group, a roundtable of
3 folks from across the region who are looking at
4 issues around how to have more impact in the
5 region in terms of effecting the supply of
6 housing that serves low- and moderate-income
7 folks in dealing with housing affordability
8 issues.

9 And that roundtable is comprised of
10 representatives of the philanthropic community,
11 the business community, advocate community, and a
12 couple of -- and the intermediary, and the
13 financial institution community.

14 So, we've had some conversations
15 preliminarily with director about having her
16 engage. And to her credit, has reached out to
17 the group to say we want to engage in some
18 dialog, at least, with that group.

19 One of the things that group is looking
20 for is, one, ways to lean in in terms of policy
21 issues in the region. Some specific areas where
22 the force and the power of networks within those

1 different communities could be brought to bear in
2 a more powerful and impactful way across the
3 region, so working with groups like CNHED, CABAHA
4 over in Virginia. There's a group now that
5 started in Montgomery County to look for specific
6 kinds of legislative or executive branch policy
7 issues to lean in on.

8 But the other thing is with the trust
9 fund and with the investment that's been with
10 whatever money is in the trust fund is
11 significant. And certainly, if we get to that
12 \$100 million baseline amount, that's a lot of
13 money to serve as a magnet to have real
14 conversations about how to potentially engage
15 with both -- to leverage that money beyond what
16 is even envisioned without, to look for
17 potentially new creative ways to leverage those
18 dollars.

19 So we're very early on, obviously, in
20 terms of that. But I appreciate and wanted to
21 just publicly thank the director for her
22 willingness to have that conversation with that

1 group. We will say, obviously, in the region,
2 the District tends to -- people say the District
3 has more of the supply of housing that serves
4 extremely low-, very low-, and low-income
5 residents and also puts in more money for that.
6 So we'll see where those conversations go.

7 There's nothing else on the Leverage
8 Working Group update.

9 Okay. Why don't we go back then to item
10 number 2, Consideration and Approval of the
11 January 5th, 2015, Meeting Highlights. Let me
12 also say, if I can ask Bea Fields, for the record
13 and also because we have a number of folks here
14 from the public. By law, we are required to,
15 under District law of boards, to keep records of
16 the proceedings.

17 And, Bea, could you just let folks know
18 that if they ever wanted to access the notes from
19 these meetings, electronically or otherwise, kind
20 of where those are available? And, Nathan, would
21 you mind passing that mic over?

22 MS. FIELDS: There are basically three

1 ways that you can have access to the proceedings
2 at each of our meetings. We electronically
3 record them. We also have engaged transcription.
4 So you can read them. You can hear them.

5 And thirdly, once the board approves the
6 highlights, they are posted on the website. So
7 if you go to the DHCD website, under information
8 or contact information, you'll see a section for
9 the Housing Production Trust Fund.

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Great. Thank you, Ms.
11 Fields. Appreciate that.

12 Board members, we're going to take a
13 minute. And to the public in the audience, this
14 is what we call the slow time of the meeting,
15 where we pause for a minute to review the
16 highlights and see if there are any changes that
17 need to be made. So if you all will indulge us
18 for a second.

19 Board members, if you could take a look,
20 see if there are any changes you'd like to make.
21 And once you've had sufficient time to review,
22 you could certainly, we'll entertain a motion to

1 approve.

2 (Pause, the board members reviewed the
3 documents.)

4 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: I want to flag -- Bea,
5 for one thing, and for board members, on page 2,
6 number 3, it says 20 for the answer. Starts off
7 \$25,000, and then it has \$25 million, parens. So
8 that needs to be --

9 MS. DONALDSON: The latter.

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yeah, the latter.
11 Change "thousand" to "million."

12 MS. DONALDSON: The building limits that
13 \$25K.

14 (Cross-talk.)

15 MS. DONALDSON: Yeah, right. Yeah.

16 (Pause, the board members reviewed the
17 documents.)

18 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Any changes or
19 additions, deletions that board members want to
20 recommend be made to the meeting highlights?

21 (No audible response.)

22 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: We'll entertain a

1 motion to approve the meeting highlights. Is
2 there such a motion?

3 MS. MARSHALL: So moved.

4 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Moved by Sue Marshall
6 and second by Jim Knight.

7 Any discussion? It's been moved and
8 properly seconded. Any discussion on this, any
9 issues related to this?

10 All in favor of approving the January
11 2nd, 2015, HPTF Advisory Board Meeting Highlights
12 signify by saying Aye.

13 (Chorus of "Aye.")

14 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Any opposed, nay?

15 (No audible response.)

16 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay. Seeing none, the
17 meeting highlights are approved. Thank you very
18 much -- with that one correction. Thank you,
19 staff, who worked on this to get it done.

20 All right. Let us move then to item
21 number 4 on our agenda, the Update of the
22 Development Finance Project Pipeline. Nathan, we

1 turn to you or Chris on this?

2 MALE SPEAKER: That would be okay.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: All right. Chris, if
4 you don't mind --

5 FEMALE SPEAKER: This is something that's
6 going to be on the line, and so we want to --

7 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yes. So we'll be
8 onscreen. And, Chris, if you can introduce
9 yourself for the minutes, and we'll turn it over
10 to you, sir.

11 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: Thank you. Good
12 morning. My name is Chris Dickersin-Prokopp,
13 with DHCD. For the board members, we're going to
14 be looking at a series of four reports that are
15 in your packet, after the meeting minutes. We'll
16 go in a slightly different order than you have
17 them, so skip that first page.

18 And for everyone in the audience who
19 doesn't have a report, don't worry. We'll go
20 over everything up here on the screen.

21 So if you do have a packet, you should
22 have a pipeline report that says, DHCD DFD

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 Pipeline projects, obligations, commitments,
2 allocations. And this is all -- for the public
3 and for everyone here, this is all available on
4 the DHCD website. If you go to dhcd.dc.gov, our
5 agency homepage, scroll halfway down, and here on
6 the right side you can either click on this graph
7 or go to this link and it will take you to our
8 QuickBase database, where all of these reports
9 are stored and publicly available.

10 So, there are 32 projects in the pipeline
11 right now to be funded by the Housing Production
12 Trust Fund. There's another chunk of projects in
13 our pipeline that are funded by CDBG or Home or 9
14 percent tax credits or any other funding source.
15 But these are the ones that are funded by the
16 Housing Production Trust Fund or that are
17 scheduled to be funded by the trust fund.

18 So, we're showing 40 here, 8 of them
19 closed so far this fiscal year since October 1st.
20 Just to give you a sense of how the report is
21 laid out, project name, the scope. We've got new
22 construction, rehab, a couple of predevelopment

1 or acquisition loans. The units by AMI target
2 income band, so zero to 30, 31 to 50, and 51 to
3 80 percent of AMI. Then some of these have
4 either market-rate units or staff units, or units
5 targeting incomes about 80 percent AMI.

6 And then a total column for the total
7 affordable HPTF eligible units. And the total
8 HPTF funding amount, and split along the lines of
9 how that's allocated to each income band.

10 On the top, you've got the closed
11 projects. Then 20 committed projects -- this
12 means that they've been underwritten by DHCD.
13 They've gone through loan committee, and they're
14 completing their final due diligence conditions
15 precedent to closing.

16 Then there's another category of projects
17 that have been underwritten by DHCD. And we've
18 set aside money tentatively, but they haven't
19 gone through loan committee yet. So they're one
20 step further behind in the process. And there
21 are seven of those that we think will still close
22 in fiscal year 2015.

1 And then there are five of those that are
2 in the same status, but we believe will close in
3 fiscal year 2016.

4 At the bottom, there's a summary table
5 that shows -- in the closed category, there were
6 eight projects, \$36 million in trust fund dollars
7 closed so far this year. And that committed
8 category are the ones that went through loan
9 committee. We have 20 projects accounting for
10 1,401 affordable units, \$80 million. And then in
11 that third allocated but not through loan
12 committee, we have about \$110 million split
13 between 2015 and 2016.

14 And these numbers will feed into a report
15 that Oke makes later that gives us a sense of how
16 much money there will be available on the next
17 NOFA.

18 So, in total, 40 projects, 3,396 units.
19 And then, 1,000 of them in the zero to 30 percent
20 category; about 500 in the 31 to 50 percent AMI
21 category; and 1,820, the 51 to 80 percent AMI
22 group.

1 (Pause.)

2 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: The requirement
3 that 40 percent of HPTF funds go to support 30
4 percent AMI units -- remember, that doesn't mean
5 that 40 percent of the units need to be in that
6 category; it's that 40 percent of the money we
7 spend needs to go in that category.

8 So, we'll start looking at FY13 and come
9 up to the present to look at how those
10 allocations have gone over the years. So, in
11 FY13, 52 percent of our HPTF obligations were in
12 the 30 percent AMI category. That exceeds the 40
13 percent minimum requirement.

14 Thirty-five percent went into the 50
15 percent AMI units. This also exceeds the 40
16 percent requirement, because it's cumulative,
17 right? So this plus this must exceed 80 percent.
18 So the overflow here goes into this category.

19 And no more than 20 percent of our funds
20 should go towards units in the 80 percent AMI
21 category.

22 In FY14 and FY15, to date, you'll see

1 there's, moving forward, we're going to have to
2 prioritize lower-income projects because the
3 split, what is 10 percent towards 30 percent AMI
4 units, 20 percent of our money towards 50 percent
5 AMI units, and 66 percent into the 80 percent AMI
6 category.

7 And that's a somewhat similar split for
8 the first quarter-and-a-half of the new fiscal
9 year -- 16 percent, 2 percent, and 81 percent.
10 So we have to get back on track with those.
11 Right now, our pipeline, we're at -- this is
12 those 32 projects that are either in the
13 committed or allocated stage -- 42 percent of the
14 funds are supporting 30 percent AMI units; 20
15 percent are at 50 percent AMI; and 36 percent are
16 at 80 percent AMI.

17 This has come up at the meetings before.
18 We need to think about a way for, on these
19 projects and future projects, just shift some of
20 these units down to a lower AMI category. A lot
21 of these are 60 percent AMI units, and that's
22 being driven by projects getting D.C. Housing

1 Finance Agency, 4 percent tax credits and bonds.

2 The default unit type is 60 percent AMI.

3 So to get on track with our performance,
4 we need to shift some of those 60 percent units
5 down into this category. And I think there will
6 be opportunity to discuss ways to do that when we
7 get into the NOFA priorities this year.

8 (Pause.)

9 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: The question came
10 up last meeting, where's our funding
11 concentrated? Where are we targeting
12 geographically? So we'll go through some maps
13 that will give you a sense of that.

