### THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY

+ + + + +

### BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
JANUARY 16, 2020

+ + + + +

The Board of Commissioners met in the Executive Director's Conference Room, 1133 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Franselene St. Jean, Vice-Chairman, presiding.

### COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

FRANSELENE ST. JEAN, Vice-Chairman KENNETH D. COUNCIL, Commissioner DYANA FORESTER, Commissioner\* NAKEISHA NEAL JONES, Commissioner WILLIAM SLOVER, Commissioner ANTONIO TALIAFERRO, Commissioner AQUARIUS VANN-GHASRI, Commissioner

### STAFF PRESENT:

CHELSEA ANDREWS, General Counsel
TYRONE GARRETT, Executive Director
HAMMERE GEBREYES, Director of Government
Affairs

SENTHIL SANKARAN, Director of the Office of Capital Programs

KEN SLAUGHTER, Corporate Secretary

### COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

NEIL ALBERT, Chairman JOHN FALCICCHIO, Commissioner JOSE ARNALDO ORTIZ GAUD, Commissioner LEJUAN STRICKLAND, Commissioner

\* present via teleconference

### C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Call to Order, Moment of Silence, and Quorum	4
Discussion related to Redevelopment of the DCHA Headquarters site and Resolution 19-40	6
Public Comment	107
Vote to Rescind Resolution 19-40	158
Announcements	183
Adiournment	183

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

9:54 a.m.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Good morning.

I do apologize for the lateness. Happy New Year.

Emergency Board meeting, Thursday, January 16,

2020.

Good morning. My name is Franselene St. Jean. I am the Vice Chairman of the Board of Commissioners. I call this meeting to order.

This is an emergency Board meeting of the District of Columbia Housing Authority being held today, January 16, 2020 at DCHA Headquarters, 1133 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, D.C., 20002. The time is actually 9:54. Please silence your cell phones, electronic devices. Thank you.

I would now like to ask for a moment of silence.

(Moment of silence.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: The Board of Commissioners welcomes constituent input on matters of public concern and offers you today an opportunity to express your views including

spirited debates of DCHA's decisions by its management and this Board during the public testimony portion of every meeting, however, we require that members of the public who attend our meetings abide by certain rules of decorum to allow the Board to complete the business before it.

Members of the public cannot engage in any disruptive conduct or loud, threatening or abusive language during Board meetings. This includes loud outbursts or shouting during times when you have not been invited to speak. Anyone who violates these rules will be asked to leave the meeting immediately and be subject to arrest for violation of D.C. laws on disorderly conduct. Serious or repeated violations of the rules may result in you being barred from future Board meetings for a period of at least 60 days. We appreciate your interest in the matters before us today and thank you in advance for abiding by these rules of conduct.

I ask for a roll call to determine a quorum.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Neal

Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Present.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Ortiz?

(No audible response.)

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Present.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner St. Jean?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Present.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner

Strickland?

(No audible response.)

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner

Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Present.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner

Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Present.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Present.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner

Falcicchio?

(No audible response.)

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Forester?

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Here.

MS. GEBREYES: We have a quorum.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. We will begin with a discussion of the agenda and I will look to the Commissioners to see who would like to begin. If a motion -- we can start with the Commissioners if -- who wants to start first?

Commissioner Aquarius, would you like to start first?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Let me put on record that one of the discussions we've been having -- I want to put on record Commissioner Taliaferro's discussion with me. And Commissioner Taliaferro's discussion with me was he was looking out for the seniors in Sursum Corda, TurnKey and Sibley.

And unfortunately, Commissioner, you felt that I was not looking out for my constituents when I voted no to the resolution.

However, I did understand very well that

Commissioner Taliaferro's position was he was looking out for the seniors that live -- you need to speak for yourself.

OUMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I'm looking out for all seniors, just -- not just the seniors I'm under. And the seniors in like the TurnKey and Sibley, they come to me. They have a lot of questions. And I see the concerns they have. Then I call Aquarius that day. Me and her have a long talk about this. And she asked me -- she understand why they -- you know how she says stay in your lane. But all residents is my concern.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Now with that said, I'm the Commissioner that I feel on this Board have the expertise in Northwest One, and one of the reasons why I feel that I'm the Commissioner that have the expertise in Northwest One because me and my grandmother slept on that ground out there when it was Sibley Hospital. And I've always sat on this Board and I told you that my model is Sursum Corda.

I also let you know that Lonnie Duran

is one of my advisors and I also inform that out of all of the public housing in the District of Columbia it is the first time that I ever seen a co-op in the District of Columbia that lived its life cycle with the history of the Catholic Church behind it. And when gentrification hit their door, those residents, correct me if I'm wrong, not only did they leave a home over 30-some years, coming from Bates Street, Defrees (phonetic) Street, Pierce Street under urban removal, renewal -- those residents stayed in a co-op along within this life cycle. Not only did they leave with a voucher, a federal voucher, they left with a check.

And if I'm wrong, can anybody on this dais correct me? If I'm not wrong -- I've been on the dais and I let it be known that it's the model that I have encourage all public housing residents to model after. It is and it was a success.

Some of the outstanding issues that I have is -- I can only speak for myself. I read the resolution. I may be the only person in the

District of Columbia that have the original Commission Blue Book under Marion. So I read. And if anybody that's come on this Board -- and everybody on this Board, we come from different backgrounds. I live in public housing. I live off a stipend, and I've lived off this stipend for 13 years. And it was the only way that I could understand this housing market.

When I came on this Board I had to learn language, real estate language. I had to learn math all over again. And if I have a team on this Board, that team would be -- I shouldn't have to have to do everything. This team, when we come together we should be coming together as a puzzle and everybody have a expertise because we all have a constituents group that we represented.

I voted no and I understood my input.

I wanted to see the five bedrooms on this property.

As a matter of fact, Councilmember Silverman is sitting in here today and when she stated to Tyrone Garrett that he had a Housing Authority that he could sell, it's a wonder I didn't get put out of

the Council that day because I said no, we will not sell 1133.

If you or anybody else keep coming in this town and you want to organize, you want to sit on the bench, you want to do this, you want to do that -- but I'm going to tell you what none of you all do: You do not respect the culture of the communities here. I am a Washingtonian and I am very territorial.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you, Commissioner Aquarius.

Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: She already said -- I said my part already.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Council?

(No audible response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Neal Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes, I just wanted to say like certainly this is a process that

involves a great deal of complexity, a great deal of emotion and a great deal of trust. And I do want to say that I am concerned about the conversation that happened here before the vote really around the level of federal subsidy that was required.

no additional federal subsidy, I think that would have been accurate, but I think the language as I remember it was there won't be any federal subsidy. I don't think that it's uncommon to have this kind of financial structure as what we're talking about. I do think that it's really important to be transparent at every step of the way.

And so I do want to encourage our staff to be cognizant of that. As you're explaining information, especially when you say there's no federal subsidy involved, like tell us exactly where you think the money is coming from and how that's going to work. And I just don't think it was done in this case and there was no -- not yet. Maybe I'm hoping to hear more about that today, but it sounds like it was the plan to actually layer

those subsidies. That was the plan from the beginning. And so I think just to have some clarity around that would be good.

The other pieces from me I think that I would like to hear a little more about is really around the building of the headquarters. Really I know that in the terms of this resolution there's a three-and-a-half-year like lease back period if we need it in about a year-and-a-half before that starts.

And so what I'd like to know more from the team about is really what has been done? What has DCHA done to this point that gives us some level of -- that's demonstrated that this course of action is feasible at the costs that are being talked about in this deal and how do we know that to be true based on the past performance of the Agency?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you, Neal Jones.

Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes, I

appreciate the opportunity to say a few things.

I want to start off by saying that -I want to sort of echo some of those comment earlier
about sort of the trust and sort of what it is that
we're doing here as an agency and who we're serving
and are we doing what we say we're going to do. And
I think that was -- a lot of the conversation in
December was about sort of the stark departure from
what we -- a Board five years earlier had put out
in terms of what they wanted to see happen on this
site and how it was -- how that narrative was bent,
for lack of a better word, to fit what we ended up
doing.

And so I want to walk through what I see as the three major components to what Resolution 19-40 speaks to, and that is the -- this site that we're on right now, which is 1133 North Capitol, and really trying to get -- there was so much missing information and so much stuff that's still coming in that we aren't able to talk about because it's still an actively being- negotiating deal.

That alone is a problem for me as a Board

member because my fiduciary responsibility is to understand actually what it is that I'm approved. And so I have a hard time fulfilling that obligation if I'm approving a concept that could change materially in a lot of different directions in the future.

So it's about -- the three components are the value of 1133 North Capitol, the amount of subsidy that DCHA is putting in; if you want to call it subsidy or something else, the amount of land value we're discounting to achieve the affordability that we're getting, and sort of how the value of that land was arrived at.

And then the second piece is the actual affordability on the site. Who is it going to serve, how are people going to access it, and how is it going to be supported for the 99-year lease? We keep hearing this affordability is going to run with the lease for 99 years. That's a long, long time, longer than any of us will be here. And so the question is how do you put -- how do you -- how can you assure that that's going to be the case?

So I didn't get enough information to fully understand how that's going to work.

And then to the headquarters. The headquarters was supposed to be on this site. It was supposed to be part of the deal. We were supposed to not be exposed to the construction risk guarantee that we always shy away from as to why we need to bring in co-developers. We don't have the balance sheet to support this. We don't have this. But here we are exposing ourselves to construction risk guarantees in the future.

And then the unusual lease back situation for staying in this building, which five years ago we deemed beyond its useful life and yet this resolution will keep us here for another five years. So 10 years from when we stated it was no longer habitable we're going to be here. So I have a series of questions which I hope we can get answered.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you. Oh, sorry.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, can I go

through them?

So with regards to the value of 1133 North Capitol, can you tell me how you arrived at the value for the lease price?

MR. GARRETT: So, Commissioners, I'm going to ask that my team come up front, both Senthil, the Director of OCP and also Tanner Dudley, who's our consultant working with HR&A, and we'll explain that.

I just want to get us started by also recognizing Commissioners and the public as I think some Commissioners did see the article that I wrote in reference to housing authorities having to actually reinvent themselves going forward if we want to continue our mission of providing affordable housing to all communities throughout the District.

And in saying that, the one thing that we need to note is that we have -- we're looking at a piece of property -- and I remember, and I think we all do remember Commissioner Slover himself talking about utilizing the value of this

particular property in a manner that would allow us to support other endeavors that we might be moving towards. I think that was the gist of his commentary at one of our previous Board meetings.

In saying that, this particular project, this particular parcel of land cannot solve all of our issues. We identified it and tried to give a description to it as being a pie, and that pie having to be cut in different pieces in order to support the things that the -- the mission of the Housing Authority directly.

In saying that, there are going to be gives and takes where we are able to create affordable housing, where we are able to create a headquarters that can administer the programs that we need to administer in behalf of our residents. In addition our ability to support our Transformation Plan, which is those next 15 to 20 years that we've been talking about intensely over the last seven to eight months.

So the idea of this particular concept that we are approaching is creative in nature, yes,

but it has to be creative because we're trying to solve for multiple things all at once. And in addition we need to be able to also leverage other properties and other projects that we have in the pipeline in order to get things done. And the reason I say that is my discussion about 1133 when I first came on board has come full circle where I believe that this the better deal, the better opportunity for the Housing Authority moving forward.

In addition, when we talk about 882 South, which is the location that we are intensely looking at being а location for our new headquarters site, started having we conversation on 882 prior to starting to work on any new concepts for 1133, meaning that was something that I needed to do, that's something that I did directly engaging the current developers that are already there to see what their appetite was to work with us to get this done. And that was my responsibility to make some of these happen and get the ball rolling.

And I remember at the November meeting we talked about how the Housing Authority -- our pace in terms of moving forward with some of our initiatives were slow. I heard the Board. I heard Commissioner Slover. I heard everyone loud and clear. And we picked up the pace because we know how important this is. Time is -- not only time for us is a funding issue along with the fact that our residents need us. And the longer we take to move things forward and make presentations and get buy-in the longer our residents are out there without our true support.

And the last thing: We talked about trust. I ask that the Board have faith in myself and my administration to get this done, to move this forward. I believe we have the capability. And I don't put out failure before we have even started. That is not something that I look at. That is not something I put on my staff.

We believe that we can get all of the things necessary to help our residents and improve their lives as quickly as possible. We believe we

can get this done over the next five years. In less than that actually because -- Senthil and Tanner will go through that. But I believe that this is a positive approach for this particular transaction.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And what is the advantage for 1133 to be in Ward 6?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: We have to go --

VICE CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Can we --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I apologize.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes, thank you. So can we get back to the --

PARTICIPANT: Can we go through the questions?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Can Commissioner Slover read all of his questions so it can be in the record so -- and everybody else talk so we can have a dialogue, please? That's why I came here today.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And I want to be --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I didn't come here to just sit.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- respective of everybody's time --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- so I'm going to try and get through this as quickly as possible.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No problem.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Can you tell me how you arrived at the lease price for 1133 North Capitol?

MR. SANKARAN: Good morning.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Good morning.