14 (Pause.)

15 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: Board members or
16 anyone with a folder should have this report.
17 So, this is just to remind you what we're looking
18 at. Those 32 projects in underwriting are in the
19 top table. And 30 projects that have closed
20 since the beginning of FY13 are in this lower
21 category. And then there's a summary line at the
22 bottom.

1 So, you've got the projects and funding
2 and unit numbers split up by ward and highlighted
3 in a way that, the darker the highlight, the
4 higher the concentration. So, you see that in
5 underwriting, 1,095 of the 2,609 units in
6 underwriting are in Ward 8. That 476 of the 30
7 percent AMI units out of the 952 is up. So you
8 can look at it on your own a bit.

9 But what it shows is that both in the
10 unit counts and our expenditures or obligations,
11 there's a concentration of activity in Ward 8.

12 For the projects that we've closed in the
13 last two-and-a-half years, there's not such a
14 pronounced concentration, or at least not in the
15 same direction; \$28 million of the \$90 million
16 that we've spent has been in Ward 4. That's the
17 biggest concentration of any ward, but it's
18 fairly spread out, aside from there being nothing
19 in Wards 2 and 3. But Ward 4, \$10 million in
20 Ward 5; \$16 and \$17 million, respectively, in
21 Wards 7 and 8; and a considerable amount in Ward
22 1, also.

1 (Pause.)

2 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: If we go by year,
3 our FY13 closings, we've got a dot on the map for
4 every project we closed, and it's sized by the
5 number of units in that project. So we've got
6 Wards 1, 6, and 8, one in Ward 5.

7 And FY14, again, spread out everywhere
8 except Wards 2 and 3. A lot in Wards 4 and 8.
9 Date, in FY13, one or two in each of Wards 4
10 through 8. For the last two-and-a-half years,
11 all closings mapped. Similar to what we saw on
12 the last table, it's fairly spread out.

13 This is by units, though. So if we
14 review the map by dollar amounts, changes
15 slightly. You saw a big concentration of units
16 in Ward 8, but not as big a concentration of
17 funding. This is a per-unit cost in those
18 neighborhoods.

19 Here's our pipeline, 32 projects that
20 will be closing over the next year-and-a-half.
21 Also, spread out quite a bit in Wards 4, 7, and
22 8, also Wards 1 -- and we now have some projects

1 in Ward 2. If we look at just the new
2 construction projects, we've highlighted those
3 here. More of that is occurring in Ward 7 and 8
4 than in the other wards, but you'll also see it
5 in Ward 2, and 1 and 4 and 6.

6 So, bear with us on this one. It's a
7 little bit confusing, but now we've split each of
8 those project points into a pie chart that shows
9 the number of units in each AMI category. So,
10 the darker the purple, the deeper the subsidy and
11 the lower-income being targeted. So a project
12 like this one is all 30 percent AMI units.

13 The others with more of a split, and here
14 you have close to 75 percent at 80 percent AMI
15 and about a quarter at 30 percent AMI. And you
16 see the 30 percent AMI units are fairly well
17 spread out across seven wards.

18 And converting that unit count to a
19 dollar amount, here's our pipeline in terms of
20 dollars.

21 (Pause.)

22 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: This is the same

1 chart we looked at at the beginning.

2 (Pause.)

3 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: So, we can field
4 any questions about any of this.

5 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: It's great. Thank you,
6 Chris. Very helpful. Appreciate the timely
7 follow-up from our last meeting.

8 Board members, any questions or comments
9 folks have on the issues? Concerns or questions
10 for clarity?

11 MR. POHLMAN: Well, I find that the
12 allocation for '13 and '14 to be troubling. The
13 trust fund does have legislation that requires a
14 certain allocation. And I really think we need
15 to get into a serious policy discussion about
16 this. In particular, a policy discussion about
17 use of trust fund dollars with tax credits.

18 We have a Housing Finance Agency that is
19 focused heavily on 60 percent of AMI through tax
20 credits, and that's just the way it is. So when
21 we use trust fund dollars, it seems to me we
22 should be making sure that we drive down into the

1 lower income categories, especially when we use 9
2 percent tax credits.

3 I note a couple of projects here. For
4 example, the Grove at Parkside, 186 units. We
5 got 10 units for PSH from that, based on the
6 trust fund -- I mean the NOFA requirement, 176
7 units in the 51 to 80 percent category, which is
8 probably 60 percent, as I recall a description of
9 that project. And we put \$10.7 million of trust
10 fund dollars into this.

11 You know, I think we need to take another
12 look at that, especially when we're not achieving
13 the goals that are specified in the legislation.
14 I also look down at Channel Square. I'm familiar
15 with that project. It's a preservation project,
16 which is a good thing. And since that's an
17 occupied building, you know, you have to preserve
18 it for whoever is there.

19 And all the units are in the 51 to 80
20 percent category, which is understandable. But
21 my thought is, in terms of policy, if we're going
22 to project \$7.4 million of assistance out of the

1 trust fund to a project like that, even for
2 preservation, that we ought to have some covenant
3 about vacant units.

4 We ought to have some covenant about
5 units that are backfilled so that we get more of
6 the kind of units that this City obviously needs,
7 and we're seeing evidence through the homeless
8 population, the homeless family population.

9 So, I'm just, you know, looking at those
10 kind of things and saying, you know, that I think
11 the purpose of this board is to have policy
12 discussions as opposed to looking at the
13 mechanics of the trust fund.

14 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Thank you, Bob.

15 At our last meeting, it was also brought
16 up, and it's been brought up at a couple of
17 meetings and at the last meeting, the notion of
18 how to have trust fund dollars. You see in the
19 meeting highlights. What is the system by which
20 we get to an intentionality about meeting the
21 income targets, and how to do that?

22 I know part of the conversation today

1 when we get into the NOFA conversation, we will
2 be looking at that. Bob's point is well taken in
3 one about, how do we continue to engage with the
4 Agency around making sure that the NOFA is
5 structured in such a way that we can meet our
6 income targets?

7 Jim Knight.

8 MR. KNIGHT: Thank you, Chairman. I
9 think it highlights another conversation we've
10 had in sort of an ongoing way that, so long as
11 the RFP process is essentially taking the
12 projects that the market produces and not
13 influencing what the market produces, that we are
14 not going to be in control of what gets produced.

15 And so looking forward to the
16 conversation about how this particular RFP might
17 be structured more in alignment with the City's
18 goals.

19 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Questions, comments,
20 observations from members of the board on this?

21 MS. MARSHALL: It would be helpful to
22 have the RFP conversation in conjunction with

1 this conversation. I don't know about anybody
2 else, but it would help me.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yeah. And we are going
4 to absolutely have that conversation. We can
5 certainly open up to the new business piece about
6 the NOFA conversation and do that.

7 If there's no objection from members of
8 the board, we can go ahead and kind of dive into
9 that conversation about NOFA priorities and
10 funds. So let's do that while we've got this
11 data here.

12 Sue, anything you want to add?

13 MS. MARSHALL: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay. So, we're going
15 to kind of combine here to that point, this
16 conversation about where the numbers are, but
17 also the NOFA priorities and the funds
18 availability.

19 Let me ask. Does anybody have any other
20 questions, specifically in terms of from a
21 clarity standpoint, about numbers that Chris was
22 able to present to us?

1 (No audible response.)

2 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: One question I had was,
3 in the underwriting pipeline, and to the point
4 that was just raised, if we look at the one-pager
5 on the Housing Production Trust Fund Income
6 Target Performance Report --

7 MALE SPEAKER: What was that?

8 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Housing Production
9 Trust Fund Income Target Performance Report one-
10 pager, Chris, your numbers show that the
11 percentage of units -- I'm sorry. The percentage
12 of dollars going to support units at 30 percent
13 of AMI has gone up significantly.

14 So now, 42.3 percent -- it says 41.7 on
15 here, but 42.3 there on the screen, which is
16 where we're supposed to be. The 50 percent also
17 looks like it's down from FY13. Those numbers
18 have gone up relative to FY15 closings to date
19 and FY14 closings. The numbers are down relative
20 to FY13.

21 So I was wondering, Director Donaldson or
22 Nathan or anyone from the Agency, if you have any

1 thoughts on what has -- what if anything has
2 impacted the uptick from FY14 to what's in the
3 underwriting pipeline now? Do we have a sense
4 of, was there anything intentional that was done
5 to get to that uptick? Or is that just a
6 reflection of what's supposed to come in in terms
7 of the market?

8 MS. DONALDSON: I think it's just a -- my
9 understanding is that it's a reflection of the
10 timing of what projects were ready when. I don't
11 think it's based on any -- quite frankly, what
12 I've been able to detect that it's not -- and
13 what I've had shared with me from staff that
14 there was not the intentionality.

15 That indeed is needed. And that when we
16 talk about what's in the pipeline, it's what came
17 in, what passed threshold, and what was
18 indication for commitment. It was not, in my
19 understanding, and you can correct me if I'm
20 wrong, anything -- because I wasn't here,
21 obviously.

22 But that's been my -- from what I've seen

1 from the compilation of the data, it's not
2 because there was a change in strategy to approve
3 projects later. These all came in at the same
4 time.

5 So, the intentionality discussion in
6 relation to the RFP is a very important
7 conversation to continue. I can assure you that
8 there are internal discussions already going on
9 based on this data that is clearly indicating
10 that we're behind in meeting the targets and the
11 goals.

12 And I think also it's going to be very
13 clear that, as we gather the resources from other
14 agencies, as well, some of whom are present in
15 the room, both the Housing Authority and the
16 services and other components that go into the
17 deal structure, it's clear that there's going to
18 have to be even more intentional targeting going
19 forward with the RFP that will be released this
20 year.

21 I also want to note that anything that's
22 allocated or says that it's in a slightly

1 different, more faded print, I think, on the part
2 of Chris and his target, in terms of allocations
3 for 2016, those are projects approved in the FY14
4 round that went beyond the amount that had been
5 budgeted for FY14 and '15 and will be addressed.

6 Now, I've been assured that not all of
7 them will necessarily close or close at that
8 amount in all. I happen to think, actually, that
9 the development community, both the for-profit
10 and the nonprofit, have gotten much more
11 sophisticated and have really presented some
12 outstanding and excellent projects.

13 So I'm not quite clear what the slippage
14 rate is going to be, and I think that's something
15 we also have to enter into the calculation. I
16 say "slippage." But, you know, are all these
17 projects going to come to fruition? Yes. Some
18 may slip. But I think that's something we, I
19 think we have to look at the capacity within the
20 development community, again both not-for-profit
21 and for-profit.

22 These are high-quality projects. And so

1 the question of how that's going to work going
2 forward makes this intentionality discussion even
3 more important, quite frankly.

4 Chris? I'm sorry.

5 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: No, no. Chris?

6 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: One variable that
7 is driving this uptick, though, is the
8 requirement that all new construction projects
9 have at least 5 percent of their units set aside
10 as permanent supportive housing. That means
11 every new construction project in our pipeline
12 has at least 5 percent of its units at 30 percent
13 AMI.

14 And a lot of projects are exceeding that.
15 Some are 100 percent VSH units. Some are
16 somewhere in between. But I think it's a matter
17 of timing. That's been in the NOFA now. It's
18 been a requirement of the RFP for two years now.
19 This will be the third year. So every project
20 here has that requirement. And I think it's a
21 permanent uptick as long as we keep that
22 requirement.

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Has there been any --
2 two questions related to that that I have, Chris,
3 and I appreciate your bringing that up. One, has
4 there been a totaling, do we have a total number
5 somewhere of how many of those units we have?

6 And secondly, have we, has the Agency --
7 can you share a little bit, anyone from the
8 Agency, about what kind of feedback you've gotten
9 from the developer community in terms of a lot of
10 bellyaching? A lot of, "Okay, we get it, it's
11 required"? And, "Oh, by the way, we'd like to do
12 more"? Or not much feedback at all?

13 Has there been any sense of how that
14 policy change is driving, if at all, the market
15 one way or the other in terms of what people are
16 doing?

17 MR. SIMMS: I would say in terms of last
18 year, I think it didn't really -- it may have
19 caught some people by surprise, but I think
20 people were able to adjust. We had a lot of --
21 we did have the benefit of having a lot of
22 conversations with folks leading up to the

1 submission. So I think that was helpful.

2 And to the director's point, I mean there
3 were folks who had, you know, visions and dreams
4 of just the 60 percent standard, tax credit deal.
5 And so, hearing from us that that's not the way
6 we wanted to proceed allowed them to make the
7 adjustments really in real time before they made
8 a submission.

9 For us, I think, going forward, the
10 amount of coordination that we have with our
11 sister agencies around permanent supportive
12 housing, and the resources that go towards that,
13 and to the director's point about targeting,
14 really having a production plan that says, you
15 know, "Here's what we need in terms of units at
16 the income targets, and this is the types of
17 responses we're looking for" --

18 I think people have adjusted. I mean,
19 we've tried to be very clear about it. And so,
20 you know, that's always helpful to both the
21 development community and the lending community
22 in terms of where we're going. So I think we

1 continue to build on a process that started, you
2 know, two-three years ago. And so I think we've
3 had tremendous strides this round, and certainly
4 the next round.

5 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: And on numbers,
6 32 projects total in the pipeline; 24 have at
7 least one permanent supportive housing unit in
8 them. So, this is the number we want. There are
9 665 PSH units in underwriting. One of the
10 earlier slides, there are 2,600 units total in
11 the pipeline. That's not the same number as
12 this. And we don't have the 2,600 here because
13 this is only showing the PSH project.

14 But there's almost exactly 25 percent of
15 the units in the pipeline of permanent supportive
16 housing, and five closings with permanent
17 supportive housing units.

18 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So, let's be clear on
19 that. So, roughly a quarter of the units that
20 are in underwriting are permanent supportive
21 housing units?

22 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Other questions? Yeah,
2 Jim Knight.

3 MR. KNIGHT: I wanted just to follow up
4 on that. The importance of having 30 percent AMI
5 and below affordability for households who might
6 not need permanent supportive housing. So I'm
7 wondering if you know from the top of your head
8 or from the graph information whether there are
9 30 percent and below units that aren't PSH that
10 are meeting that need as well?

11 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: Yeah. In
12 addition --

13 MS. DONALDSON: There are some. We are
14 needing to get confirmation on some of those
15 because they're not necessarily in our system
16 right now as -- I mean, we're counting the PSH.
17 There are other units on projects that have other
18 forms of subsidy that are for 100-30 percent.

19 I think you're raising the key point.
20 It's not just PSH that's needed; it's also the
21 under-30-percent AMI, with subsidy support and
22 being clear about that. I would expect we're

1 going to have, actually, a count because it's
2 needed for the Strategic Plan to End
3 Homelessness. So it's being compiled right now.

4 There's a further sweep of these unit
5 numbers here to really delineate which ones are
6 for families, which ones for individuals, and are
7 there other under-30-AMI that are not being
8 counted in this way?

9 MR. KNIGHT: So, at the moment, are they
10 lumped in the 665 and haven't been --

11 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: No.

12 MR. KNIGHT: Or are they somewhere else?

13 MS. DONALDSON: They're in the other.

14 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: Yeah. There's
15 952 30-percent-AMI units, total. So that's an
16 additional 300 that --

17 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: But we have a sense
18 that roughly -- so we've got 665 that we know are
19 PSH, and 900 total, roughly, that are under-30.
20 So we've got about 300 that are non-PSH units
21 that are serving below 30.

22 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: Right. And in

1 this PSH number, there will be maybe some
2 reclassifications. Some of these may be, we're
3 calling them PSH now, but it may turn out that
4 they're transitional housing or some other unit
5 type on the continuum. And that's where the
6 sorting will happen.

7 MS. DONALDSON: And there are a couple of
8 projects in the FY16 on your original chart that
9 look like all the units are at 80 percent, or 60
10 to 80. And they just haven't gone through --
11 they're in such an early part of the process that
12 they haven't gone through the need to readjust
13 and to have more units distributed in that way.

14 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So there is then
15 opportunity for the Agency to impact where the
16 income targeting is on the projects that are --
17 let me ask a question related to that, then. So,
18 in these categories -- now I'm looking at the
19 DHCD-DFD pipeline handout, project handout.

20 In terms of the -- so the categories we
21 have here, closed 2015, committed 2015, category
22 3 allocated 2015. It's another category 3, but I

1 guess that would be for allocated 2016. Of those
2 categories, in which of those categories does the
3 Agency still have the ability to influence the
4 income targeting?

5 MS. DONALDSON: Oh, three and four?

6 MR. SIMMS: Yes, three and four.

7 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So the allocated 2015
8 and the allocated 2016. So, if I'm looking at
9 that right, so that's three --

10 MS. DONALDSON: Those are initial
11 commitments that have not gone to underwriting;
12 am I correct? Or if they are, they're in the
13 early stages.

14 MR. SIMMS: They have not. Yes. Right.
15 No, you're correct.

16 MS. DONALDSON: Correct. So they have
17 not gone through the complete underwriting. And
18 some are commitments that are not -- haven't even
19 gone through the NOFA process, I mean, which --
20 the application process.

21 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So if I'm looking at
22 that, we're looking at 349 total affordable units

1 in the allocated 2015. And we're looking at, if
2 I'm looking at this right, 281 units that are in
3 the allocated 2016?

4 MS. DONALDSON: Um-hm.

5 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So that's roughly 600
6 units, give or take where the Agency still has
7 the ability to influence the income target.

8 MS. DONALDSON: Actually 859, isn't it?

9 MR. DICKERSIN-PROKOPP: Yeah, 859 plus
10 349. It's one column to the right of where
11 you're looking.

12 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Thank you. So the 859
13 number. Okay. So we've got about 1,200-plus
14 units where we can influence income targeting.

15 MS. DONALDSON: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay. Why don't we
17 pause here? I'm going to ask Oke, I believe --
18 is Oke going to make the NOFA presentation or the
19 -- was there anything, Oke, that you were going
20 to present on that we need to hear on?

21 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: No. The only thing I
22 have there is the updates on the --

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Update on that? Yeah.
2 Let's do the update on the numbers, and then
3 we'll make sure we're all good on the numbers,
4 and then go into that broader conversation.

5 MS. DONALDSON: And I can present --

6 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: I believe there's a
7 handout. Oke, is that right? You'll be
8 referring to this Housing Production Trust Fund
9 Preliminary Funding?

10 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay.

12 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: The only changes, just
13 as -- yeah. If you look at the numbers, like the
14 director already mentioned, with the difference
15 between this and the last one, we stopped at
16 2015. So, if you look at the second page, where
17 we have projects under review, projected to
18 close, as projected to close in 2015, it's just
19 the projects we estimate that will close by
20 September 30th.

21 So, the ones that die in 2016, we see \$31
22 million is not included there. If you look at

1 the allocated for 2016, it's 31 million not
2 included there.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So, Oke, let me make
4 sure I'm looking at this right. So are we
5 looking at -- we're looking at the handout that
6 board members have.

7 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: At page 2, second page.

8 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay.

9 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: If you go, projected,
10 obligated, committed, (indiscernible) forms.

11 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Um-hm.

12 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: Why 2015 we have the
13 obligated is 36 million, committed is 80.2, and
14 there you have to the furthest on that review,
15 which is allocated, but where for 2016 that won't
16 go past September 30th.

17 So, about -- it didn't include some of
18 the ones that went beyond 2015, which is about 31
19 million, and doesn't include the set-aside for
20 ALP, which would be about 25 million.

21 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Bob?

22 MR. POHLMAN: Yes. It seems to me that

1 the allocated 2016 projects from the pipeline
2 show 79 million for 2016. And that is not
3 included in the chart here. Is that not correct?

4 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: No. There was 31
5 million.

6 MR. POHLMAN: But if you look at
7 allocated 2016, five projects, we have the Beacon
8 Center Plaza West, South Capitol, Cedar Flats,
9 and Archer Park. And if you look at the amounts
10 that are required from the trust fund, that adds
11 up to \$79 million.

12 Are those included in anything that's on
13 this paper?

14 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: No. No.

15 MR. POHLMAN: So, if you take the 79
16 million that is shown as a balance down at the
17 bottom of this paper, the \$79 million of projects
18 that are allocated for 2016 will use that
19 funding. In addition, you need another 25
20 million for ALP. Is that correct?

21 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: The one thing that's
22 not -- Bob, to your point. The one thing that's

1 not included also on this is the FY16 revenue.

2 MR. POHLMAN: Right, right, right.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Right. So if we would
4 put FY16 expenses in this number, we'd also want
5 to include FY16 revenue.

6 MR. POHLMAN: Right. Good point. Right.
7 Good point, good point.

8 MS. DONALDSON: But the 79 does not
9 include the ALP, just to be clear?

10 MR. POHLMAN: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yes. Right.

12 MS. DONALDSON: And that would come out
13 of FY15, at least according to plan at this time?

14 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yes.