MR. SANKARAN: Senthil Sankaran,
Director of Office of Capital Programs. Can
everyone hear me?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: Okay. Good. I think it's important as we talk about the process of how

2.3

we arrived at this value that we also understand of -- a little bit -- as Commissioner Slover had indicated, a little bit of the history of this project. And it has evolved over time and I would say that that's how I would characterize it. It is an evolution.

The earlier iterations also included a headquarters and a service center being separate and off site. And the Executive Director, as part of his mission, saw both of those things as being integral parts working together and needed to be retained together. So that also has an impact in terms of the size of the operation that we're looking to accommodate.

So as this deal evolved earlier iterations also had lower levels of affordability as being — this was not a deal in order to maximize affordability and it was more to maximize financial value. And I believe the last iteration of the deal had either seven or eight percent of units being affordable at a higher income and I'll — that would go up to 80 percent of the AMI.

So as we approached this with a fresh set of eyes we had three primary objectives that we had come to put forward: One was to provide for a new headquarters with no out-of-pocket expense to the Authority; deliver 20 percent affordable units to serve residents at a 0 to 60 percent AMI band, which is lower than what was previously prescribed; and then having additional funds that would be remainders to fund other priorities of the Authority.

And think it's important Ι to understand that these are all competing goals that come at a cost to a project. So as you adjust one goal -- so if you look at it as one pie, as you adjust one, it comes out of another piece of the pie. we believe as a team that we've come and put together and presented a plan that achieves the balance of those objectives. And to answer your question, Commissioner, with that primary objective of the 20 -- one of those primary objectives was the 20-percent constraint on value. We gave specific directions for appraisers that the

same appraisal language that was used both on -both by the developer and by us to arrive at a value
for 1133.

appreciate your answer. I have a lot of questions so I can't have that much response. I just want to get specific answers to my specific questions. I understand you needed to go through the history of all that, but how did you arrive at the price?

MR. SANKARAN: So we engaged in a three-appraisal process in order to arrive at the price. And like I said, with the specific directions that were provided the developer --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Let me ask more specifically why was there not an actual number in the resolution? You said there was a floor number that couldn't move up.

MR. SANKARAN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Why did you -- is it --

MR. SANKARAN: So --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I guess let me just ask you the question. You don't have all the appraisals? The point is you don't have all the appraisals, right?

MR. SANKARAN: No. No, we actually -- I can speak to the third appraisal now if you allow me.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, before -
I'm talking about when the resolution was done -
MR. SANKARAN: At the time of the resolution we had --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- you didn't have all the appraisals? Right?

 $$\operatorname{MR.SANKARAN}:$$  We had our appraisal and the developer's.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Why did you feel the need to bring the resolution forward without --

MR. SANKARAN: We felt --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- all the information?

MR. SANKARAN: -- comfortable bringing

it forward because we were able to establish the --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MR. SANKARAN: -- floor price and we had limited our down side. We knew it would not go below that price.

me the amount that we are contributing to the deal via land cost deductions? In other words, whatever that number is you arrived at is less than a larger number. So it's an important number because you keep saying it's what subsidizing the land values, what's subsidizing the affordability. So what is the number?

MR. DUDLEY: Mr. Slover, just to clarify your understanding, what is market value in this --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. DUDLEY: -- neighborhood versus what is 20 percent at 60 percent --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, isn't that

### NEAL R. GROSS JRT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIE

what the --

MR. DUDLEY: Each of the --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- land discount

would be?

MR. DUDLEY: Yes, exactly.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MR. DUDLEY: And each of the appraisers obviously comes at this a different approach, but I think I can say generally speaking that in this neighborhood \$100 per FAR, for gross floor area foot is market for this neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So it's a 25 percent discount?

MR. DUDLEY: Based off of 20

percent --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Thirty percent discount. It's a 30 percent discount on the land, which still doesn't come to a number. So it's \$25 times 993,000 FAR square feet. So 25 million bucks?

MR. DUDLEY: That's \$25 million.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So a \$25 million subsidy from the Housing Authority? Okay.

Do you have updated financials on our development partner, MRP?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: You want to --

MR. GARRETT: I just wanted -- could you just -- Commissioner Slover asked a question in reference to the appraisals. I just wanted you to go just a little bit deeper with what we found with the third appraisal that came out that we had. And remember just -- I know he doesn't want us to go into full explanation, but the reason that we did the third appraisal was because we wanted to ensure that we were maximizing the value and opportunity here at this particular site.

MR. DUDLEY: Just to -- I think to reiterate the process was that each party secured an appraiser with the same appraisal guidance based off of 20 percent at 60 percent AMI. A third appraiser was selected neutrally by those two appraisers. They picked that -- there were three

of them. They picked the third person that was available to do it on -- basically within the constraints of our requirements. They came back with a value that was at \$65 per FAR foot.

So recall we had a number at -- our appraisal said 75. The developer said 65. That third appraisal came in at 65. Since the floor was in effect of \$70 per \$0.50 FAR foot, the floor was effect. So therefore we are at \$67 million which is --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. SANKARAN: And that was something that was negotiated by us ahead of time to have a floor. A typical standard procedure would actually be an average of three appraisals which would actually have put us lower than the floor that we've established.

MR. GARRETT: Right. So, Commissioner Slover, when we brought the resolution forward we could do no worse than \$70 a square -- 70 a square foot. So our anticipation was if it went up, there would be a win, an

additional source for the Housing Authority.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I understand that, Mr. Garrett, but the bigger point I'm driving to is after five years what was the hurry? Why couldn't you wait until you got all your information? And I guess that that's a decision you made and that's my response to that.

Did you -- do you have updated financials on our development partner because we are expecting a pretty significant payment from them in the not-too-distant future. So what do we do as an agency to sort of understand their balance sheet and their ability to pay?

MR. SANKARAN: So I don't have current financials, but I know in earlier -- prior to the developer selection and the process that the developer's capability was verified and this is an established development firm that has developed tens of thousands of units.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So three, four years ago when we picked them was the last time --

MR. SANKARAN: Again I don't know when the last -- I can go --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- anybody

checked their financials, according to you?

MR. SANKARAN: I can let you know when the latest --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So you don't -you have -- since you've been on you haven't seen
anything?

MR. SANKARAN: Well, I've been here --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No, I get that.

I'm just asking. You're the lead --

MR. SANKARAN: No, I -- since I've been here, no, I --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right. You're in charge of the process. You're the lead guy.

MR. SANKARAN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm just asking

you. You haven't seen their financials?

MR. SANKARAN: I have not seen their

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

financials, no.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. Why is that you are not -- what's the max FAR square feet available on site?

MR. DUDLEY: So our team engaged an architect to take a look at that and see. Since we're in a D-5 zone where there's -- it's really -- you can build quite a bit, you could probably build a little over a million square feet of gross floor area, which is --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. DUDLEY: -- Mr. Slover, it's above what has been anticipated by the developer. And in a lot of cases developers will choose to under-build in certain parts of the site as a result of design. From our perspective obviously we want to maximize that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. DUDLEY: We want to get as much as we possibly can. So it's -- and I'll just -- I think what you're getting at is how are we not being compensated --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Correct.

MR. DUDLEY: -- for that? As part of the process we're ensuring that if anything is built above the 960,600 gross floor area, which is contemplated in the OI --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

 $\label{eq:mr.def} \mbox{MR. DUDLEY: } \mbox{ -- we would be compensated}$  for that.

MR. SANKARAN: I also think it's important to know as to a part of what shapes that and you -- to use the term under-build, is that for when they will be building on Phase I of that site, which is the front lawn, they also have to accommodate an existing user, where they have to accommodate space needs and everything. So there are -- it's how you can be -- it can be carved up.

But in our deal we have captured that anything that would be -- because the 900-and -- we have also established that the 960-some-thousand square feet is a reasonable -- is use of that space in terms of how it would developed and that any additional FAR that would

be captured, those -- we would be compensated for.

MR. GARRETT: So just -- I think -- and so if anyone has any -- just a quick question about that -- so again --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No, we want -- well, we would like --

MR. GARRETT: I think if they build -if they should build more units, Commissioner
Vann-Ghasri, we would receive a benefit.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Let me tell you what we'll like. We want Commissioner Slover to get all his questions on the record. We want whoever he need to answer his questions and the rest of us want to talk, because I did not come here today just to sit. I do have some other questions.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I should not have been the first person to call. Maybe it should have been Commissioner Slover so -- because it could have a better flow than what we're doing.

MR. GARRETT: Well, I apologize. I'm trying to get through this.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No, no, no. You're absolutely correct.

MR. GARRETT: So --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: We should have started out --

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- so that the flow would have been good by the time -- COMMISSIONER SLOVER: My bad.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- we got}$  to my end.

So basically we're underselling the site? Traditionally --

MR. SANKARAN: I would not characterize --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So traditionally you would sell -- if you build a million FAR square feet, you sell a million FAR square feet. if they decided to build less, that's

their choice.

So moving onto the number of affordable units I think we've gone around on this one. I think there was a lot of confusion at the December meeting about what was being agreed to, what was not being agreed to. And I just would ask a very simple question: When the Commissioners were asking the resolution to be amended at the December Board meeting what did you think people were asking for around the 30 percent AMI? What did you hear?

MR. GARRETT: Commissioner Slover, I heard exactly what I repeated on the record, that -- and what was put in the resolution, printed in the resolution was that we would target units at 0 -- we would target residents at 0 to 30 percent AMI upon their -- for their return back to the project.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But I'm pretty sure that's what the resolution already stated. And so that's not an amendment. I guess my point is you had already articulated that that was the intended goal. And so again I ask you -- because that was a big thing. And so what I heard was

people asking to be assured that 30 percent AMI folks would be in the building through a guarantee and I don't think that's what was delivered. And that was a big thing that you and I went back — around and around and around on. And so I just — I want to get that on the record, if that's what you thought. Is there an issue?

MS. ANDREWS: I was asked to just come up in case there were questions about the amendment. The prior version did not have the language in regards to targeting 0 to 30, but I think your question should still be responded to.

In regards to what was amended there was a provision added to target 0 to 30 as well as to add five three-bedroom units to the resolution.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: There were some other amendments.

MS. ANDREWS: Yes. Yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So maybe you should put all of them on the record so we can

speed this along.

MS. ANDREWS: Those were the two amendments, Commissioner, that were added.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.

So --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So there was -there were no reference -- anyway, let's go to the
office building.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Finish,

Commissioner Slover.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Finish.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, I -- look,

I just think there's so much -- I don't want to say deception, but either you're going to guarantee that people with 30 percent AMI are coming in the building or you're not. And this Board has been bitten a few times on guarantees for 30 percent AMI residents that don't come through.

And when I started this all far as

talking about -- we need to build trust back with our residents and with our clients and when we do things like this, we're just not building the trust. And so it's about doing what we say we're going to do. And what I heard on this dais was a lot of back and forth. Commissioner Strickland said I just want to make sure that everybody out there who doesn't understand the language up here recognizes that we are looking out for the 30 percent AMI residents.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Correct.

percent AMI is not looking out for the 30 percent AMI residents. It just isn't. There's not a legal definition. It doesn't mandate or require the developer to put anybody in there. You can direct and push and prod all you want, but if it's not mandated and required, it isn't. And that's as simple as it gets.

MR. SANKARAN: Commissioner, may I respond to that?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. SANKARAN: So to begin with I fully respect and agree with your position, however, I would like to just make sure -- because there --I want to make sure that there is no -- I know you said you don't want to use the word deception, but you did put that on the record and I want to make sure it's clear there was no intent to deceive. And it is very much -- this is -- we've put forth a deal that we are -- that we think is a fair deal for the Authority. And I think it's also important the intent of that word was also to -when we say targeting 30 percent of AMI units, it is putting the Authority in the position in order In a typical process where a to manage that. developer can just do -- that you set that minimum and it's 0 to 60 and then like -- we are the referring authority, so we're taking on that responsibility and taking on a role that different.

And so I just want to make sure it's clear that when we're talking about intent that that's also important as you understand is what our

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

intent, and there's no intent to deceive. And --

MR. GARRETT: And in addition we are also not only just referring residents and targeting and identifying the residents to move into the new property, but we're also going to manage that process throughout the time frame of affordability. So for those 99 years it would be the responsibility of the Housing Authority not only to ensure that residents are referred and placed, but also to monitor to ensure that that continues on an ongoing basis. That will be our responsibility versus putting that responsibility on the developer.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: All right.

Can I say --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. I just want to have respect to Councilmember Silverman being here at a Board of Commissioners meeting and for that to piggyback on the new resolution. So I recommend when we do a resolution that is amended we are not going to vote on it until we see the

draft. Okay?

MR. SANKARAN: Procedurally I don't -(Simultaneous speaking.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: I understand that. I'm just -- OGC is here so she's listening to what I'm saying.

And then again on the resolution it says targeting. So 89 percent of our portfolio is 0 to 30 percent AMI. So when you say targeting I think the language should have been changed to say guaranteed, not targeting.