15 MS. DONALDSON: So that is a point that
16 needs to be shared.

17 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So then, that FY15 --
18 on page 2, the FY2015 estimated balance of
19 projects under review or obligated, if we back
20 out the ALP number, would then be roughly 54.8
21 million. Is that right?

22 MS. DONALDSON: And that's just trust

1 fund?

2 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Right.

4 MS. DONALDSON: The question of other
5 resources going into the NOFA, CDBG, and home is
6 not on here either. This is just regarding the
7 trust fund? So just to be clear that that does
8 not mean this is the total amount for the actual
9 NOFA round.

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So, if we, just -- a
11 question for clarity's sake, you know, make sure
12 we kind of -- everyone gets kind of a big-picture
13 bottom line, if that makes sense, that when we
14 look at the chart of projects that are expected
15 to close or -- let me not say "expected to
16 close."

17 Projects that have been committed and-or
18 allocated, right, for FY2015, and if we look at
19 the revenue that the trust fund has, there's
20 enough money to cover what is expected, what's in
21 the pipeline.

22 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay? With, if I'm
2 reading this right, even if we back out ALP,
3 which is now represented on here, there would be
4 kind of a \$54 million cushion, so to speak.

5 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: And then we've got
7 projects that are already in the queue for '16
8 that represent the 79 million that Bob talked
9 about, right --

10 MS. DONALDSON: That have not gone
11 through underwriting.

12 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: That have not gone
13 through underwriting.

14 MS. DONALDSON: There is a very
15 preliminary stage.

16 (Cross-talk.)

17 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: It's just on the board,
18 on the radar, but more work to be done. So just
19 if, in a best case-worst case scenario, 79 all
20 went through, you said, "We've only got 54
21 million available to go towards those projects,"
22 but there's an FY2016 allocation of funds from

1 deed and recordation tax. And then if the mayor
2 and the council agree to that \$100 million
3 baseline, we've got that money going in.

4 So, from a big-picture -- but that FY --
5 so then the other question is, and we'll talk
6 about this, this NOFA that's expected to come out
7 this fall, this spring, there would be new
8 projects coming into that that would put demand
9 also on that money.

10 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: Got it.

11 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So the big picture --
12 there's enough money to cover what's kind of in
13 the queue now. Okay. All right.

14 Other questions, comments? Nathan?

15 MR. SIMMS: I think it's important to
16 note, too, I mean, as part of this exercise and
17 what we had did before, there are projects that
18 were on here previously. I mean, I think we did
19 this initial presentation back in October,
20 November, that have now been moved to other
21 funding sources as well.

22 So it has this -- you know, going through

1 and definitely scrubbing the pipeline has allowed
2 us to kind of free up additional resources, where
3 I think, before it was much more of kind of an
4 overextension. Now we definitely have a much
5 more larger cushion at the end to absorb the
6 projects that we have.

7 MS. DONALDSON: And we also still have
8 some other reallocation to come, based on what
9 we're doing in terms of auditing of CDBG and home
10 for this year's funding. So, I mean, there's
11 still more of this cleanup, quite frankly, going
12 on. Or readjusting I guess is perhaps the better
13 way to put it, for the record.

14 But it is readjusting, and it is looking
15 at allocating from the total pots that we have,
16 not just the trust fund, which is, I think, what
17 some of the information given out at the end of
18 last year was basically, let's just allocate
19 everything to trust fund and we'll figure it out
20 later. Which -- this is the figuring-out-later
21 time, right now.

22 MR. SIMMS: Sure.

1 MS. DONALDSON: I assure you by March we
2 will have a clear picture in preparation for the
3 RFP. And as we get to our conversation on how
4 the department is going to work with the
5 administration on what the priorities would be
6 and then part, obviously, with input from this
7 board will be able to present that, I think, as a
8 more complete package in March.

9 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: Can I just make one
10 statement?

11 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yes. Oke.

12 MR. ANYAEGBUNAM: And this is like going
13 back. This is to the presubmission projects that
14 Mr. Pohlman mentioned about going back and
15 reviewing the covenant for tenants coming in.

16 One of the problem with that is, at the
17 time of underwriting, we don't make allowance for
18 that. It becomes a big problem because after
19 that, we have to increase the subsidy at that
20 point, which is a problem. That's the thing with
21 presubmission of projects. You don't have much
22 room to maneuver.

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Thank you, Oke, very
2 much.

3 MS. DONALDSON: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: We appreciate it.

5 Why don't we flow into the conversation
6 about no proprietors? So we have a sense of
7 where the money has gone in terms of income
8 targeting. We have a sense of where it is going
9 right now. We have a sense of how much money is
10 available.

11 Director or Nathan, anything that you all
12 want to say in terms of the NOFA proprieties,
13 where the thinking is right now, to kick us off
14 in this part of the conversation?

15 MS. DONALDSON: And this is with the
16 knowledge that this is this year's money, but we
17 will be in the middle of the budget season when
18 this is released and have a clear sense.

19 The mayor has reiterated her commitment
20 several times over the last week, usually with me
21 in the room and kind of pointing at me, saying,
22 "I'm going to have some additional resources, and

1 we'll be working with the community to ensure
2 that they are allocated for the need."

3 One important point to remember, the
4 Interagency Council on Homelessness is preparing
5 a strategic, a renewed strategic plan to end
6 homeless that includes a quantified target for
7 permanent supportive housing units, and other
8 under-30-percent AMI units to be developed as
9 part of the actual strategy and plan.

10 This is not just trust-fund funded. This
11 would be looking at resources from across any and
12 all agencies that touch housing or touch work on
13 the issue of trying to prevent or end
14 homelessness.

15 So that, the targets and some of the
16 priorities are going to, in part, come from that
17 government-wide plan to end homelessness,
18 particularly in the lower-income, I mean the
19 under 30 percent of AMI, as well.

20 So, that is one thing, too. And all
21 those meetings are public meetings, open
22 meetings, sessions that are open to all to

1 participate in and to learn and understand from.

2 So that is one.

3 The other is --

4 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Director, I'm sorry.

5 Real quick, let me ask you.

6 MS. DONALDSON: I'm sorry.

7 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: If the public wanted to
8 find out, access the information on where those
9 meetings are taking place, where should they go?

10 MS. DONALDSON: Actually, the easiest way
11 is through Kristy Greenwalt, who is the Executive
12 Director of the Interagency Council on
13 Homelessness. There is a monthly meeting
14 scheduled of the Strategic Planning Committee
15 that is producing the plan.

16 The ICH also meets every other month. So
17 the next meeting is in February. Do we have a
18 date; do you know?

19 MS. MARSHALL: I don't know off the top,
20 but they do have a website.

21 MS. DONALDSON: Well, they do have the
22 website. I just don't know if all the meeting

1 schedule is up to date on that. So, before
2 directing people to it, what I will do is
3 distribute out to the list of folks signed in.
4 We will distribute out or put on our website how
5 to access that information on the Director of the
6 ICH so we can get inquiries going on and make
7 sure the meeting schedule is known and so folks
8 can participate in that. Thank you.

9 The other priorities -- and I have to say
10 that there are several that are under discussion
11 that, in part, have come out of discussion here.
12 Clearly, we have mandates in terms of how the
13 funds are used and targets we need to reach. I
14 think the earlier presentation has made clear
15 that figuring how to do under 30 percent AMI,
16 integrated and mixed in with other project goals,
17 is going to be an important priority.

18 We are also looking at trying to, in
19 terms of preservation, preservation of existing
20 units, but also potential conversion of existing
21 affordable units that are put forth to another
22 use; i.e., transitional housing, for example,

1 that could and should be converted, some of them,
2 to permanent housing and be into that pool of
3 housing units that can be used to address the
4 targeted needs and to increase that supply of
5 permanent housing, affordable housing.

6 There also will be a look at some of the
7 other segments, both population, so looking at
8 senior housing, looking at what are some of --
9 and trying to be more intentional about
10 allocating specific pools of money. In other
11 words, many other municipalities actually say,
12 "All right. We're going to dedicate x million
13 towards senior housing" or "x million towards" --

14 I mean, we've done it with permanent
15 supportive housing. But I think it's going to be
16 working towards a more intentional view on that.
17 And I think having that feedback of what those
18 priorities should be will be important on that.

19 I also think that there are geographic --
20 and I think Chris's charts really tell a
21 fascinating story, but one that we really need to
22 focus on the geographic diversity of where we are

1 investing and how we're investing in, again,
2 mixed-income projects and developments and how
3 we're doing that.

4 And, you know, there -- and I think those
5 charts were very telling, and one that we're
6 going to have to take a look at how to do that.

7 Is all this going to happen with this one
8 Super-NOFA or RFP in April? No. I can assure
9 you probably not. But we're going to make a very
10 clear effort to do that. I've already met with
11 the directors of the Housing Authority, the
12 Department of Health, the Department of Human
13 Services.

14 We've met together to have the resource
15 discussion, or at least begin the resource
16 discussion, including the Housing Finance Agency,
17 including representatives from DBH to be able to
18 really identify clearly the other resources that
19 are going to come to the table, as well.

20 There's a working group that's looking
21 at, for example, in the services side, Medicaid
22 as a potential funder of some of the services on

1 the permanent supportive housing piece. So, you
2 know, these are the conversations that are going
3 on right now.

4 Is it all in ink? No. And so I think
5 this is, again, going to be part of our March
6 discussion. And as we finalize towards the
7 April, and it may be late April, issuance of the
8 RFP. If that helps.

9 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Absolutely. Yep.

10 Questions, comments, feedback from
11 members of the board on that, about the
12 priorities?

13 MR. KNIGHT: Director, I think you had
14 encouraged us to come with some ideas. So is
15 this that time?

16 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Absolutely.

17 MS. DONALDSON: Absolutely.

18 MR. KNIGHT: Okay. So, I've got a
19 comment, again not a new idea, subject to prior
20 board discussions and the larger community, for
21 sure.

22 The first I guess I would say is

1 targeting, whether it's through points or as a
2 threshold requirement, additional affordability
3 goals. So, right now the PSH, 5 percent PSH
4 requirement is the only one that I'm aware of in
5 the RFP. To help us get to the 50 percent AMI
6 units, from the earlier discussion, do we want to
7 look at a threshold requirement? Do we want to
8 look at priority points, or points and
9 applications?

10 In addition to the permanent supportive
11 housing units themselves, there's been a lot of
12 discussion about whether or not rapid rehousing
13 units might be created in affordable housing
14 developments, whether they're new construction or
15 rehabs.

16 So I guess I would hold up those three
17 kinds of income-related housing -- PSH, rapid
18 rehousing, and the 50-percent-AMI goal that we
19 are behind on in the trust fund, as one parameter
20 for consideration.

21 Want to take turns or throw out a few
22 more?

1 (Cross-talk.)

2 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: More. No, keep going.

3 MS. DONALDSON: Keep going. No, that's
4 good.

5 (Chorus of "Keep going.")

6 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: As they said in "Animal
7 House," "Don't stop him. He's on a roll." So,
8 keep going, Jim Knight.

9 MR. KNIGHT: It will run out soon enough.

10 Following a lot of the discussion that
11 Sue's work has stimulated, the whole demand side
12 notion. How we link more services to
13 developments that are going to be trust funded.
14 So whether it is, again, prioritization,
15 preferences, scoring, or even threshold
16 requirements, whether properties can accommodate
17 services onsite, and there might be points or
18 threshold for site-based stuff.

19 If not, if the physical constraints of
20 the property don't permit that, then developments
21 might be encouraged, might be required to come
22 into the RFP with service MOU's in place across a

1 number of demand-side considerations.

2 So, thought would need to go into what
3 those would be like. But I would say it's akin
4 to what the department has been successful with
5 so far in a consolidated RFP, where the permanent
6 supportive housing service providers have come
7 into the RFP with developers.

8 MS. DONALDSON: Can I clarify? Do you
9 mean in addition to PSH?

10 MR. KNIGHT: Very much so.

11 MS. DONALDSON: Service-enriched housing
12 for --

13 MR. KNIGHT: I would name things like
14 early-childhood education, after-school
15 programming.

16 MS. DONALDSON: Resident services kind of
17 package?

18 MR. KNIGHT: Workforce development, job
19 placement, those kinds of components. If the
20 site can host them, that might warrant a certain
21 amount of scoring preference. If the site can't
22 host them, then the development could partner

1 with existing providers with significant
2 commitments for that.

3 I'll stop there for now.

4 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Great. Other board
5 members? Ideas, suggestions?

6 Bob.

7 MR. POHLMAN: I think it's really going
8 to be important to -- I'm very encouraged,
9 Director Donaldson, for the discussion about
10 targeting. And even within PSH, I think we need
11 to get a lot more sophisticated. You know, we
12 had a production schedule to eliminate chronic
13 homelessness by 2020.

14 And last year, a lot of money got put
15 into leasing. The roadmap made some
16 recommendations there. Money did get into the
17 budget for that. I'm not at all clear on what a
18 production schedule would look like today. And
19 I'm sure you've got the PSH committee. But as
20 you know, only 10 percent or less of the families
21 need PSH.

22 So, what kind of PSH are we asking for in

1 the NOFA, whereas we know that, for singles,
2 there are, first of all, a lot more singles and a
3 higher percentage that need PSH. So maybe what
4 we're starting to look at is PSH unit for
5 singles, which is another complication, because
6 what kind of units are those?

7 So I'm just saying I'm really looking
8 forward to, you know, a more sophisticated
9 analysis of this. And certainly we'd want to
10 meet PSH goals, but we don't just want to put a
11 requirement on that isn't related to what the
12 reality of the situation is.

13 MS. DONALDSON: Exactly. And I will say
14 that's why I mentioned the strategic plan and
15 homelessness at the beginning. There will be and
16 are -- I mean, I've seen early drafts that are
17 still being refined of targets for both
18 individuals and families for permanent supportive
19 housing.

20 The greater need at this time, and
21 whether it will be a likelihood that it's going
22 to get memorialized in some way in this year's

1 RFP is strong. It will be for individuals,
2 permanent supportive housing for individuals.
3 There's a major backlog and the production has
4 not kept up with that.

5 That doesn't ignore the family side or
6 the needs on the family side either. But there
7 have been more production on that side or in the
8 pipeline already addressing what we believe is --
9 and Sue is going to speak more to this in just a
10 moment -- what we believe to be the current
11 demand for permanent supportive housing.

12 Can I say on the rapid rehousing, just to
13 comment, Jim, I think that's part of the overall
14 increasing, more affordable units at the 30
15 percent or below, and also at the 30 to 50 range,
16 because that is what families who work and do
17 increase their income actually -- you don't want
18 to make it so that threshold is so hard and fast
19 that then they lose all subsidy or all reduced
20 affordability. And so, part of looking at that
21 is really with an intentionality.

22 The other piece about rapid rehousing, of

1 course, is that it's permanent. So, you know, it
2 isn't as if a family moves out and that unit
3 becomes available again unless there's natural
4 attrition and turnover.

5 So figuring out some of the mechanics on
6 that, from the developer point of view of, how do
7 you maintain that, is something that other
8 municipalities have done and that I will
9 certainly -- you may have missed this, but I have
10 a trip to Denver later this week where I actually
11 talk with my counterparts in the other major
12 high-cost-of-housing cities in the country. So
13 that certainly will be on the agenda as well.

14 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: One of the things -- go
15 ahead, Jim.

16 MR. KNIGHT: Just one comment on that.
17 I'm glad you're looking at that, Director.
18 Whether -- I mean when you say "other 30 and
19 below affordability," this has been discussed a
20 lot before you were in your present role in this
21 circle. So I feel like you're probably going to
22 go there in your next report. So maybe I ought

1 to just hold this comment.

2 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: I couple of thoughts I
3 have on the NOFA and the priorities. And some of
4 this we have mentioned in past meetings. One,
5 right now the director alluded to this, the only
6 kind of goals that I think generally the public
7 has the sense of that the City has as it relates
8 to affordable housing were the goals that were
9 outlined in the Housing Task Force report that
10 was released a couple of years ago.

11 And, so one of the things that I think
12 would be helpful to know from the new mayor and
13 the administration, recognizing it's been 30
14 days, right, is the notion of what is the goal?
15 Where are we trying to go? Are we trying to get
16 to Topeka, or are we trying to get to LA? Right?

17 And so, are we still -- is the City still
18 aiming for the 10-by-20? Is it aiming for the
19 10-by-20, plus the other 8,000 units that were
20 referenced in that report that were not
21 highlighted by the previous mayor as part of the
22 goal, but was part of the recommendation in the

1 report?

2 So, one is kind of the total number of
3 units. What are we trying to preserve? What are
4 we trying to produce? And what types of units
5 are we trying to preserve and produce beyond just
6 general numbers?

7 So I think -- and it sounds like,
8 Director, you're saying that clearly there's some
9 work in one subset of that in terms of
10 identifying target numbers. There I think one of
11 the recommendations would be for the
12 administration to think about, what is the goal?
13 What are the goals?

14 And then, to the extent -- then the
15 question becomes, for the Agency, there's a
16 statutory requirement in terms of at a portfolio
17 level. And we should be clear about that
18 portfolio level, not at the project level, for
19 where dollars go. But then also, how does that
20 connect to whatever the larger goals are for the
21 City? How many units are we trying to produce of
22 this, of that, and where?

 OLENDER REPORTING, INC.
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 And so, I think clearly, the NOFA should
2 point around policy. And we've had this
3 conversation before. The NOFA in some way ought
4 to -- so I'm just echoing now what Jim said --
5 ought to look at how to either require and-or
6 incentivize people to meet the statutory
7 requirements.

8 But I think it shouldn't stop there. It
9 should also go to, what is the larger goal that
10 the City has? And being clear about that, and
11 then tailoring NOFA there.

12 I think Bob's point that you brought up
13 about, what about projects, in looking at even
14 geographically, what can the department do for
15 projects that come in the door that provide a
16 good preservation opportunity that most would
17 applaud?

18 And so I think, let's use Channel Square
19 as an example, where all would probably applaud
20 that as a preservation goal. By the actual
21 numbers, it's not hitting the income-targeting
22 bands that the trust fund statute requires, which

1 is, again, okay because those requirements are at
2 a portfolio level. But that policy conversation
3 about, how do we use that money, and are there
4 mechanisms like, when the units become vacant or
5 other things -- for us to think creatively.

6 And whether the department figures that
7 out itself, convenes a group of stakeholders, you
8 know, in and outside of the Agency to help things
9 through. What are some ideas about how to
10 generate that in a way that's going to make most
11 sense? Because there are projects out there that
12 aren't going to hit it, but maybe could down the
13 road. And then there are projects that aren't
14 hitting it now, but maybe with some or a few
15 extra dollars could. And so looking at all of
16 that.

17 MS. DONALDSON: And so just to your point
18 on Channel Square, very good point. In fact, it
19 was interesting. We had an internal conversation
20 of how to score that because, quite frankly, for
21 the next 15 years, there's a significant group of
22 residents at 30 percent of AMI or below with

1 Section 8s. But they don't transfer with the
2 project, right? They're not projects.

3 So, the strategy would be, what do you do
4 10 years as the population -- as the units do
5 become vacant, what do you do with them in that
6 way? And I think looking down the road that far
7 has not necessarily been part of the underwriting
8 process here or packaging in that way, and I
9 think is something worthy of looking at.

10 Because, quite frankly, we could have
11 scored some of the units at 30 percent or below
12 at least for a period. But it's not in the
13 covenant for 40 years for it to be that. And
14 that's the distinction of sorts.

15 So, anyone who's there now at whatever
16 income level has the right to stay there, and
17 that's been memorialized in all the documents
18 that have gone with that project. But again,
19 it's, how do you then score it, going forward?
20 And so that was a tricky one, and we might need,
21 you know, asterisks or something, like Roger
22 Maris, right?

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. DONALDSON: Just to age myself.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Two other things I
4 would mention. One, this notion, all this
5 conversation about how to get other folks
6 engaged, other stakeholders engaged in the
7 leveraging conversation beyond even ALP, and
8 conversations with other businesses and others,
9 philanthropic community.

10 Thinking about, you know, the notion now
11 and the geographic distribution, a lot of
12 developments that have folks living at the income
13 levels that are statutory requirement, extremely
14 low- and very low-income folks are going to be in
15 -- tend to be disproportionately in certain parts
16 of the City, Ward 7, Ward 8, right?

17 So if we -- so when there's kind of this
18 pull of, if we want to hit projects, developments
19 in Ward 2 and Ward 3, like parts of Ward 1, parts
20 of Ward 4 that may now not have folks in those
21 income bands, but when we think about the price
22 escalation in the community, right, in our City,

1 someone who's making 50 or 60 -- everything is
2 relative, right?

3 (Cross-talk.)

4 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: If I've got one shoe
5 and you've got no, I'm doing all right, but I'm
6 still struggling.