MR. SANKARAN: So I also -- the resolution also -- and then the intent of a lot of this, as per the original covenant that we were modifying, is also for returning residents of the Northwest One area which also include DCHA residents at Sursum, TurnKey Town Homes, Sibley Town Homes, former Temple Courts. And I think Director Garrett can speak a little bit to the make up of those, but those are not exclusively 0 to 30 percent AMI residents and we want to make sure that we are capturing that initial intent to serve those

returning residents.

And so if we were to say exclusively 0 to 30 percent, just understand that then we would be turning our backs on those folks that these were also intended to serve.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. So what is affordable housing? Do the definition of affordable housing -- how Commissioners -- what is affordable housing? What's the definition?

MR. SANKARAN: There are tiers of affordable housing. There's extremely low-income, low-income -- So explain to -- so on our portfolio today how much -- those tiers -- what is the brackets, what are the numbers?

MR. SANKARAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I don't have our --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay.

MR. SANKARAN: -- entire portfolio, Commissioner. But generally speaking affordable housing is 80 percent and below and then --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Eighty percent?

MR. SANKARAN: Then -- within 80 percent AMI. And then within that 80 percent and below there are tiers based upon income levels of 0 to 30, 30 to 50, 50 to 60, 60 to 80, you know things like that.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So what's a affordable unit that's going to be on 1133? It's exclusively voucher, correct? That's the funding source?

MR. SANKARAN: So 0 -- so --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So I'm asking you -- I'm just asking you a straightforward question.

MR. SANKARAN: And I'm answering in the most --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay.

MR. SANKARAN: -- straightforward way possible.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: It is being covenanted from 0 to 60 percent of AMI, however, the -- we have established a mechanism by which we can also

include 0 to 30 percent AMI units utilizing folks with vouchers, which a lot of these folks -- most of these folks that are --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Right, have vouchers.

MR. SANKARAN: -- residents of Northwest One that are leaving are voucher residents.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Correct.

MR. SANKARAN: So they are coming back.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Correct.

MR. SANKARAN: But then also they are coming -- and before there's an intimation of like double-subsidizing or anything like that --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. SANKARAN: -- clear, let us understand that we have written these values -- the land value down as we indicated during our conversation about the appraisal to a 60 percent AMI level. And as such we are also capping the contract rents of those vouchers at the 60 percent

AMI level.

And for an example what that would mean is in a typical -- and, Tanner, please correct me if I'm --

MR. DUDLEY: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: -- stating anything incorrectly, but a typical voucher holder pays their proportion of --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: -- whatever they can pay. And say if it's zero, the voucher covers from 0 to whatever the fair market rent is on a unit.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: When you're coming into one of these affordable units bringing a voucher, that will be capped at 60 percent of AMI contract rent. So for example for some of the five three-bedroom units that we've secured per the recommendation of the Board --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: -- in that resolution, that rent is \$4,000 a month, I believe, in the Old

City 2 market and the 60 percent AMI contract rent is \$1,600 a month. So they would be coming back. And then the developer would only be able to receive that \$1,600 a month contract rent.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So what's the --

MR. SANKARAN: So that \$2,400 difference is a savings to the Authority on a monthly basis. While that same voucher holder, if they were in a market rate unit across the street the Authority would be paying \$4,000 a month. So that savings is actually something that we're able to capture by controlling this process here of the referrals, and we actually think is a responsible use of overall funds for the Authority.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Can I -- I haven't finished yet. There's no guarantee for that. That's the problem. That's where it all breaks down. And I heard Mr. Garrett say he's going to ensure that people get placed. I don't see the mechanism to ensure that they get placed. I can see the mechanism to refer -- they get

referred and suggested and hope and pray and all the rest, but many of us won't be here when this actually happens.

And so what is the guarantee? I just -it gets down to the brass tacks of the situation
which is there's no guarantee. We can hope that
everybody does the right thing down the line, but
without a guarantee -- and your whole notion of
you're going to box people out that aren't in the
30 percent AMI is I think just -- we could force -we could say there's a requirement for 50 of the
units 30 AMI, 50 percent -- there's way to get
around.

To wholesale suggest that we can't mandate that 30 percent AMI units are X number because we don't want to like preclude other people from getting in gets to this disingenuous aspect of things, which is you can do a lot of different things.

MR. SANKARAN: But because you're -- again to use the word disingenuous I find -- and we're talking about intent. Let's make sure

that's not -- I don't want that -- there's no intention to be disingenuous here.

If -- from -- again going back to my pie analogy, if you are saying 0 to 30 percent AMI unassisted, meaning without a voucher --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We're not even talking about unassisted AMI.

MR. SANKARAN: No, no. Okay. Well then I think it can be said. If you --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But -- well, why don't you do it? That's at issue.

MR. SANKARAN: It's like then --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Why would we have to ask?

MR. SANKARAN: -- if we are saying specifically with a voucher of 0 to 30 percent of AMI, that is something that can be done as -- and -- because then we're able to contract rent at 60 percent --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Excuse me though --

MR. SANKARAN: -- and it doesn't change

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the other pieces of the pie.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- the voucher -- the 30 percent non-assisted thing left the building months ago.

MR. SANKARAN: Okay. Well then -
COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No one's been talking about that. Nobody's been talking

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. SANKARAN: -- wrong. I think we're --

un-subsidized at 30 percent AMI. Is that what you think we're talking about?

SLOVER:

COMMISSIONER

MR. SANKARAN: Well, I -- that was part of the conversation.

MR. SANKARAN: That was part of the conversation in the December -- so --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I get that, but

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

about --

there is still no 0 to 30 percent AMI unassisted, even in your scenario. Right? So why do you keep referring to it?

MR. SANKARAN: Because I felt that that was part of the conversation you're saying. I am saying right now this deal will stand as hold if it were to be amended to say 0 to 30 percent, X number of units 0 to 30 percent of AMI assuming that they are coming with a voucher to get to 60 percent of AMI.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And the real question becomes why didn't you do that to begin with? But I'm going to move on because I want to get people's time.

Let's get back to -- let's get to the office building. So where -- how did you come up with the approximated \$14 million rent back number to stay in this building for three-and-a-half years? What is it based on?

MR. DUDLEY: The \$14 million is based off of the dollar amount of the Phase II on this site, which is this -- the footprint of where this

building is sitting based off of a cost that is associated with -- to hold that land on the -- from the developer side.

So when you look at that dollar amount of the \$14 million and you compare that to what you'd be paying for Class C space, it's around \$30 a square foot, which is consistent with Class C space. And I think the --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And --

MR. DUDLEY: -- goal was to make -- oh.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No, this is going to be -- I want some focus on this.

MR. DUDLEY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Class C space would not -- how much cap ex you think this building needs today?

MR. DUDLEY: In speaking with I think of the team we've understood that there are some acquired investments that would need to be made over the next several years and we understand that it could be --

MR. SANKARAN: And decisions would be

made. If we were to be here for a longest terms, larger investments would be made. If we were going to be here for three-and-a-half to five years, then there's different investments. So I think we would continue upon, for lack of a better term, the Band-Aid approach to keep it going because we do want to put large amounts of capital investment if we know we're going to be relocating residents.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Did you consider looking at swing space --

MR. SANKARAN: So --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- for the market, for the --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SANKARAN: Do you want to speak to the --

MR. DUDLEY: Yes, I think --

MR. SANKARAN: We did evaluate that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. DUDLEY: -- before the -- there -- you're -- you were right to say that you could get space for a shorter lease period in our last

meeting.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MR. DUDLEY: That's true. It is possible. It could be done. There's a decision to not move the entire Authority twice. I did -- we didn't say this last time, but there would be a movement into temporary space and then a movement again into a new headquarters. So --

MR. SANKARAN: From a policy and operational standpoint that did not seem to be something that would be advisable.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: If it costs twice as much money --

MR. SANKARAN: Well again, and I also did want to be clear; and, Tanner, you can speak a little bit to it, I think intimating that it would cost twice as much money is not -- I don't an accurate depiction --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, we don't know.

MR. SANKARAN: -- because one of the -- sorry. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We don't know because there's a triple net aspect to a building that's deteriorating. And so my point is --

MR. SANKARAN: And just to be clear -COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- you could

MR. SANKARAN: it's not a true triple net because the developer is responsible for paying insurance and taxes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. So the real issue is the infrastructure. So you would --

MR. SANKARAN: I would --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- shield yourself from that. So you would limit your financial exposure if you moved to a different site for three-and-a-half years, you would improve -- everyone thinks this building is falling down. The reason we need to move out is because it's not a great work environment. You'd solve a lot of problems.

So I just wish you'd come back as part

fix --

of this and said here's the analysis and this is the cost benefit analysis for staying here and these are the reasons to do it. For us to swallow for carrying the cost the developer three-and-a-half years while we sit here isn't one that's -- is there any holdover language? if we're for we're here for here three-and-a-half years, what happens to the rent?

MR. SANKARAN: So at that point it's at the option of the Authority to either look at additional swing space somewhere else -- and then we have some language as to -- because let's just -- it's important to understand the only reason this -- and we're calling it a lease back, but it's not a traditional lease back, right?

A traditional lease back would be over a long period of time and where the residing entity like the -- in this case the Authority would be leasing it, true leasing it back. Here what we're doing is we are leveraging the private dollars who are paying us for land that we are sitting on so that we can then go and build somewhere else.

So if there was enough value in just the front lawn, we would stay here and not close on the capitalized lease payment for this building, if there was enough on that front lawn alone to where we can take the cash, get the affordability and go build somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MR. SANKARAN: So therefore that -- we're leveraging that value in order to do that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So I think the lease payment is exorbitant and exposes the Agency to a lot of unknown expenses that could have been capped and we could have fixed our exposure in a different site. But I'm going to move on to the office building.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Slover, just a moment.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Just in your expert opinion, Tanner, do you think that the lease back dollar amount is consistent with what the market is driving here in the District now?

MR. DUDLEY: I think if we're talking

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

about Class C space within close proximity to the Metro and with parking in the back, I think you're talking about a price that is reasonable for that three-and-a-half-year period. And I just want to note --

MR. SANKARAN: I would argue with that three-and-a-half-year period we're actually below market.

MR. DUDLEY: And there would be no escalations during that time.

And I just want to clarify, Mr. Slover, that the -- there still is flexibility for -- to decide not to do that if it was not financially advantageous to the Authority to go identify swing space, and therefore that would be -- we would be credited back any of that \$14 million.

MR. SANKARAN: And our team is protecting against also for the fact that if by some chance the development partner does not move forward on Phase I, that time tolls against us. So we don't start paying unless they have commenced construction on that --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

opened the door on this -- I was moving on, but since you reopened the door, do we need all the square feet in here, because we're going into 66,000 square feet. So if we were to lease off site, it would be significantly less and there would be no problems that exist in the building, it would be more efficient space. There's a lot -- you can cut this both ways.

What you didn't do was bring forward to the Board an analysis other than this, and that's what as a Board member I would like to see. I would like to see that something that may cost us \$20-25 million -- who knows, we might end up putting an elevator in. Got to get up. I don't know. That wouldn't be on us if we were in a different space.

That is a decision that I would have liked to have been privy to and understood what went into those choices. Again, a piece of information that was not provided to the Board. And it's our responsibility to look at all those things. And

I continue to sit on this Board and I continue to ask for more information. And this is a great example of a lack of information for me to be comfortable with my decision. That's a comment, not a question.

So I want to move onto the office building. Why are we -- what -- so the 882. So where did you come up with the \$40 million?

MR. DUDLEY: It's a rough estimate of costs on the high end of what we'd anticipate for the space that the Authority has currently estimated that would --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Is the price quaranteed?

MR. DUDLEY: I cannot say that the price is guaranteed?

MR. SANKARAN: No, not at this space. We have not entered into any guarantee --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Are we going to bid out the construction work and the development partner?

MR. SANKARAN: Will we? Or are you saying are we?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Are we going to?

MR. SANKARAN: I mean, yes, we have an existing development partner and then -- and we can speak off line and on in the --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Why do we have existing development partner?

MR. SANKARAN: So the site that we're looking at we have -- is -- there's a existing development partner for these parcels.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: They have control of the site?

MR. SANKARAN: They have -- and we've also undertaken a master planning study for these sites, and that also includes commercial use on this site --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No, no. I want to get down to who controls the site right now?

MR. SANKARAN: So I mean the Housing

Authority. It is a Housing Authority-owned site --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. SANKARAN: -- but we have a development partner --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Are we looking for different development partners who might give us a better deal?

MR. SANKARAN: Well, we haven't. I mean when I mean you say a better deal, how are -- what are you saying that -- better against what?

Because we have --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I guess what they're offering.

MR. SANKARAN: So we are currently doing our due diligence on that parcel and negotiating with the development partner and which, as we said, we would be bringing that strategy to the Board as to -- but and then you can say maybe a better deal, but then you -- there's no -- I don't think it's fair to say that a better

deal compared to what --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right, that's the point.

PARTICIPANT: So we already --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'd like a comparison.

PARTICIPANT: But we already have a procured developer on that site.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, why do we have a procured developer.

MR. SANKARAN: So one of the advantages of working with a procured development partner, an established -- an office partner at that as well, is that we then from a timing standpoint are helping to manage the risk here as well. So this was a -- this is a conscious decision.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: There's different partners.