7 MS. DONALDSON: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: So, are there ways that
9 we can use the leveraging conversation to bring
10 in more resources so that folks who are living,
11 let's say at 70 to 80 percent AMI in Ward 2, 3,
12 or 4, they're not the neediest of the needy, but
13 they're still -- they've got to wrestle as well.

14 And so maybe there are ways to use trust
15 fund dollars to bring in other private dollars
16 that could potentially be targeted more to those
17 developments, and maybe using CDBG or home, those
18 kinds of things, to help with some of those
19 developments while trust fund dollars go more so
20 towards the income targeting so that we don't get
21 a case where the City itself is really only
22 supporting projects that are at the ELI and VLI

1 levels, which are extremely needed, but there's
2 another whole swath of, you know, what is needed.

3 MS. DONALDSON: Exactly. Exactly. And
4 that's where, I mean, I think that trying to
5 balance that is, that's what we have to do. And
6 remember, 100 million is the floor, right? And
7 how that truly can then be leveraged and
8 potentials as the debt cap reduces later this
9 decade, right? And what that means in terms of
10 other creative ways, you know, to leverage
11 additional private finance as well.

12 You know, I think there are a lot of
13 things on the table that need to be part of the
14 conversation, going down and looking -- but
15 absolutely. What is the goal? I mean, that's
16 actually -- my new boss starts today, Brian
17 Kenner, Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic
18 Development. And that's -- we have a
19 conversation scheduled on that this week.

20 So, you know, that's exactly what the
21 intent is of the administration to do and then to
22 have the NOFA follow from that. I mean, that

1 would be not only logical, but it's as it should
2 be. And as we are in year three of this
3 coordinated super-NOFA, let's pool the resources
4 to maximize and get the most bang for the buck.

5 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Let me make one more
6 recommendation, and then I see Bob, and then
7 we'll move on to the next part of the agenda.

8 The other piece, too, from a policy
9 standpoint, looking at the requirement, for
10 example, on PSH was for new construction
11 projects. I see that a number of the projects,
12 the developments that have come in are in the
13 substantial rehab category. I think one of the
14 questions to ask is, Could there be requirements
15 put on substantial rehab and new construction
16 developments, as well? And that might broaden
17 that universe of potential units.

18 Bob?

19 MR. POHLMAN: Yeah, I was thinking that,
20 too. But, you know, it would be for vacant units
21 at the time. For instance, take Channel Square.
22 Were there any vacant units? If there were, you

1 could specify those for PSH.

2 But I thought it was -- you know, I'd
3 love to see DHCD be able to count those units
4 that -- I have folks at below 30 percent AMI in
5 them, with Section 8. I understand that, you
6 know, the commitment is for 40 years.

7 One of the things that the Housing
8 Authority could do is project-base those units,
9 which would then be indefinitely affordable and,
10 you know, it would be part of your total plan.
11 That's one thing.

12 The other thing, I'm just curious.
13 Maybe, Nathan, you have some thoughts on this.
14 But if we started to go to -- if we started to go
15 to housing for homeless singles, what would we
16 do? Would you do -- I mean, the new stuff that's
17 being produced, you're not getting studios, are
18 you, affordable? Or what would you do?

19 MR. SIMMS: Well, I think that's a good
20 question. And so, once piece we come back to is,
21 folks recall like two years ago when David Berns
22 was the Director of DHS, and we started having

1 the permanent supportive housing discussion, it
2 was really about the need for families.

3 But if you look at our portfolio
4 traditionally in terms of what we produce, we
5 were producing zeroes, ones, and twos. And so,
6 it was the need to ramp up and produce at least
7 threes, and in some instances where we have rehab
8 projects, we have fours.

9 So, the production aspect -- I think,
10 one, we want to be clear because it was just
11 like, you know, swinging the other way in terms
12 of this is what the need is. So if that's what
13 the need is, that's fine. You know, let's get
14 comfortable around it. Let's figure out -- it
15 gives us more flexibility, because obviously,
16 subsidizing a one-bedroom unit is going to be
17 different, you know, than a two-bedroom or a
18 three-bedroom unit.

19 So that resources, those resources can go
20 a little bit further. Same thing with, you know,
21 rental subsidies, same thing with other sources.

22 So I don't think it's a -- you know, it's

1 not a stretch for us to -- we have to be able to
2 articulate, okay, this is what the need is and
3 that's what the ICH will inform us in terms of
4 our decision-making process and prioritization.
5 But I don't think it will be a hard sell for us
6 to say, you know, we need zeroes, we need ones,
7 we need twos, because I think that's
8 traditionally what we've been able to produce.

9 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: One thing before we
10 transition now to the old business part of the
11 agenda for board members, a question. The
12 meeting highlights, the minutes, obviously, will
13 reflect recommendations that have been, or ideas
14 that have been shared, I should say.

15 Just one of the questions we want to ask
16 is, Does the board feel a desire at this point to
17 move on any formal motions, a specific
18 recommendation on anything you've heard today so
19 that the minutes will reflect, here's a specific
20 recommendation from the board? Or not? Do folks
21 feel strongly on that? Do you want to wait on
22 that? Do you want to move on something on that

1 now, or not? So I just wanted to put that out
2 there for folks.

3 Jim.

4 MR. KNIGHT: I had wondered, coming into
5 the meeting, if we might want to do something
6 like the written letter to the transition team,
7 that we get clear together what our best thinking
8 is. I don't think we'd be in place to vote on
9 that today.

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Right.

11 MR. KNIGHT: But a subgroup might be
12 willing to pull those ideas together.

13 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Given what's been said
14 today, are there any members of the board who
15 might be willing to work on a draft letter for
16 the board to review, look at, and then could send
17 to the mayor, deputy mayor? And obviously, the
18 director would be a part of that chain, as well,
19 that's got a formal recommendation that would be
20 provided as it relates to the NOFA.

21 Anybody who might want to work on that,
22 on the board?

1 Jim. Sue. All right. All right. So
2 we've got Jim and Sue who will work with us, and
3 there are some other board members who aren't
4 here as well.

5 Why don't we, Jim, if we can -- and we
6 appreciate your and Sue's willingness to do that
7 -- try to work on a draft that we could circulate
8 before the next meeting, have discussion on it at
9 the next meeting, and see if we can move to a
10 vote yea or nay, if that's possible?

11 MR. KNIGHT: Can I ask the director
12 whether that would be fast enough?

13 MS. DONALDSON: No, I think it can't wait
14 till the -- March I'd like to have a clearer
15 sense. So if we could have your thoughts prior
16 to that in terms of your strong advice on the
17 directions we should go, that would be very
18 helpful to our internal, and resource-wide
19 across-agencies process. I mean, we're in the
20 final -- I mean, that's -- in order to get
21 documents approved legally and all sorts of
22 stuff. So, yeah, two weeks. What does that make

1 the date?

2 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: That would be the 16th.
3 So if Jim and Sue, if you all are able to
4 circulate something by --

5 MS. DONALDSON: Or the 17th. The 16th is
6 a holiday.

7 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: -- next Monday.

8 MS. DONALDSON: But that would be great.

9 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yeah. By early next
10 week. And then we can work through email
11 exchange to see if we can get an approval and
12 then get something formally submitted.

13 Great. Thank you all very much.

14 MS. DONALDSON: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: All right. Let's go to
16 old business and the rest of the agenda. So,
17 Update on Communications with the New
18 Administration Leadership. On Wednesday the 28th
19 is a follow-up from our meeting in January, so I
20 want the board and the public to know, on
21 Wednesday, the 28th, through the online portal
22 system, we did submit a request for to meet with

1 the mayor.

2 The meeting purpose was listed as "to
3 meet with the mayor and her senior housing team
4 to discuss the following: One, the mayor's
5 vision-slash-plans for increasing the supply of
6 housing affordable to low- and moderate-income
7 D.C. residents; two, mayor's thoughts on the role
8 of the HPTF Advisory Board and how it can be
9 helpful in realizing the mayor's affordable
10 housing goals; three, brief the mayor on the work
11 of HPTF Advisory Board."

12 So that request has been submitted.
13 We've made the director aware as well. And we
14 will work to see -- and the request is made to
15 have that meeting with the board. So we will
16 work to see if we can follow through and get that
17 meeting scheduled.

18 Any questions on that from board members?

19 (No audible response.)

20 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay. Any updates? I
21 think Bea may have been our point person on this.
22 But anyone from the Agency, updates on the

1 discussion regarding the waiver of vacant
2 property taxes for pipeline projects? Do we have
3 any updates on that?

4 MS. DONALDSON: No.

5 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay. So I think --
6 this is something we heard of. Does anyone on
7 the board have any familiarity or kind of updates
8 or sense on what's going on with this or how this
9 is moving? I know this came up at one of our
10 stakeholder meetings a few months ago. Any sense
11 of this?

12 (No audible response.)

13 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay. Hearing none,
14 we'll move up.

15 Updates on the demand side. Sue,
16 anything? We'll turn it over to you.

17 MS. MARSHALL: You should have two
18 handouts, one you will recall from a previous
19 meeting. The first handout takes a look at
20 assessment data, and I'm not going to go back
21 through that.

22 The first point I would make is that the

1 chart with the bar graph is stratified by single
2 adults and families. And it reinforces the
3 points that were made earlier that the strategies
4 have to be targeted to particular populations.
5 There is no one particular type of housing that
6 is going to support meetings, the demand at the
7 zero-to-30 and zero-to-50.

8 So, the first part looks again at the
9 assessment data and uses it to predict the type
10 of housing needed for the single adult
11 population.

12 And it says that the dark blue portion of
13 the pie chart represents 28 percent needing
14 permanent supportive housing, 52 percent of
15 single adults needing rapid rehousing, and
16 another 20 percent needing minimal intervention,
17 meaning some support with first month's rent and
18 security deposit, and likely some service support
19 along the way.

20 In response to conversations initiated by
21 Jim Knight, we added some income information to
22 this chart to look at the groupings by the

1 housing need. And if you look at the notes,
2 you'll note that 39 percent of all individuals in
3 our system, and the system is the homeless
4 management information, or HMIS system -- 39
5 percent have no income whatsoever.

6 If you look at the stratification across
7 housing types, of the individuals recommended for
8 permanent supportive housing, they earned an
9 average of \$466 per month. If you take out the
10 zero-income individuals, those with income
11 averaged \$835 a month. For individuals
12 recommended for rapid rehousing, if you include
13 the no-incomes, the average monthly income is
14 \$527. For those with income, it's \$933.

15 Individuals recommended for minimal
16 interventions, 547 for the universe, 1,012 for
17 those with income. Below that, you will see
18 family assessments for families. And I want to
19 make a point because, after we put this data on
20 the table, there were a number of questions, a
21 lot of which came from the Coalition for
22 Nonprofit Housing and Economic Developers.