MR. SANKARAN: No, but we're managing the risk in terms of like if we have a lease back scenario here within five years from -- say roughly

five years from today, right, and we can reduce our, as you said, exposure here today by leveraging a site that we can move forward on quickly and not having to procure a new development partner and move fast where we've already gone through a process to procure someone, that -- it is an advantageous situation for the Authority.

MR. GARRETT: Saves time, correct?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But, no, I would fundamentally disagree with that. We have -- you're in the same spot right now. 882 is owned and controlled by the Housing Authority.

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We could go to three different people and say here's what we want to do; give us an offer.

MR. GARRETT: But we already have a procured developer.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, why do we} $$ \mbox{have -- we in --} $$$ 

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Is there any consequence?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- December 12th -- wait a minute. Hold on. Resolution 18-37 we spent \$300,000 to master plan Squares 739, 768 and 882. If we had a procured developer, why would we spend \$300,000 master planning the site?

MR. SANKARAN: To ensure --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We don't have a procured developer.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  SANKARAN: The original master plan is --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We don't have a procured developer.

MR. SANKARAN: -- 15-plus years old. (Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: First of all we need know this: When it comes to that pre-developed -- that particular person, we need to start from the beginning with this, because see, this started from Mr. Kelly's administration. Then it went with Adrian's administration. Then it went fast forward here. Now I'm going to put this on record: First and foremost,

Northwest One did not have any public housing. The only public housing it ever had in Northwest One is when they had Sibley, when they had Sibley Town Houses and then they had Sursum Corda, the TurnKey.

Everything that was called 30 percent affordable-ability in Northwest One was vouchers. Temple Court; I cannot remember how many units was in there, but all those people have the right to return. And I'm not sure whether or not Golden Rule Temple Courts Town Houses is still included in this deal because at one point in time they were in this deal, too.

Now either By The Way sold that particular -- Temple Courts Town Houses in order for them to build what they build next door -- because By The Way own Temple Courts. I mean Temple, the high rise that we're speaking of. Okay?

So now By The Way, yes, the same place where the little girl get murdered and brought all of this about, Mayor Williams got involved with, all of that was project-based or it was all voucher.

All of those people that lived there has the right to return here. There was nowhere in the plan ever discussion of 100 percent traditional public housing. And that's what the problem this Board have and the people in the city.

Now what I got a problem with is because you were there working on the mayor's side when we was doing this -- Neal Jones was in New Communities and Neil Albert was also the deputy at that time. So when I make decisions, I have to make decisions on looking at what is there and doing it like a map and connecting my dots to come to a conclusion. And I have asked all of my constituents to do the same, but nobody seem to do that. So we all take all this long time discussing.

The bottom line is -- what I want to know is about the contract. I don't understand and I -- and that's another reason why I voted no -- I've never seen anywhere where a person is the contractor on a deal and they stay the contractor on the dealings how many years later. That makes me think it's personal. If somebody that's on that

development team, somebody must don't like -- when somebody on that development team that wanted to work very thoroughly with the Housing Authority and they said, well, I'm in partnership with you, I'm the development team, I'm going to keep the contract, but the not doing nothing.

Then all of a sudden the same people -- still the same, the contractor. So I'm under the impression that it's something personal with somebody, even the Council, the mayor, I don't know what it is, you got a problem with the contractor -- I mean the developer.

As a Commissioner I have always asked from the time I got on this Board why we cannot talk to developers. That's transparency to me.

Okay. So now we never can talk to developers. We

always have to get secondhand language.

And then I'm going just bust everybody out because I'm a star, the members on this Board who have also worked for the mayor, and they were the ones who had a problem reading the resolution.

Remember, I live in public housing. I only have

a bachelor's degree from UDC, with a education from Federal City College, with a major in urban study/social planning, and been taught by some of the best to be able to read, comprehend, analyze, review and make a decision. So I got a problem with that.

So now what I suggest and recommend in the near future, Councilmember Silverman, you make Commissioner, sure that there is a DCHA Commissioner school and they learn the language, because I'm going to tell you right now we all don't speak the same language. Thirteen years on this Board, I have actually learned -- and Commissioner Slover have learned both languages. And I can tell when we communicate we're using the same words, but it means something different to us.

So this place was never meant -- I knew why I was voting no. It was never meant for traditional public housing to come on this land because the people who fought for the land, who wanted it here, they were not traditional public housing people. And Ms. Alberta Munman made sure

she was looking out for her Northwest One constituents. And she has a very powerful base. And when you have a very powerful base in this town, it is very hard for somebody to break in.

I have a problem when I'm dialoguing with somebody that work for the mayor and they was on one side, now they on this side. And I don't know, maybe you got a gag order because nobody is talking the way I think somebody is supposed to talk because everybody should be more knowledgeable than us, because we never worked for the mayor and DMPED.

So when you all sit here and then you all fighting Tyrone -- Mr. Garrett just came here. And I want this on record: He's not used to working for a District of Columbia. He's really used to having a governor, a mayor, a congressman, a senator. All he know is the big boy game. And remember, D.C. want to become a state. So what he's doing, he's following trends of real states.

I don't agree with all the trends of the real states. I want to take advantage of being a

municipal corporation and a federal government girl. And I know none of you all got no money and all of you all getting money from the federal government. You hate them today, but you get their money tomorrow because those are those grants that you're using.

Now you have your contractors and your developers. My constituents, we are money to you. We are called tax deductible human beings. That's what we are. So let's accept the fact the way the fact is.

Now what we need to really do with this deal is this: Is the deal going to stay, I can tell you now I'm not changing my vote. I was not incompetent when I voted no. I'm not changing my no because your elements are not going to change either. You will not be building nothing that is 100 percent traditional conventional public housing on this land. I've gotten over it and I'm moving forward.

So now in moving forward where this transparency is, No. 1, let's get real. Half the

people that live in Temple Courts, they not coming back because most of them that was here the household dead. So the question is whether or not you're going to go down to the lease and who was the next lease holder that was -- is now over 21. Are they eligible to get these vouchers to move in here when you build it here?

I'm not tripping on your 99-year lease because they all over Washington, D.C. Pamela Jones is the 99 lease land trust professional. So we all know about that.

Commissioner Slover is absolutely correct about we is the team when this occurred with some guaranteed language. That is the job of this Office of the General Counsel.

The General Counsel Office is the office that's supposed to know how to make English legalese layman, and Commissioner Slover is the only person I can look up to on this Board to see the developer. And then he's an advocate, the advocate Commissioner. So he got two things going. He know how to ask questions and say your

developer world language.

I am tired of sleeping at home, not getting paid -- living off a stipend, getting paid every four months, coming up here and playing games with everybody. So let's stop playing games and let's fix it.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you.

whatever we need to fix, that's what we need to discuss. And that go for the Advocate Group, that go for the Organizing Group. Everybody needs to stop playing. Come up with your own questions. When somebody give you all something to do or answer, do the answer. You don't have too many times.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So the communication -- I'm not going to stop yet. The communication is real easy. If you need a template to know how to talk with money, talk about vouchers -- you talking about traditional public housing that you know that nobody want, and that

includes every president in the United States, and that even included President Obama.

Everybody -- every president have a And any way for any housing authority initiative. to build anything, if they using federal government money, they have to look at their president and find out what initiatives do that president have for money. That's how national housing authorities But they have more pots of money than we work. They can get county money, they can get have. local money, they can bet the feds' money, and then they can also get HUD money. We can't get all those pots. So that's where we need to first try to figure out where is our pots of money coming from and fix this resolution. And the only way it can be fixed, it pass.

so now what we going to do? So we'll need to go back and forth. Now if you're here thinking that you going to overturn it, let's stop playing games. Put the vote on. And if you're not going to overturn it, then put what you need to be put on the record so at another time when we need

to do what we got to do.

Commissioner Slover, please read all of your questions into the minutes whether they are answered or not.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm trying.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Forester is on the phone and she's trying to actually put her questions.

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Hello?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Forester?

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: I'm sorry you guys. Can you hear me?

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes, we could hear you. } % \begin{center} \b$ 

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Okay. I just wanted to say -- I'm in between meetings, so I need to get back in here, but I just wanted to say that because we're having all of these questions and things are coming up, when I was on the dais and when we -- I felt like unifiably expressed concerns around the 30 percent and increasing the number

we amend this bill if we have not taken the fact to developers. Don't -- we have to agree to something? Like we can say this is what we want. How do we know this is actually what we're going to get?

And for that reason with -- the reason why I said let's not vote on this today, let's state the concerns that we have, then come back once they've been addressed to make a decision. So I think here we are today raising the same questions --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I'm not.

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: -- still no answers. And this is the reason why I think myself and others were saying we need to vote to table this until we get these questions answered. So I just want to say that. I'm sorry I'm not there and I can't fully be engaged.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I'm not voting. I'm not incompetent.

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: I will try to

listening, to but I have to get off the phone.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you, Commissioner Forester.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I got a question.

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Thank you.

Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: You all

developers, why they not here?

PARTICIPANT: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Why the developers not here? I was told they would be here.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. So, Commissioners, there's one piece -- and I think Commissioner, Vann-Ghasri, you know this from the FADA trainings for Commissioners. One thing that they talk about is for the governing body to separate itself from actual interaction and engagement with developers until such time everything has been solidified. So that's one reason.

We want to -- you've engaged, you've given the authority to the administration to negotiate with the developer, and that's something that we do. Because what happens in some cases is that -- and I'm not saying it would happen in this particular case, but what is taught to many commissioners across the country is that taking that step you take on the additional responsibility that you not -- might not necessarily be prepared for in trying to engage the development team. You entrust your staff to do that and then they bring you back the information. So that's one of the reasons.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Don't you have -- the problem is --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. GARRETT: Because you can't have two entities negotiating --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: -- Mr. Slover got answers -- Mr. Slover have answers and he can't -- if they can't answer, why can't the

developer answer?

MR. GARRETT: But my staff has been in -- now let's say this --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I mean -- (Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. GARRETT: He has questions; and we all will respectively agree to disagree sometimes, and I think my staff is adequately answering the questions.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: Now if we don't agree with the answers that come back, that's one thing.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: That's one thing.

MR. GARRETT: But I think my staff and I are answering the questions to the best of our ability based on what we have and based on what we've done up to this point and we will do in the future. So and it's always tough --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I understand that.

MR. GARRETT: -- for the -- and the

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

developer themselves, it sets a bad business precedent, Commissioners --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: True. Yes, it does.

MR. GARRETT: -- for the Board to start to negotiate with the developers. And that's something that we wanted to shy away from and would be detrimental to us in the future when we attempt to do business with other entities.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Can I just --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: But I -- let

me finish. But I understand that, but this housing and this building you're building been on the books for a very long time and it's ridiculous, it's very ridiculous everybody going back and forth, back and forth, back and forth. Let's get this project done and get it out the way because it been on the books too long and everybody is around here with their head chopped off. And the resident looking at —the residents are looking at us.

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

MR. SANKARAN: I would agree with you,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I mean it's a point that it's -- is -- if you're going to do it, do it. If you don't, take it off the books.

MR. GARRETT: We're trying to move it forward, Commissioner.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you,
Commissioner Taliaferro.

To piggyback on what you said about the developers, that was my question I raised with Executive Director, why the -- to have the developers be here. And the reason why I did bring that up -- because per -- Chairman Neil Albert discussed to the Council and said that any Commissioner can have a developer present at our meeting. And so you're telling me now for the record that as a subject of concern that we cannot have developers in our meeting or we cannot have a conversation with the developers?

MR. GARRETT: I'm saying that it would be a bad business practice. They could come.

You -- they could come to a public meeting like

this. They could if they wanted to step up to the dais and give comments or -- if they wanted to. But what -- if they -- if that's what they chose. I'm saying that it's a bad business practice to attempt to do that with development partners that we're working with. Also to do it in a forum such as this sets a terrible precedent for us because then it takes away our ability to negotiate effectively. And that's important to us.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay.
Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Are you suggesting that nobody -- that it -- you don't think that the developer shouldn't meet with Board members?

(No audible response.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Deep breath.

MR. GARRETT: No, it's not a deep -it's a -- I understand what you're actually trying
to drive at, and what I'm stating is in this
particular forum here I think it's inappropriate.
And that was Commissioner St. Jean's request, is

that the Board engage the developer in this particular forum. And I said I think that is bad practice.

opened the door to another conversation which said that you don't think that Commissioners should be interacting directly with the developers and negotiating terms and conditions. And I would beg you to explain to me why it is that certain members of this Board have meetings in their offices with you and the developer and the development team that others aren't privy to and aren't allowed to participate in and don't have access to.

MR. GARRETT: Now again, Commissioner Slover, I said that --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It's a different question.

MR. GARRETT: It's a different question, but --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Because you said -- what -- I think what I heard you say was

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

it's bad practice to have Commissioners negotiating. That's your job. And that's what we hired you to do and that's -- and I agree that's what you should do. We should not be necessarily meeting with the developers, but it happened.

MR. GARRETT: And what I was referring to again, and I'm going to clarify for the record, Commissioner St. Jean asked that they appear in this body.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I get that.

MR. GARRETT: And I also stated, yes,
I think it is bad practice for it to happen. But
what Commissioner Albert said was that he thought
that Commissioners should have that ability.

Now if that's something that the Commissioners want, we would have to set it up in a different forum, but it can't be this public forum to do that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm sorry, but Mr. Albert actually responded saying that that wasn't an option for the developer to meet with us because that was your job. So --

MR. GARRETT: He said I believe at the -- my recollection to the best of my knowledge was that he stated that any Commissioner could meet with a developer.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, that's not how -- but that's a whole different thing.

Can I just finish on my 882 thing?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Am I okay?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I

apologize.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes,
Commissioner Slover.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So we were going down the road of why we've committed to a single development partner on --

MR. SANKARAN: That's -- to be clear, we have not committed to a single development partner.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Oh, we've gone --

MR. SANKARAN: I said we're doing due diligence on 882.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It's been described that we have a procured development partner for Square 882 and that we are singularly negotiating with --

MR. SANKARAN: No, that is not the case.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: There were --

MR. SANKARAN: And just to be clear, we're doing our due diligence --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Did we put an RFP out or are we speculating to put an RFP out to ask for the development community to respond to developing our headquarters on Square 882 and what ideas they might have to do that?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  SANKARAN: We would come to you with a strategy on --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Why have we not sought about doing that?

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. SANKARAN: I'm not going to say that we either have or not. We are contemplating what our action is and we're evaluating. And as I mentioned, there's multiple sites, but we're doing heavy due diligence on that site.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So as a Board member my expectation would be that we got multiple bids and offers to do a \$40 million headquarters rebuild. That would be my expectation.

I think what might have been even a better deal was to -- since -- when we decided to do this off site to couple it with the deal we have here so that we limit our exposure on both sides. So you can -- you talked earlier about incentive to make sure that building gets done. We have a different developer here and a different developer here. There's no incentive there.

So I do this for a living. I actually go to cities and advise them on how to undo bad real estate deals. And so one of the things that a lot of people miss is that opportunity. And so I feel like here we have it and we're missing it, because

it wasn't contemplated in the original RFP. That's why. It was supposed to be here on site, which would have done what? Limited our exposure to the new construction, because it would have been imbedded in the deal.

And so I just think that there's so many unknown parts and so many pieces of information that we weren't provided, and this deal was brought to us with not enough information to the point where in the resolution there's a reference to an LOI that was signed between the Agency and the developer.

Why were -- why was the Board not provided a copy of the LOI prior to the vote? The LOI informs a lot of things about how things were arrived at, what's contemplated, what's some of the underlying stuff on -- you just gave us raw numbers and very high overview things that it's hard to understand how you got to. Why wouldn't you just give us the LOI before the vote?

MR. GARRETT: We extracted for the -for resolution and also for the Exhibit A that we
used we extracted from the LOI all the pertinent

information that we thought would be necessary to support the resolution. And we were also able at the Board meeting to be able to answer any questions that you might have.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But I think that's -- the way you responded to that I guess is my issue. So what you thought was important and what you figured was important. I just don't understand why -- since the LOI was dependent upon Board approval why wouldn't you give us the LOI?

MR. GARRETT: Well I mean,

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: That's a simple question. I just --

MR. GARRETT: I mean you entrusted this agency to do certain things and you entrusted the administration to do certain things. At a point in time -- I know you talked about trust, I know we've talked about capacity, but at a point in time we have to be able to do our job on a daily basis. And if -- and that goes back to when we talked about business transactions and dealing with development

Commissioner --

partners and attempting to do business in the District and to track those individuals to help us with our endeavors.

The one thing that we can't have is developers or business partners trying to negotiate with two different entities at the same time, and those two different entities would be the of administration t.hen t.he and Board Commissioners, the governing body at the same time. It becomes very difficult and individuals -- many business individuals don't want to take on that burden, because anything that they negotiate with the administration they feel as though could be overturned or could be undone, or additional burdens in their mind added that were originally negotiated with them. So dealing with one particular group is always best, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So I would fundamentally agree with that, Director Garrett. I think the problem is; and I -- when you first came on board I articulated this issue to you. I said to you this agency could not continue to operate

the way it does, which is give blanket approval to the Executive Director to then go out and do as they please, that a better solution and a better path -- can you -- are you -- I'm actually talking to you -- a better solution and a better path would be to actually get the deal significantly completed, provide all of the information to the body, to the Board prior to voting --

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- not this is what we think is going to happen or these are estimated or approximated things. And you said that that's what you would do, that you would provide that information.

Now this situation right here, we're still negotiating the deal. And so to me that didn't happen. And as a Board member with again fiduciary responsibility, I think it's important that you have everything as done as possible so you don't end up with two bodies negotiating because you provided all the information to the people who have to make the decision before they make the

decision. Now the information is still trickling in. And so --

MR. GARRETT: I don't want to prolong, but I would like to respond to that.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: He will.

MR. GARRETT: Because, Commissioner Slover, just as you have years of experience, I have over 20 years of experience, 25 years of experience in development in the housing world. And so what I do know is that negotiations are always ongoing even after completing an LOI, even after completing the ground lease.

Commissioners, and for the public, there are ongoing negotiations and things that have to be ironed out before we could bring the additional information that Commission Slover might be referring to to you and, based on the need to move as quickly as we possibly could to start moving the ball, getting some things accomplished and done. We don't want to keep spinning our wheels. So we are doing exactly what in the normal course of business of a housing authority to create

development opportunities -- we're following that same model. We're not doing anything different or anything that would be detrimental to the Agency.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. So just one final thing and then I'm done.

The net proceeds to the Agency as you described it was \$13 million.

MR. SANKARAN: So based upon a \$67 million land value --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. SANKARAN: -- assuming an estimate of three-and-a-half years from closing --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Correct.

MR. SANKARAN: -- so about five years from today estimated at 14 --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Correct.

MR. SANKARAN: -- the deduction would be -- and then add a -- what we think is a conservative \$40 million office --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MR. SANKARAN: -- netting to \$13 million. However, if we were able to; and we think

we can execute so that we can move off sooner, there
would be a deduct --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MR. SANKARAN: -- to that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But if we stay longer, it will get bigger?

MR. SANKARAN: Or we could -- or to your point we would also have the opportunity to look at other opportunities to move off site.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I get that, but we just went through why we're not doing that, because it's --

MR. SANKARAN: But I'm just -- but that would be an option that is available to this --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Why do you not include any deal costs? It's got to be in the millions at this point.

MR. SANKARAN: Those deal costs independent of -- that's true for all deals.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. But

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

there's a -- but it's part of the 13.

MR. SANKARAN: I don't see that as being deducted from that 13. I mean that's part of the operational budget of OCP and of the Agency --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, I would look at it --

MR. SANKARAN: -- in order to do so.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I would -- as a fiduciary I would look at it differently, because we get -- keep -- we keep -- we get told on -- time and time and time again as we pass these legal contracts, oh, don't worry, we're not spending that \$2 million. It's going to come back to us in the deal. So that would come back to us in this 13 million. So that's --

MR. SANKARAN: I know certain deals where we are actually a party to long-term -- there is an element where we are a partner in. This is not -- and again, this is a -- we completely acknowledge that this is a different structure for this 1133 --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. Why did you not include any land costs for 882?

MR. SANKARAN: So I think we're foregoing either a cost for the office space, whether it be at 1133 or at 882.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But there's a -- 882 is estimated to be worth \$40 million, so that's a lost opportunity cost?

MR. SANKARAN: 882 -- where are you? I don't understand what you're asking me.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: That was some information you guys sent us before the --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner
Slover --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- Board meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: -- just one. Sorry. Sorry. I'm trying to cut in.

Commissioner and staff, I appreciate the robust discussion. I want to take a pause now to acknowledge and invite Commissioner

Silverman -- Councilmember, I'm sorry -- Councilmember Silverman to speak. Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER SILVERMAN: Good morning.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Good morning.

COUNCILMEMBER SILVERMAN: Thank you so much Vice Chair St. Jean. I have actually enjoyed the discussion. I have a meeting that I cannot cancel at noon, so I appreciate you making time for me to speak.

So for those who don't know me, I am Elissa Silverman. I'm at-large councilmember and I'm a member of the Committee on Housing and Community Development. So I want to thank you, Commissioners, for holding this emergency meeting and allowing me to speak.

Here's a point that I want to make to you today: Commissioners, you have one of the most important roles in our city. Housing, as you know, is the number one issue of our residents and studies have shown that D.C. has the highest, the highest level of displacement and gentrification for our

peer cities in the country. And you, you hold the trust of our most vulnerable residents, Commissioner Taliaferro, our seniors, our moms and dads working at the minimum wage and their children, to make sure that they have a place to live here in this city.

And you also have great power and authority, as well as fiduciary responsibility to -- for the responsible use of our public dollars. And this needs to be done in a way that is true to your mission to house our most vulnerable in a way that is transparent and honest.

You need to make sure -- I remember this was a discussion I had with you, Commissioner Taliaferro -- you need to make sure that you get all your questions answered and that you are given all the facts before you make a decision that will impact our city for generations. The decision you're making about the headquarters is going to impact our city for generations.

My understanding is this meeting was called to correct what happened in December, to get

all your questions answered and have all the information before you, and also to be clear about what you are voting on. My understanding from listening to this discussion is all Commissioners want this development to include homes for people, our seniors, our residents who are working at the minimum wage, whose incomes are at or below 30 percent of AMI. You don't just want to target. You want a guarantee that they will have a place here.

And so I was confused as well; I'll be honest with you, after the December meeting. And after the meeting I asked Chairman Albert to clarify what you actually passed and he sent me answers and the answers said that the goal was to target 30 percent AMI renters for half of the affordable units. Goals and targets, as we know; as I know unfortunately at the Council, are not guarantees. And my belief is that residents of public housing deserve a guarantee. They deserve better.

So today I think you have the chance to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

send a clear message to your own residents, to this city and to the council and the government that you want a guarantee that public housing residents will live on this property.

Again, the information is not complete for me, but my understanding is that this meeting was called to reconsider the actions taken in December by rescinding the authority, to sign an agreement for the redevelopment of DCHA Headquarters and move forward.

And I agree with you, Commissioner Taliaferro, we need to move forward, but we need to move forward on a better deal that will guarantee housing for those whose mission -- your mission is to house. And I think the action that you take today, if I understand correctly, to rescind the resolution that you passed in December and move forward with a deal that really will guarantee housing for those seniors and those residents who really need housing here at this site.

I'll just make one more comment, which is I think affordability is used in a very elastic

way; it's like a rubber band, but your mission is to house those at 30 -- 0 to 30 percent AMI and those former residents who are in communities and have been told that they have the ability to come back. That's your core mission. That's what you are saying, Vice Chair St. Jean. Housing we have a lot of tools in the tool box for affordable housing in 60 percent AMI, in 80 percent AMI. We have other tools for that. But honestly you are our tool for housing those at the lowest income levels. You have the tools either through the ability to use the land values here right on this site or through vouchers to help those who are critical to -- I will say we want to have an inclusive community, we want to make sure long-term residents are able to live here. Also people who are working at incomes at 0 to 30 percent AMI are critical to our economy. Right? They are working in jobs that are absolutely critical to us.

So I urge you today to rescind the authority of Resolution 19-40 and to move forward with a deal that will truly prioritize our most

vulnerable and guarantee that they have a place to live here and to live in this city. And this is really -- this is a moment I think for this Board to send a clear message about the Board's priorities and that you truly are concerned and are focused on making sure that there is a place for working people at 0 to 30 percent in this city.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak. I might not be able to stay for when -- if you do move to a vote, you do that. I really urge you today to rescind what you did in December and move forward. And I think you can move forward with a better deal. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Excuse me,
Councilmember, would you please also go on
record -- and this is no disrespect to you --

COUNCILMEMBER SILVERMAN: Okay.

as you do know, I voted no and I read. So I feel as though your presentation that you just gave just a moment ago are to those who voted yes, and many of those who voted yes had a problem. And you know

who voted yes and who they are. Commissioner Taliaferro have just gotten on this Board, so I would think that your speech is more to those who are more seasoned than him who voted, and they're all mayor's appointees.

So you can't say this, but I'm going to say it: I am asking the mayor appointees that as long as they're on this Board please stay up at night like I do and read. And the best way to comprehend a document is to do the seventh grade English test. But the verb, the subject, the adverb. And now you understand what the sentence mean and you don't have to be a lawyer or a paralegal.

Have a nice day, ma'am.

COUNCILMEMBER SILVERMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you, Councilmember, for your --

COUNCILMEMBER SILVERMAN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: -- comments.

Before we continue the discussion among

Commissioners I would like to invite the next witnesses. The public comment period permits residents and Housing Choice Voucher Program participants to have signed up today to be the first to present to the Board for five minutes. People who are residents have three minutes to present.

Your name will be called in the order in which you signed. When your name is called, please come to the table and speak directly into the microphone. The meetings are recorded.

So Daniel del -- I'm so sorry -- Deraja?

MR. DEL PIELAGO: It's okay. Good afternoon now, I think --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Good afternoon.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: -- Commissioners.