 OLENDER REPORTING, INC.
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 And I want to make the point that the
2 data you see represented here represents the
3 entire family continuum. The data, I believe,
4 Director Donaldson and others looked at looks at
5 this specific population. So there would be some
6 particular differences, for example, in the
7 residence at D.C. General or in the hotel, and
8 those who are residents of transitional housing
9 programs. So that's why you see those
10 differences in distribution.

11 If you look at the entire universe,
12 permanent supportive housing for families is very
13 small, at 3 percent; 36 percent for rapid
14 rehousing; and 61 percent for minimal
15 intervention.

16 I'd make another point about this
17 assessment data. This data focuses as much on
18 service need as it does on housing need and
19 economic need. And I am happy at how these two
20 conversations are coming together in this forum.
21 But it certainly speaks to both the production
22 and supply side, as well as the demand side.

1 Right now, I think we need to continue
2 the conversation about disaggregating this data
3 to be able to make more refined targeting
4 recommendations. And I think this data goes to
5 support the recommendations that certainly both
6 Jim and Bob made earlier.

7 The second handout you have takes a look
8 at the area median income in the categories that
9 we are trying to meet goals in. At the top, you
10 get what is the AMI by family size. And if you
11 look at the bottom of the chart, and this is for
12 the single individual data that does not include
13 family data -- if you look at the bar graph at
14 the bottom, you could match the incomes at the
15 bottom in the blue with the incomes on the pie
16 chart on the previous handout.

17 So, for individuals recommended for
18 permanent supportive housing, again average
19 income, \$466. If you look at the gap between
20 that income and 30 percent of AMI, it is roughly
21 \$1,400. If you look at the gap between that
22 income and 50 percent of median, and this -- in

1 previous conversations, these are the minimum
2 levels of income that we are looking at towards
3 our target, that gap is almost \$3,000.

4 If you look at the rapid rehousing
5 population, at 527, gap of 1,350 to get to 30
6 percent of AMI, about \$2,600 gap to get to 50
7 percent. And for those needing the minimal
8 intervention, higher income of 547 and a gap of
9 about 1,330 to 30 percent of AMI, and a gap of
10 about \$2,600 to get to 50 percent of income.

11 I think this speaks to how very much we
12 need to continue the subsidy conversation and the
13 conversation that Jim brought up of, how do we
14 produce housing that is affordable to low-income
15 families and individuals with these slow levels
16 of income?

17 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Thank you, Sue.
18 Appreciate it.

19 Comments, questions from members of the
20 board?

21 MR. KNIGHT: What I'm trying to formulate
22 -- I'm not sure how well this will come out. In

1 your prior life, you had a lot of experience with
2 this particular -- many years ago.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MS. DONALDSON: Prior life? Many years?
5 Last year, you mean, right?

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. KNIGHT: A few weeks ago.

8 Trying to understand how to think about,
9 in the end, the unit production, but also then
10 what kind of service gets coupled with it. Or I
11 guess, Sue, when you were first -- before you
12 drilled down this deeply into the data and you
13 were first talking about the difference between
14 what an individual or family needs when they need
15 permanent supportive housing versus when they
16 need rapid rehousing, the differentiation of
17 support.

18 When you look at all the populations,
19 even those with sort of the mainstream resource
20 need, their rent level needs to be as low as the
21 other two categories. I guess I'm trying to
22 understand what the qualifications of the

1 households are that sort of differentiate which
2 category they end up.

3 MS. DONALDSON: And this is piggybacking
4 on it, so she and I have talked. I mean, we've
5 been working together on this project. And this
6 is with my former hat on with the Transitional
7 Housing Corporation, working with Community of
8 Hope and with PCP and with the Department of
9 Human Services to begin the coordinated
10 assessment process with families. That's what
11 the data substance were.

12 And so the beginnings of that were to
13 assess families in the shelter system, both D.C.
14 General and hotels. And so that kind of baseline
15 data for those families is different from those
16 who are already in some form of a stable housing
17 situation of transitional or rapid rehousing.

18 And so, if you don't mind, I'm going to
19 share what it is from those who are in the
20 homeless system. Before they're placed in some
21 form of permanent or apartment-style transitional
22 housing, you know, 8 percent score for permanent

1 supportive housing; 12 percent for minimal
2 intervention; and 80 percent for some form of
3 subsidy and services for a shorter period of
4 time, not permanent. Permanent housing was a not
5 permanent subsidy and services need.

6 When you aggregate those numbers with
7 those who are already in the transitional housing
8 system, they've been stably housed. So the 61
9 percent is actually saying, "Who's prepared to
10 really graduate or move to another, who have
11 actually increased their income or are going to
12 be able to do it?"

13 Your income question, though, isn't
14 necessarily on the family side reflected yet. I
15 mean, this is just the data for the individual
16 side. In fact, those who have successfully
17 transitioned from both transitional or rapid
18 rehousing do increase their income in a
19 remarkable way. Is it market, though? No, not
20 necessarily. And that is why building at that 30
21 to 50 is as important as under-30 and making sure
22 that we can structure rents that way.

1 So it's not a disagreement on data. It's
2 just saying it's two different data pools. And
3 what gets talked about in terms of, what are the
4 immediate needs for families that are coming into
5 the shelter system, and what is the appropriate
6 services and housing intervention? It's a
7 different conversation from saying, "What do we
8 now need to build in our community? What's the
9 housing stock that we need to produce to ensure
10 that, as families flow out of the homeless
11 system, there's appropriate affordable housing
12 for them to flow to, literally?"

13 Does that clarify? How did I do?

14 MS. MARSHALL: And I'm thinking you did
15 well.

16 MS. DONALDSON: All right. Thank you.

17 MS. MARSHALL: It goes to a point you
18 were making earlier about the need to better
19 stratify this data to match the population, to be
20 able to better target the resources both on
21 demand side and on production side. And with
22 families, in particular, one of the things the

1 data is intended to show, again related to a
2 point you're making, is the need for
3 comprehensive services that are not just social
4 services, but are services designed to strengthen
5 the ability to retain housing in the private
6 market.

7 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: One of the things that
8 strikes me about the data, the conversation about
9 demand side, and with this notion of -- the way
10 the conversation was framed, historically, as I
11 perceived it, was the notion of, how can we
12 impact people's need for housing that is where
13 they have to have subsidy in order to live in a
14 way where they're not severely housing-cost
15 burdened?

16 And I'm very intentional about that
17 language because I say I live in subsidized
18 housing every year when I do my taxes and take
19 the mortgage interest deduction. So I get a
20 subsidy for my housing. But I don't have to have
21 that subsidy in order to not live severely
22 housing-cost burdened. So I just wanted to be

1 clear on why I go through all those hoops, just
2 basically.

3 That being said, one of the things this
4 data has shown kind of raises for me is the
5 notion of, if someone walked in and said, "We
6 will double, even triple your income," most folks
7 would yell, "Hallelujah" and say, "I'm good,"
8 right? "Life is going to be good."

9 What strikes me is that, even when we
10 back out, look at the numbers in terms of folks
11 with income, right? So the 466 is 835; 527 is
12 933. If we doubled their income, tripled their
13 income -- I'm not in that world of resident
14 services, but I would think that if we went to an
15 agency and they produced something that said,
16 "All of our folks doubled their income," you'd
17 say that's a wildly successful program.

18 And yet, those folks would still be in
19 need of housing that's supported by the trust
20 fund. Triple their income, those folks are still
21 in need of housing that's supported by the trust
22 fund.

1 So I think -- so, where am I going with
2 that? I think two things. One, yes, we need to
3 have the -- the collective "we" need to have the
4 conversation about how to intentionally leverage
5 resources that will help people increase their
6 income.

7 I think we also need to manage the
8 expectations in the wider community that, by
9 doing so, we might markedly reduce the demand for
10 housing supported by the trust fund, because when
11 I look at the data, and just my own kind of
12 general sense of how people do it, right, and
13 program, et cetera, et cetera, that even if it
14 was wildly successful, given how high costs are
15 in our market, there's most of these folks are
16 still going to be in a bucket where they need
17 some trust-fund-supported units.

18 So I say that to not say we shouldn't do,
19 because we should. But we need to manage the
20 expectation that, even if we as a city get that
21 right, it's not as though the demand is going to
22 drop way down and we can kind of move on to the

1 next problem.

2 MS. DONALDSON: No. It's an ongoing, and
3 I actually think that one of the key pieces is
4 control the stock. You know, or the covenant --
5 you know, having, knowing that we're not just,
6 you know, providing short-term leasing
7 arrangements or whatever --

8 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Right.

9 MS. DONALDSON: -- but that we're really
10 producing the stock that maintains in the public,
11 you know, for the public good and with
12 commitments by, again, for-profits and nonprofits
13 both making those commitments. But that's how
14 we're going to get to true affordability rent
15 levels in that way. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Last comment on this, I
17 think, from Jim.

18 MS. DONALDSON: Yes.

19 MR. KNIGHT: Going back to your last
20 comment before Dave's helpful thoughts, I think I
21 heard you say that (indiscernible) create a
22 distinction between -- you said coming out of the

1 homeless system into the Housing? Is that fair?

2 MS. DONALDSON: Well, I mean through the
3 emergency part of the homeless system.

4 Transitional is technically still part of the
5 homeless system as well, whereas rapid rehousing
6 is viewed as -- is permanent housing or is a
7 permanent housing setting. So if that helps
8 clarify.

9 MR. KNIGHT: I say that just along the
10 continued question that I have for our
11 discernment. Is there some kind of housing that
12 the trust fund wouldn't produce because it's
13 emergency homeless? Or is the entire realm of
14 what is going to house men and women, as we move
15 away from shelter as no longer a preferred
16 option?

17 MS. DONALDSON: What was that last part?

18 MR. KNIGHT: As we close shelters, as
19 shelters --

20 MS. DONALDSON: As we -- or refine the
21 shelter system so it truly is emergency only, you
22 know, with the goal of a 30-day stay max. I

1 think we do have to play some part in thinking of
2 how to create alternate settings. And either
3 through -- I mean, maybe not trust fund
4 resources, but land resources or other ways that
5 we can do that, depending on the entities that
6 are going to be able to help put that together.

7 That's a multi-agency conversation and
8 all, but one that's going to happen. It has to
9 happen. Yeah.

10 MR. KNIGHT: Appreciate that comment.
11 And as I think some of us try to figure out what
12 this body's function is, just trying to see into
13 the spectrum of housing that we're trying to
14 support the creation of, that's where this is
15 coming from.