My name is Daniel del Pielago. I'm the organizing director with Empower DC. I was really here just because I want to continue hearing this discussion, because what concerns me, and I think what concerns a lot of people who have been following this, is this is -- we're on the precipice of a major endeavor of demolition, relocation -- and as

somebody who -- a lot of this development stuff goes over my head, but what I do see is that something isn't right. Something is not working correctly.

And it gives us no real -- what's the word? We're not sure that what we're being promised is going to happen with repositioning, with the transformation plan is actually going to play out in a way that benefits residents, because right now we're not seeing how this is -- would benefit residents that really need housing. It doesn't seem that this project is going to benefit them.

And once again we can't get this -trying to see into the future and say are they going
to get their act together by the time they have to
demolish and relocate thousands of people, there's
very little confidence. So I would say that.

I would say we want to support what's happening and we want to find ways forward because we do believe it's important for residents to be in better conditions. So I don't want to just kind of throw everything -- everyone under the bus as

well though. And that's just kind of listening to what's transpired today. And I think I said something very similar in December before the year was out.

another question more Τ do have specifically around Barry Farm. We recently saw demolition happening on the property, which if folks don't know, the remaining buildings on Barry historic Farm are under an designation application. That board has yet to opine. They've not made their decision on what they'll designate. The application is for all of Stevens Road. They have indicated that they are likely to designate as historic, but not specifically what.

However, in this -- the first week of this new year I was there to take some pictures of the vistas. I noticed that there was a huge hole in one of the buildings and several of the storage units which are connected to the buildings at Barry Farm had been demolished. It's our understanding that that is not supposed to happen while an application is still being -- is awaiting the

decision.

So I just want to ask what happened and what is happening to ensure that nothing like that happens until a decision is made. If they decide we're only going to designate one building and you -- we approve your demolition permits, so be it, but we feel like right now either the Housing Authority, the developer, somebody is not playing by the rules. So I just wanted to bring that up.

MR. GARRETT: I just want to say, Commissioners, in response to that -- because you started out in the same vein in talking about 1133, about something being done that is not above board and you carried it over into Barry Farm, let me say for the record; and I'll continue to say the same thing, this administration is going to be held accountable for its actions and those actions are always going to be based on integrity.

At no point in time are we going to do something that some people might perceive -- or I shouldn't say that because people are going to perceive a lot of things, but this administration

holds integrity at the forefront. I hold integrity at the forefront. My character is on the line when we do these transactions and these deals.

So Barry Farm if you -- Barry Farm was a misnomer. That was something that occurred without any of us having any true knowledge of. And that -- and the development partner has been put on notice along with the contractor that is there. That was not something that was done with mal-intent. That was just something that was -- sometimes people just do silly things, and that was the case. It wasn't done with any mal-intent. It wasn't done with any hidden agenda.

And I need to get that on the table because I've said that to other -- in other groups that everything that happens isn't always a sinister reason. And what we're talking about, even with this particular project isn't a sinister reason.

When we first started talking about this particular -- creation of this -- of 1133 when I first came on board, we were only talking 70 units of affordable housing. Now we have increased that

number to 200 and trying to push it past 200 to 228. So we have made steps to try and provide the appropriate affordable housing; in fact more housing than what was originally discussed and talked about.

And I know that people are skeptical of our ability, skeptical of me and this is what's on the line, but we believe that we are going to do the right thing -- we know we're going to do the right thing by the residents.

So that answer -- I hope that answers your Barry Farm piece, but it also trickles over into what we're talking about for 1133, with what our actual intent is.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: I understand that mistakes happen. That seems like a huge mistake that happened, for them to start -- actually starting demolition activities. So why did it happen? I mean --

MR. GARRETT: I don't -- I can't answer it, but I can say that it won't happen again.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: And what is -- what

kind of guarantee has there been? Like a cease --

MR. GARRETT: They've been put on notice.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. Thank you, Daniel, for your comment.

Ms. Beth Mellen Harrison?

MS. HARRISON: Good morning. I think it's actually still morning.

I -- my name is Beth Harrison. I'm a supervising attorney at the Legal Aid Society of the District of Columbia. My colleague Amanda Korber was here on December 11th. Unfortunately she couldn't be here this morning, so I'm your poor substitute for her.

And I really can only echo what has already been said by the other witnesses. The mission of the D.C. Housing Authority is primarily to house those extremely low-income households at 0 to 30 percent of AMI. And I know you all already know this, but those are the residents of the

District who are suffering the most in terms of rent. They're paying half or more of the rent. Many of them are paying 80 percent more of their income for rent. They need subsidies. They need hard units.

And so I understand that's out the door at this point on this deal. I appreciate that, but I'm still going to say it: We are deeply disappointed that this deal with affordable units, none of them are hard, deeply affordable units. If there will be residents here who are at those income levels, it is only because they have a subsidy that the Housing Authority has separately provided to them that they could use anywhere in the city.

And then getting to that issue I think you all have raised a lot of really good questions about guaranteeing that. So if the best we can get out of this deal is resident with vouchers being able to live at this site, let's get a guarantee of that. Let's not have just a target or a goal or referrals. Let's make sure it happens.

But I just want to reiterate it's deeply

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

disappointing that that's the only way we're going to get residents here is to put them in these units. And then what's the point? I understand it will save the Housing Authority some money, but if you're touting that these units are affordable to 0 to 60 percent AMI and they're not going to be occupied by the people who actually need them at 60 percent AMI -- it saves the Housing Authority money. I mean, that's good, but I'm not sure that's really the point of having affordable units at 60 percent AMI.

And I think the bottom line to me of this deal; and Commissioner Slover and others have done a really good job this morning of asking questions and getting information that shows it -- I don't see any met benefit to DCHA. When you look at all these numbers: the development costs, the cost of the land for headquarters, building headquarters, leasing back, the discounted land value you're getting, it seems like it's a net zero or loss. And for that what we're getting is affordable units at 0 to 60 percent AMI, which is not what we need and

it's not the core mission of the Housing Authority.

And, Director Garrett, I appreciate -I certainly am not here saying that you or anybody
else has sinister motives. That is not at all my
accusation or allegation, but we want the Housing
Authority -- as you and the Board and the city are
approaching transformation and trying to deal with
these broken public housing sites we need the
Housing Authority to come to the table and be the
best negotiator you can possibly be, get the best
deals for the residents.

And so maybe it is just a matter of transparency and sharing the information and explaining and providing the analysis, as Commissioner Slover has gone through on multiple points, so that you can convince all of us that these are the best deals you can get, but without the information it's hard to convince us.

And then there's a trust gap and there's a transparency gap. And to me it's not about sinister motives, but it's about us trusting as we go into transformation. And the Housing Authority

is asking the Commissioners, the mayor, the council, but most importantly you're asking the residents you serve and all of those extremely low-income residents of this city who are on the verge of being displaced -- I mean the Washington Post had an article a couple days ago about a family. Rapid Re-Housing Voucher money ran out. They're in Maryland now. They're not going to be able to make it back here, right? There are 20,000 Armenian-American families at least who have been displaced like that.

And so we want to make sure the Housing Authority is doing the best job it can approaching transformation to try to prevent that same story from playing out over and over and over and over again.

And so I hope moving forward -- I am asking the same thing that Councilmember Silverman asked -- and it is directed to folks who voted yes as opposed to no, but for the Board to rescind the approval and look at this deal and see what can be done to get that guarantee in anything else to make

this a better deal for the residents. That is my ask today and I hope that is what the Board will do. Thank you for --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Can I ask

MS. HARRISON: Yes, please.

question is this: First and foremost I'm going to say this again and I want you to understand it as well. If you already have Temple Court Town Houses who are -- to come back here, they was never traditional public housing. Temple Courts High Rise, who started the lawsuit for this to happen, they were not traditional public housing. Then you only have the 39 town houses that belong to Sibley Plaza, which are Temple -- they are traditional public housing, which they will be having the right to have a voucher to move back here.

You are representing the Legal Aid.

Now you hit -- now I'm playing devil advocate. Now when I come back as the Temple Court People With

a Purpose -- because you let Ward 6 -- no, you let Far East Capitol Hell 6, 7, 8 and 5 all move in here, but I didn't get to move in here because I came out of Temple Courts that already have a voucher, who you're not advocating for me because what I'm hearing you say -- and I voted no. What I'm hearing you say is don't worry about the people who once lived in Temple Courts because -- wait a minute. Wait a minute. Listen to what I'm saying.

MS. HARRISON: Please.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Because if you already know how many houses going to build on this land and you already know how many of the houses or units are going to be HCBP units, all of those people are coming back. There was never meant for traditional conventional public housing to be on this land in the beginning. And I don't hear none of you all say that either. You say whether it's affordable.

Now let me say this again -- and I know why I voted no and I'm going to continue voting no because I wasn't incompetent in the first place

because I read and comprehended and I did my research. That's why I can tell you what I'm telling you today.

I don't care what way this Board go. If this Board do not allow the traditional residents that started a lawsuit about this in the beginning — nobody is talking about them really coming back here. And you'll be the same one representing them, flipping the coin on us, saying why you think duh, duh, duh, duh, duh. These people had the right to do duh, duh, duh. See, this is what this Board need to learn to do, the devil advocate part. So I'm looking at it both ways voting no.

So whoever voted yes, you need to direct that to your yes people and not your no people. And I don't understand why the no people have to -- why we're really put on a -- it's like sometimes I feel like I'm on trial here for voting no because of whoever voted yes. Now what I look at it a fair -- if this is a democracy and it's fair -- and it's 11 of us. And if somebody voted yes, the

resolution pass.

I live in Potomac Gardens. I did not want to see Team Management to leave. When the majority of these people up here voted yes, I went along with my constituents and it went back to DCHA. So either you are going to be a team player and understand what's going on or you're going to take a self-interest and you going to have to look out for all of the people, not just the people who need affordable housing.

I have people that's my constituents and they been on a transfer list. They would like that same opportunity, but they can't do it because you came up here and told us to close the waiting list, and we not even a state. Now we closed the waiting list. Nobody paid attention that half the people on the waiting list and have vouchers and public housing 10 and 20 times.

And the people who are still suffering?

The most vulnerable residents in the District of

Columbia Housing Authority, that woman that got six

and seven children living in a two-bedroom and

their unit can be deplorable. And they can't even get a voucher. And they just got a degree and a job.

MS. HARRISON: So Ι agree with everything you just said. And thank you for voting Thank you for your leadership on this Board. Thank you as you said for taking the time to look all of these things, to talk at to constituents, to be a public servant on this Board.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So now you --

MS. HARRISON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- what you going to do; and this your assignment, you going to have to get some classes, too.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No, seriously.

MS. HARRISON: No, I -- we always --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: You're

going to --

MS. HARRISON: -- want to learn more,

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

but --

commissioners. You're going to have to train Commissioners. You're going to have a Commissioner Academy. You can't keep on just getting on this Board, getting on this Board like this, because that's why we in trouble now with a lack of knowledge before getting on the Board.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: All right. Thank you. Ms. Harrison.

MS. HARRISON: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you for coming and providing your testimony.

I now ask your indulgence to take a 10-minute recess and then resume the meeting.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:38 a.m. and resumed at 11:54 a.m.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. We are now ready to resume. I know there are still many questions, so I would like to give all Commissioners a chance to speak and ask their

questions.

In the interest of time I ask each of you to stick only -- for two or three minutes, sorry, for timing purposes.

Commissioner Neal Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes, I actually had a couple of questions just from the initial part of the conversation that I didn't hear answers to, and it was really around the 882. It really is. So we're being asked to trust. And I think we also have to verify with the best information that's available.

And so what I would like to know, like what are the major assumptions around us going to the new headquarters? Timing, the cost I think that we have, and other major assumptions that I might not be thinking of but that are certainly -- need to be a part of this to be successful. And what evidence do we have, like -- meaning like past performance of DCHA, anything additional that we are like bringing into the mix? What evidence do we have to support that that is going to go as we're

estimating it right now?

I also have questions about like what are the next phases for Board engagement on this particular deal? I mean I know that the resolution itself does give a lot of latitude to execute the ground lease, affordability covenant and to go forward in other ways with the deal. I do want to ask like what are the plans for coming back to the Board so that we're at least informed about what's happening here.

And then the last question that I have is -- so there was a conversation about the developer who's procured and that's the developer that we prefer to go with. What I want to know is like what are the consequences or penalties of not going with that developer?

MR. GARRETT: Okay. So you're -- and Chels -- I'm going to have to rely on Chelsea just a little bit from -- for OGC's representation if I go astray, but one thing we do have a procured developer already for the site. If we were to move in a different direction more than likely -- we

always talk about the idea and concept of potential litigation. So that leads us into the position where the conversations and the engagement that we've had with the current developer procured for 882 have been serious in nature and actually began, as I stated, before we got to this particular point on whether or not they would be able to execute what we're requiring or what we're asking of them.

And what we -- and it's always -- in development it is always a chance that there will be an obstacle of some sort, but what we're pushing for is that less than that. I know Senthil is conservative. He has been conservative at OCP. staff and the consultants have conservative about our time frame to move off this site there. But I am pushing that it could be much sooner than three-and-a-half years, five years from today. That's what I am pushing for to ensure that we are able and have the ability to move to a new -- to the new location, Commissioner.

And I didn't -- I'm sorry, I was trying to remember all your questions from --

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Oh, it's really around like what evidence do we have? I mean --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  GARRETT: Whatever -- well, we do have --

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: I mean we trust, but what evidence do we have --

MR. GARRETT: -- an effective --

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: -- that lets us know we have the capacity, that lets us know that we can pursue a --

MR. GARRETT: Well, you're asking a -you're asking something that's interesting,
because over the last two years we've been
transforming the Agency internally trying to put
the right people in our OCP Department in addition
to the staff that I have in my Executive Office to
move these things along very quickly, at a pace that
will allow for all things that we're trying to take
on to be -- to actually be accomplished.

The development partner has accomplished things. They are accomplishing --

they built things. In fact, the -- ooh, Chels, I'm sorry, am I able to say -- the Brookfield -- I'm going to put it out there. Brookfield is one of the largest development entities within the nation and in the world, which we'll be working on our 882 component. In terms of financial capacity, ability, they have it. And I hope that gives you some comfort.

As for the Authority being able to move forward with an opportunity like this, remember this will be my first redevelopment deal from beginning to end, not inheriting someone else's. So I am optimistic and very confident to say that we could accomplish this particular goal.

Past performance, I understand we may have fallen short in other areas, haven't gotten certain things done, left some units off the table. Under my administration there is no way -- I shouldn't say no way. It is not our intent to do that. We're not traveling down that same path.

And so that's the only guarantee I can offer for us is that the administration that you

have in place now has the right tools, have the right people in place between OCP, our legal department, along with our other entities: Housing Choice Voucher, to get things done on behalf of the Agency on both sides of this deal and transaction.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you, Commissioner Neal Jones.

Commissioner Council, do you have any questions?

(No audible response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: No, ma'am.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: 882 -these are some yes and no answers. 882 is in Ward
6, correct?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So if the Housing Authority bet build on its own land, what type of lease will they have? We already --

MR. GARRETT: We don't --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: --

discussed that. Here's --

MR. GARRETT: No lease.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No, we have

no lease?

MR. GARRETT: No. No, no lease.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: What I wanted to ask is here at 1133 do you know whether or not before we purchased 1133 did we have a lease here? And if so, how long was the lease?

MS. GEBREYES: No, ma'am, I'm not aware if there was a lease here.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Can anybody answer that question?

MR. SLAUGHTER: There was no lease. It was transferred -- I'm sorry. I'm Ken Slaughter, corporate secretary. My recollection is that we did not acquire this land for use by lease. It was a transfer fee simple from the District to the D.C. Housing Authority.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Who was the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

mayor at that time?

MR. SLAUGHTER: I think it was Mayor Williams.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Therefore if 882 becomes the headquarters for 1133, one of the advantages the employees will have, it would be Metro accessible. They would be able to still have lunch, which is feasible around them. in that area. And above all, it would probably most likely give Ward 6 residents who live in Greenleaf, James Creek --

MR. SLAUGHTER: Syphax.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- Syphax,

Potomac Gardens, Hopkins -- and I'm looking at

workers. So that would give all of my constituents

the opportunity to be gainfully employed.

However, would they be union employees or would

they be independent contractors, or will they be

contractors or would they be subcontractors to the

contractors, or have you gotten that far?

MR. GARRETT: We haven't gotten that far, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri, but you know it's

always going to be our intent with our economic inclusion policy to go well beyond any Section 3 or employment requirements for our residents with anyone that we engage.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. So now I have one more other question and it's in reference to 882. So how long would it take for this to be demolish and they begin to work on 882?

MR. GARRETT: I would have to call Senthil up just to go over that because we've been going over the logistical times.

Senthil, just the time line for 882? We've already started --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. I'm going to move along --

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- while he coming --

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- because I did my homework.

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Now do we have a problem -- now I want a yes or no answer, and I may not even say his name correctly -- is David -- his last name start with a J. Is his company involved in this deal?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Jannar? Yes.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes or no?

And David --

MR. GARRETT: Yes, David Jannarone.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: His last name start with a J. Is his company involved in this deal?

MR. SANKARAN: He's one of the -- I think you're speaking about David Jannarone.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Correct.

MR. SANKARAN: Yes, he's one of the CB partners --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Do somebody got a problem with him and his company getting this contract and then hand it for this long

or was he one of the -- or was his --

MR. SANKARAN: Well, the primary --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Wait a

minute. I'm not finished.

MR. SANKARAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Or whether or not his company was one of the companies that have already had this contract for the last how many years?

MR. SANKARAN: Five years I believe is --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI:

Approximately five years?

MR. SANKARAN: We're talking about 1133? Yes, approximately five --

me carefully. I told you all you all problem with me is either my tone of voice or you don't listen. So next month I would ask the Board to please send me to a English school so that when I speak would allow you to listen.

MR. SANKARAN: I apologize.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Now here's my question again: You already said yes that David company is one of the developers.

MR. SANKARAN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: My next question was how long was his company a part of this deal?

MR. SANKARAN: Since the original selection.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So we talking about how many years?

MR. SANKARAN: Five years, I believe.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, five years, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Do somebody got a problem with him? His company? I'm going deep.

MR. SANKARAN: Someone meaning whom?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I don't know. That's what I'm trying to figure out.

Because what I'm --

MR. SANKARAN: I can't speak for anyone

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

else.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- first thing I'm been trying to figure out, if I -- I'm putting myself as a company. I got a company. I got a deal with the Housing Authority. It happened before Director Garrett. You're talking about five years ago, so all you have to do is go back and you see who the director was five years ago.

So now all of a sudden I still have this contract even though nothing has happened, nobody put a deal back out. So now today we having a problem with the same person. He's a -- is this just his company or it's more than one company?

MR. SANKARAN: I mean the lead developer is MRP.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.

MR. SANKARAN: They are the lead developer. They are the ones with -- of -- they're not -- there's another CBE developer as well in the deal.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So now let me ask another question.

MR. SANKARAN: CSG. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So now I know for a fact that David was a part of the Fenty administration. He also was a part of the developing team. He was a part of New Communities. I know that for a fact.

Now being that I know that for a fact and knowing where he's at now, and we're talking about five years later -- and I ask even Councilmember Silverman; not trying to put her on the spot, but I'm using my mother with, that whether or not somebody of his nature who have had all these dealings with the city on another hand and now that he's a subcontractor to the developer, is there a problem with this? Because see, I just don't understand where we got here. I do not -- and it's -- and I do -- I'm not trying to put nobody on the spot.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Aquarius, can you wrap it up because I --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I'm going to wrap it up. And I'm not putting nobody on the

spot. So you answer my questions, my developer questions. You answer my 882 questions. And I already knew the answers to the rest of my questions.

MR. SANKARAN: If I can just for the record also say with regard to your 882 question, it's important to know that while we are evaluating 882 we are by no means committed -- 100 percent committed to it at this time. What I -- as I mentioned earlier in my testimony --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Well, if we all --

MR. SANKARAN: -- we are 100 --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. See, this is where you mess me up at. If you know you own the land, anybody with good sense know if I own the land, that's where I'm going to try to build at. I'm going to build --

MR. SANKARAN: That is --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- right on the land. Why I'm going -- I ain't even going to

put it out there to the Board, to nobody else. I'm going to advocate 882 --

MR. SANKARAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- unless you have a problem with my councilmember.

MR. SANKARAN: I am 100 percent saying that this is the one that we are looking at right now. We feel it is, quote/unquote, the lowest --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Now answer this question: Why you all did all that? How many people in the union? How many union people are you going to have working on this deal? Have you thought that out?

MR. SANKARAN: So the -- our construction of the headquarters would be a Housing Authority construction project and --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Will you have more union people working on this deal or will you have more independent contractors?

MR. SANKARAN: I mean --

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

#### COMMISSIONER

VANN-GHASRI:

Contractors. Non-union. Who will work the most on this deal? Will it be union people or will it be equal?

MR. SANKARAN: I don't know.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And how many of my constituents will be getting paid on the deal --

MR. SANKARAN: So --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: --

working?

MR. SANKARAN: I don't think I can --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you.

MR. SANKARAN: -- speculate at this

time.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri.

At this time I have two questions: So is there a way --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Don't

forget me. Don't forget me.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: I won't forget

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

you, sir.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Is there a way -- do we have appraisal for the 822?

MR. SANKARAN: As I mentioned, we're in our due diligence period right now and that is something that we're contracting for in order to get a full appraisal for 882.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So when will we have the appraisal of 882 so it --

MR. SANKARAN: I anticipate it will be another four to six weeks.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Let me finish the question.} \\$ 

MR. SANKARAN: Oh, sorry.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: I'm so sorry.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SANKARAN: I was just responding to that.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: When are we going to initially get the appraisal for 882 in order for the Board to actually see it, for the whole Board?

MR. SANKARAN: Once we receive it.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So how long does the appraisal take?

MR. SANKARAN: So it will be four to six weeks probably.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Four to six weeks?

MR. SANKARAN: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So we resume February 12.

MR. SANKARAN: Six weeks from today probably is by the time we get it.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. And then on -- and another question is this: While you guys were negotiating around 1133, let's say something happened to this building. Why didn't -- okay. Let me just kind of -- why didn't you negotiate -- if something happens to this building, would MRP fix the issue? So we have a HVAC system. So we have a HVAC system and we have a problem with the HVAC system, right? We do have

the issue? Because we -- this is -- we're doing three-year lease. We're paying them. Would MRP come and say, hey --

MR. SANKARAN: No, MRP will not fix that.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So we're going to fix that issue?

MR. SANKARAN: If there's an issue, that would be the --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Within --

MR. SANKARAN: -- responsibility of the Authority.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Right. So the HVAC system --

MR. SANKARAN: The Authority isn't -- sorry, MRP isn't purchasing the building; they're doing a capitalized ground lease on the land.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Right. So this building will not -- so the land, the -- so which means the building wouldn't be no longer at all, correct? Because DCHA is not going to own it? That's what I'm asking you. Because it's a 99-year

ground lease.

MR. SANKARAN: Correct, of the land.

And --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Not the building? Nothing --

MR. SANKARAN: Correct. I mean when we vacate the parcel, they will be demo'ing the building.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Right. So while you're negotiation with the three-year lease that you're giving back money to MRP until you guys move to another DCHA place, will MRP fix any issues that happen here? No.

MR. SANKARAN: No. I said no. That is the responsibility of the Authority --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay. So HVAC system is a six -- I think the funding is like \$ million?

MR. SANKARAN: No, I don't think that's correct. We've done an internal cost analysis -VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So what's the

number?

MR. SANKARAN: So if you could speak to -- so -- yes, go ahead speak to that because --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. DUDLEY: Our understanding from talking with staff --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

MR. DUDLEY: -- is to replace the system it would cost \$6 million.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So --

MR. DUDLEY: And there's an expectation, at least in conversation with staff, that it -- there could be Band-Aid approach to maintaining about 200 -- up to \$200,000 a year from what we discussed to maintain the system as it goes forward.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So where is that source of money coming from?

MR. GARRETT: It comes from our capital. It comes from the capital budget that is allocated to the building. We have budget lines

that go to fix maintenance -- or preventive maintenance within the structure that we have. It's part of our overall budget already. It's already built in.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: Okay?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I have a question.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I don't understand you all logic here. You want to make a headquarters on Southwest -- Southeast, but you all didn't do -- you ain't -- why you're going backwards? If you going to have new headquarters built in five or six years, what about here? So both -- this should have been after you got the deal with the -- down the new headquarters because you're going to bill until we move in. But you not telling me -- now you're bringing this back to me?

MR. SANKARAN: So the capital that this deal unlocks is used to construct that

headquarters. So we don't have the capital in which to build that new headquarters before say moving forward on this deal.

MR. GARRETT: And there's a time frame.

MR. SANKARAN: So it is that capitalized ground lease on 1133 --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: -- which unlocks the value by which we can then go build a new headquarters elsewhere, whether it be 882 or anywhere.

MR. GARRETT: And the time frame on construction here or construction someplace else would be relatively in the same vein. So we're not losing any time, Commissioner. We would have to -- regardless there would be a construction period and then there would be a period when we would have to move.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: That's the question. When are you all going to start the construction of the headquarters.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. SANKARAN: So as we're doing our due diligence one of the advantages of the site that we're looking at and we hope would -- will pan out will be the ability to move quickly on that. We've also -- we've already started engaging in conversations with the Office of Planning in order to help us expedite. We --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Well wouldn't --

MR. SANKARAN: And it is currently -COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Excuse me.

MR. SANKARAN: Sorry. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Excuse me. Wouldn't you do that first, because I see you all just pushing this project here for DCHA headquarters now. It should have been the other way around.

MR. SANKARAN: But that deal can't happen unless we know that we have a path forward here in which to unlock the dollars in order to do a deal. So we -- I can't strike a deal with the developer on a different site that ultimately we

will also own --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: -- unless I now have the capital to do that deal.

MR. GARRETT: So we have to close here first.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Okay. Then a concluding statement. Do you know was -- my first subject was about this -- on this project? Do you know that? My first issues about this issue? My issue was to cancel it. Get rid of it because it's not no good deal. And I was told you got to give a little back and forth, back and forth, back and forth. It's not no good deal. This been on the plate for a while.