16 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yeah. Right. So does
17 it make sense for other sources to really pay
18 that freight? That's a question I hear you
19 asking. Was that right?

20 MR. KNIGHT: And just trying to get the
21 bounds on what we're trying to understand and
22 advise as a body.

1 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Great.

2 Thank you, Sue, very much. Appreciate
3 it.

4 We will move on now to the public
5 comments section. We've got a couple of minutes
6 left here for our board meeting. It's open to
7 the public. If anyone would like to raise a
8 question or make a comment at this time now, you
9 may do so. And if you'd like to do so, we'd
10 invite you to just come up to the microphone and
11 give us your name and any comment or question you
12 may have.

13 Any comments from the public?

14 Yes, sir. State your name for the
15 record, and then you may proceed.

16 MR. WILMARTH: My name is Dave Wilmarth.

17 Relative to a couple of comments,
18 Director, I think you made one relative to
19 elderly assisted and the possible use of
20 Medicare.

21 MS. DONALDSON: Medicaid.

22 MR. WILMARTH: Medicaid. I'm sorry.

1 Medicaid.

2 Are you, in the upcoming NOFA, are you
3 looking at assisted living as, quote-unquote, PSH
4 units? Are they in their own category?

5 MS. DONALDSON: I don't recall saying
6 that about assisted living. And I don't really
7 have an answer to that. I don't believe -- I
8 don't think it would -- if I said that, I
9 misspoke.

10 MR. WILMARTH: I'm just asking as a
11 possibility.

12 MS. DONALDSON: No. Whether assisted
13 living facilities would be a set-aside segment?

14 MR. WILMARTH: Correct. Or whether they
15 would count as PSH units in the scoring.

16 MS. DONALDSON: I don't think so,
17 actually. But I can -- I mean, I think it's -- I
18 think there would be, I think, a separate focus
19 on senior housing, is my -- but that's still to
20 be evolved on how much we can segment out for
21 that and what kind -- assisted living is a
22 specific form of senior housing that I'm not

1 clear that that's what we would necessarily be
2 supporting.

3 MR. WILMARTH: Okay. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Thank you, sir.

5 Any other questions or comments from the
6 public?

7 (No audible response.)

8 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay. Hearing none,
9 any announcements for the sake of the board?

10 MS. DONALDSON: Oh, right. Yes. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Um-hm. Thank you.

13 MS. DONALDSON: Actually, we do have two
14 opportunities for, as part of our education
15 series, the first is on this Thursday, Nuts and
16 Bolts of Notices to Vacate, which is very
17 important if you're looking at a building that is
18 occupied. And also how do you, for tenants,
19 landlords, and realtors, this is an important --
20 it's 12:00 to 2:00 in this room, Thursday,
21 February 5th.

22 And then an information session on Tenant

1 Opportunity to Purchase, the TOPA Act, for
2 tenants. This is for tenants, tenant advocates,
3 tenant associations, and it's Thursday, February
4 12th, from 12:00 to 2:00 in this room as well.

5 So I'm sure these are also posted on our
6 website. If not, or they will be today. So,
7 just spread the word on that. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Absolutely.

9 Any board members with any announcements?

10 (No audible response.)

11 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Let me ask one last
12 question to the members of the board. In terms
13 of our agenda for next month's meeting, to make
14 sure we're clear, specific recommendations folks
15 have on issues that we should cover at next
16 month's meeting that we'd like to discuss. It
17 seems like, one, the letter that would have gone
18 in with specific recommendations would have been
19 sent by then and we can certainly kind of review
20 that at the next meeting. That would be one
21 topic of discussion, what was sent in.

22 Any other items, agenda items folks want?

1 Yes, sir, Jim.

2 MR. KNIGHT: I noticed earlier under old
3 business, we skipped that bit about tax
4 exemptions during development. It's unclear to
5 me whether someone is supposed to be working on
6 that and whether we want to solve it or whether
7 that should fall off the agenda. I think the
8 development community would probably find that to
9 be a big victory, if it's possible.

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yep. Yep.

11 MS. DONALDSON: For vacant property,
12 right? Because there already are tax exemptions
13 for non-vacant property, right, that are in
14 development?

15 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Right.

16 MS. DONALDSON: Correct? I mean, I know
17 I signed those waivers. So I know they exist.
18 But you're talking about vacant property tax.

19 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: And this was an issue
20 that came up, as I recall, in one of the
21 stakeholders meetings several months ago here.
22 And someone brought up the issue of, if you're a

1 developer who has a project that's in the
2 pipeline, the NOFA -- like you've been selected
3 and you're in the pipeline.

4 If that property is vacant, trying to get
5 an abatement for -- either a reduction or
6 abatement of those property taxes, because it's
7 in the pipeline. And so, how can that get dealt
8 with? I believe that was --

9 MS. DONALDSON: So that's the issue?

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Yeah.

11 MS. DONALDSON: Okay. All right. Let me
12 -- we'll talk about it, try to have an update for
13 next meeting.

14 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay.

15 MR. KNIGHT: This cost -- obviously add
16 to the cost of carrying the project.

17 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Right. Exactly.
18 Exactly. That was the concern that was raised.
19 Okay. So we'll have an update on that and see if
20 there's anything on that at the next meeting, the
21 letter.

22 Any other issues folks want to make sure

1 we talk about?

2 (No audible response.)

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: I would like to ask
4 that, at the next meeting, if board members
5 through our network can put out for
6 recommendations, given the policy discussion we
7 had vis a vis the NOFA. For the NOFA that's
8 coming, we would have already sent in kind of
9 recommendations.

10 But this is not a one-and-done thing. So
11 I would ask it if we can through our networks put
12 out kind of a call for ideas and recommendations
13 as it relates to what recommendations would we
14 have for the department to consider kind of more
15 broadly, not only for this, but going for, as
16 they look even towards next year. Because I'm
17 sure that thinking will start very soon.
18 Recommendations for the NOFA and how that works.

19 Jim.

20 MR. KNIGHT: I don't know, Director,
21 whether the administration has had time to think
22 this through yet, for obvious reasons, the

1 comment that you made earlier today about linking
2 the RFP goals to the larger goals. Are you aware
3 of any?

4 MS. DONALDSON: Yeah, no. I think I
5 mentioned that I'm meeting my new boss, the
6 Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic
7 Development. Brian Kenner has oversight over
8 all, and supervision over all of the housing-
9 related agencies. And he starts today.

10 So I think I said there's a meeting this
11 week where those conversations and the planning
12 that we are doing and have been doing in terms of
13 the agency. Each agency's plan will roll up into
14 that. And in accord, the number-one piece is the
15 coordinated housing strategy that builds on this
16 task force and builds and looks at creating
17 specific goals and such. So, I fully anticipate
18 that will be the case.

19 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Let me ask this
20 question of board members. In terms of for the
21 next meeting, it seems like we have a light
22 agenda. And the most timely issue that we would

1 have had to deal with will be dealt with before
2 the next meeting date, vis a vis the letter.

3 So I guess the question I'm asking is, Do
4 we still need to have the March meeting? Do we
5 wait a month to try to see if, perhaps by the
6 April meeting, we could actually invite folks
7 from the administration, perhaps, to come with
8 updates by that time, on kind of what the
9 thinking is around housing goals? That would
10 have given folks more time to maybe collect ideas
11 about NOFA, et cetera.

12 I'm not recommending we put it off, but I
13 just want to raise that question. Because
14 hearing, seeing kind of what the agenda is, it's
15 a little light. So I just want to make best use
16 of everyone's time. So people feel the need,
17 we'll come on and talk about those three things.

18 I'm happy to do that, but I wanted to
19 kind of float the notion of waiting a month and
20 then in the April meeting having a little more
21 substance to it. So I welcome any feedback,
22 board members, on that. Proceed or hold off

1 until April?

2 MR. POHLMAN: Well, how do you propose
3 that the letter be approved? That would have to
4 be done before the March meeting, I guess. Is
5 that it?

6 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: And I thought by email
7 we will have to approve --

8 MR. POHLMAN: We'll just have to do it by
9 email?

10 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Right. Right.

11 (Pause.)

12 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Would anybody have any
13 strong heartburn if we postpone the March meeting
14 and move to April? Director?

15 MS. DONALDSON: You know, I actually -- I
16 mean, I would think and I would have put on the
17 agenda the -- I mean, I think we'll be prepared
18 to have another discussion about the RFP, quite
19 frankly.

20 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay.

21 MS. DONALDSON: And so, I think that
22 would be useful to have this body, particularly

1 the chair, on that.

2 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Okay.

3 MS. DONALDSON: I'm not saying it's going
4 to be the wholly, printed, final version. But I
5 think there will be progress, both the goals --
6 Nathan is laughing because he knows I really
7 don't know how long these things take.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MS. DONALDSON: In any event -- but, no,
10 I do think it's -- no, actually, I think it would
11 be important to meet. I think it would be
12 important to know that there will be some further
13 discussion on goals and plans. And I think also
14 that we'll certainly have more on the RFP, plus
15 more on where we are with what's going on right
16 now in terms of what's actually really closing
17 and such.

18 So, stay tuned is how I would say it.
19 And let's come back March 2nd.

20 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: We will proceed then
21 with our first Monday in March meeting. It seems
22 like agenda items will be an update on the NOFA.

1 And from the department's standpoint, and also
2 we'll share what the final version of the letter
3 that was submitted on behalf of the board with
4 recommendations.

5 We'll get an update on the tax abatement
6 issue. We'll have an agenda item on ideas, well,
7 for the NOFA, that will all be part of the NOFA
8 conversation. If there are any additional ideas
9 that folks have from the board, or in our
10 community, and any updates on goals, as that
11 discussion unfolds with the new administration.

12 MS. DONALDSON: And I, if you would like,
13 could invite the deputy mayor to attend. Would
14 that -- do you think it would be of interest?

15 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: That would be helpful.
16 That would be very helpful.

17 MS. DONALDSON: Well, as soon as I see
18 him today, first day, I will see if we can get
19 that on his calendar. But I think that would be
20 helpful. And as I said, there are goals
21 discussions going on right now. It's just I
22 think that there was a desire to wait for the

1 deputy mayor to come onboard.

2 And so, that's where we are.

3 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Good.

4 Any other business before the board?

5 (No audible response.)

6 CHAIRMAN BOWERS: Hearing none, it is
7 12:07 p.m., February 2nd. This meeting is
8 adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

9 [Whereupon, at 12:16 p.m., the Housing
10 Production Trust Fund Advisory Board meeting,
11 concluded.]

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22