MR. SANKARAN: I would agree.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: And the deals -- everybody -- it's not good.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Well, if it wasn't a good deal, why did you vote yes?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I voted yes because of the residents. The residents been

waiting --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: -- and waiting and waiting and waiting for you all to do your jobs, but you all got everything all bufulgated.

MR. GARRETT: Can I --

MR. SANKARAN: No, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: And I'm upset right up because --

MR. GARRETT: Understand the steps,

Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Let me --

MR. GARRETT: -- Taliaferro.

Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Let me leave it like that.

MR. GARRETT: Commissioner

Taliaferro, please let --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I'm going

to --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. GARRETT: Please understand -please try and understand the steps that we're
talking about. We have to take one step here in
order to effectuate the step at 882. And that's
what we're doing. We have to take a step here to
make sure that we can go to 882. So one can't be
put before the other. One can be --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: That's what I'm saying.

MR. GARRETT: -- discussed and talked about, but you have to do it in parts. Part 1 is dealing with this particular agreement here and then moving over to 882. It doesn't mean that we aren't discussing it. It doesn't mean that we aren't master planning.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: But you own the land on it.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, but there's still things that you have to do in order to be able to start the construction. You can't just jump on there and -- you have to have money to do it. And

the way we're getting the money to build the building at 882 is through the transaction here. If we don't have the money from the transaction here at 1133, we can't build at 882. We have to close this deal.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you, Executive Director.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So can I --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN:

Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I wasn't finished.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Can I ask a --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I wasn't

finished.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: But the answer to the question about why I voted yes, I voted yes because of the tenants.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: That's my

main choice is the residents of the District of Columbia.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you,
Commissioner Taliaferro.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: If we do not fight for the residents, I have an issue. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So can I jump in?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes,

Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Thank you. So just -- my closing comments are quick. I mean clearly there's a lot of unanswered questions. There's a significant amount of questions and confusion about what's going on.

I think what we just walked through with the sequencing issue is a great example. If we had done a different type of transaction where there was — the developer was responsible for building our off site, we may not have this sequencing problem that's so confusing and we might not — and it goes back to do we know anything about MRP? Do

we know they can close? We're relying a lot on them showing up with that money at closing, but if it were one partner who were doing both components, we'd have less room for failure. So there's a lot of unanswered questions about the transaction and a lot of information that I think just people are confused about in general.

And then there's the 882 piece which I -- they don't have site control. Why do you have to do an appraisal if they already have site controls? They don't have site control of the land. You're talking about us potentially getting sued by someone who doesn't have site control. So I mean the questions to -- every answer starts another question.

And so I'm going to say one final thing:

I've said this in the start; I'm going to say it

at the end. We have such a significant trust gap

everywhere. Our residents don't trust us. They

keep saying why should we trust you? You don't do

what you say you're going to do time and time again.

And it's hard to say -- oftentimes they're right.

This is an opportunity for us to show that we're going to do what we say we're going to do. This is not what we said we were going to do, down to the 30 percent AMI. There is no guarantee that we are going to put 30 percent AMI residents on this site. That is our core business. You've heard it from a lot of different people.

Everyone's definition of affordability seems to be changing. Our core mission is 0 to 30 This is an opportunity for us to do percent AMI. what we say we're going to do. This is opportunity to fulfill our promises for this site. We need to start gaining the trust of our residents. We are about to embark on a massive repositioning of this Authority's properties, and what we just did was approve a development deal for our own that doesn't site headquarters anticipate occupancy of the 0 to 30 percent deeply afford it people that we -if we're not building, developing, maintaining and preserving 0 to 30 percent AMI, nobody is. And so that's what I think we need to focus on.

I hope that the members of the Board can take this opportunity to suggest that we should rescind what we did in 19-40 and ask the Agency to go back and try and make the deal better and more palatable, bring it back to us in February with some revisions and more explanation. And that's -- I hope we can do it. I'd like to move to take that vote, if possible.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Thank you,
Commissioner Slover.

Executive Director?

MR. GARRETT: We've heard everyone -
COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Executive

Director, please --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: There's a motion for a vote.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Oh, before we have the motion I need one question, and this is something that definitely need to be on the record. When it comes to the blueprint here and the housing -- the affordable housing that's going to be here, Sibley Senior Building is -- say yes

or no -- whether or not Sibley High Rise is the 100 percent public housing, because it was already in the blueprint and it was taken out of the blueprint because it was already there to represent.

And being that Sibley also have one and two bedrooms inside of Sibley, it was already known -- and I can prove this with my Blue Book, Commission, and you just say yes or no if you're still in the plan. So that was going to be your public housing part of the housing that was going to be built here because it was already in place. You invested a lot of money in it. It has been a national model. And that is one of the reason why it could have had a HIB floor. And it also had a -- you also have a substance abuse floor.

So that part right there was going to already be what you was going to call -- you already had those numbers already factored in.

MR. SANKARAN: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Say yes or

no.

MR. SANKARAN: So --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: If you don't understand, let me say it again. Sibley -- you know where Sibley at, right across the street?

MR. SANKARAN: The --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: The high rise.

MR. SANKARAN: As we've written in the resolution --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Mr. Clark's resident counsel, where he live at is called Sibley Senior. It's one and two bedrooms in there. And when they did that blueprint, the way I recollect, that was going to be part of the 100 percent, what was going to already be called traditional public housing in that blueprint for Northwest One. Yes or no? And if you don't know the answer, say no.

MR. SANKARAN: I'll yield to the Executive Director.

MR. GARRETT: I don't know. I would have to research that, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Somebody need to re-check that. Maybe, counselor --

MR. GARRETT: That's the first time I'm hearing that.

MR. SANKARAN: I want somebody to check it, but I'm not going to keep -- I'm going to be -- and then you can talk. I'm not bringing you all no more of my history because really this agency, for everything that has gone down from the day of Jasper Burnette when it got progressive, from the day that it was changed from National Capital Housing up until the day it was DPAR, up until the receiver, it is a insult this agency do not have the documentation about what I am talking about. And if it's only in my house, that's sad.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: All right.

Thank you, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri.

Does Director or team have any final comments?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'd like to motion to vote. Could I get a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Is there a

motion on the floor?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Second.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Commissioner --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So are we foregoing the comments or --

MS. GEBREYES: So just --

MS. GEBREYES: Does the director have

MR. SANKARAN: You asked if the director or her team have any comments.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Correct.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, I actually do, Commissioners. We were going back and we heard about the 0 to 30 percent AMI. And you wanted a guarantee. We are -- will guarantee that. And we will revise the resolution to clearly state that, notwithstanding anything in that Exhibit A, which was given to everyone at the last Board meeting with

a team?

Resolution 19-40, that DCHA shall guarantee through the inclusion provisions in the ground lease and other applicable operational documents that not less than 50 percent of the affordable units developed as part of the project shall be occupied by holders of tenant-based vouchers with incomes at or below 30 percent AMI.

The operative word here is guarantee, which is something that everyone wanted to hear. And we will be guaranteeing that those individuals -- guaranteeing that 50 percent of the affordable units built would be voucher holders who are -- with incomes at or below 30 percent AMI.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So is there a motion to vote on the --

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Is there a motion on the floor?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I think we already went through it all.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: What are you voting on? Are you voting on --

MR. GARRETT: SLOVER: I was just

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

asking that you consider -- before you vote I was just asking that you would consider --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: What you voting on?

MR. GARRETT: -- this amendment in lieu of Commissioner Slover's motion.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So could we deal with that first?

I think the point of procedure would be that -look, we tried to do an amendment last time. I
don't like to do things on the fly. I think a
cleaner way to do this would just be to say if you
want -- I appreciate the movement in the right
direction, but last time around we thought we did
something -- some people thought it did something
and it didn't turn out the way some people thought.

So I think a cleaner way to do this is to say you know what, let's just rescind 19-40, go and put this in, do it methodically, get some of the questions -- answers to the other questions and

come back in February and we can -- we -- so the entire Board has an opportunity to weigh on this.

And we'll do it in another meeting. So I think that's the approach. And I'd like to vote on -- (Simultaneous speaking.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Do I have a motion on that?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Second?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: I ask for a roll call to vote to rescind -- rescinding the 19-40 and so that we could have the full Board to be here in February for the new amendment.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, yes, to bring back a different deal.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So what you saying is this -- for clarification, you want the Board -- now I want everybody -- don't look at me like that because they can't read and they can't hear. So now what you're saying is that you want us to rescind what was already voted on and now

we're going to re-vote again so that -- because everybody didn't understand correct. So maybe what you may need to do is go down the line and ask everybody to repeat what they voting on, because I'm not coming back here next month for the same thing because nobody understood again.

MR. GARRETT: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri, I think all you're doing right now is to vote to rescind. You're not voting on having an additional meeting later or --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. GARRETT: -- another resolution in the future. You're --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And would you -- for the record would you please say what do rescind mean?

MR. GARRETT: To turn over. I guess Chelsea could give the legal determination, but to reverse 19-40, Resolution 19.40.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Which mean that whatever they just voted on with the yes and

the no, that's out the door?

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So we --

that's -- do you -- do everybody understand?

(No audible response.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

MR. SANKARAN: That does not preclude the Agency from bringing back another deal.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Right. So --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I ain't

saying bring the Agency for another deal. I'm
saying --

MR. SANKARAN: That doesn't preclude them from doing that is what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: That's correct.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: All right. So for clarification we are rescinding 19-40 and we're coming back to the Board, full Board for new resolution?

MR. SANKARAN: No, should they want to.

Should you want to.

MR. GARRETT: No. No, no, no. All you're doing is rescinding.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Correct.

MR. GARRETT: There is no guarantee that anything would be brought back to the Board in February. So that's -- all you're looking to do right now, Commissioner -- or what the motion on the floor by Commissioner Slover is just to rescind.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Correct.

MR. GARRETT: And, Chelsea, just -- from OGC's perspective just again advise the Board.

MS. ANDREWS: Okay. Commissioners, what was proposed by Commissioner Slover was a motion to rescind Resolution 19-40, period.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Correct.

MS. ANDREWS: He requested that motion be voted upon. There was a second by Commissioner Taliaferro. There was then discussion in regards to the motion. At this point I think it's best for

Commissioner Slover to state clearly your motion again, allow a second, and let's get a roll call vote on the very clear articulation of the motion that you would like the Board to take action on.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: The motion would be to rescind the authority granted under Resolution 19-40.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: And not --

VICE CHAIRMAN SLOVER: For point of clarification, that does not preclude the Authority from doing this in February, or anything else. My point is I think for us, we just said we're not going to do amendments on the fly. And now we're being asked to do an amendment on the fly.

What I'm saying is as many questions have been asked at this table today and as many answers have gone back and forth, there's a lot of moving parts here. There's a lot of information that needs to be fleshed out. It's a big decision. We've waited five years. We're back here in an emergency meeting. I see this as just a little bit of the same that we did in December.

And what I'm saying is let's take a deep breath. Let's go back and get some of these answers to these questions. Some more information will come in. Maybe the Executive Director will bring back a better deal. Maybe he won't. Maybe he won't bring any deal back. But it seems that they're interested in doing a deal because we have an amendment right here.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Chelsea, would you also --

SLOVER: I'm not even sure we could accept that amendment. I don't even know -- I mean it just does not -- I don't understand the process well enough. So when I had these discussions leading up to this meeting, it was -- sort of indicated that the only option was to do this, what we're talking about and doing an amendment that wasn't posted to a deal that was already -- I don't know.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Chelsea -
COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I don't know
enough about that.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- would you explain in layman talk, baby language to us, please, does this also mean that the developers that was discussed in the contract -- will they still have this contract when we rescind or would that mean they're out the door?

MS. ANDREWS: There will still be an opportunity for this Board to continue -- or excuse me, for the Executive Director to continue discussions, however you have not authorized the Executive -- you would take away any authority you gave the Executive Director to enter into agreements related to this transaction.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Now do everybody on the Board understand that?

(No audible response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So does that mean that we could put another RFP out, or what does that mean?

MS. ANDREWS: During that time frame that could happen. Obviously there would probably be another presentation to this Board in regards

to how to proceed with our current developer, but you would essentially -- we would be halting the Executive Director's ability to enter into any binding agreements.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So practically nothing would stop but for the authority to execute the deal?

MS. ANDREWS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MS. ANDREWS: So can you please restate your motion?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: A third time?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. ANDREWS: Yes, because you gave the further clarity --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And that's not -- nobody --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. ANDREWS: -- there wasn't a second on the motion.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -understand what Mr. Slover said.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Now I'm getting unclear. So I put forth a motion to rescind the authority granted under Resolution 19-40.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: I ask for a roll call to vote.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner

Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: No.

MS. GEBREYES: No. So -- okay.

Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI:

Definitely -- I'm going to say no because I stand by the vote that I -- when I voted the first time, I read, I comprehended, I voted no and that's where I'm standing and that's it.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Council?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: I'm sorry.

PARTICIPANT: He's confused.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: I think they

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

are.

MS. ANDREWS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So you're voting

no?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: No to rescinding.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No to rescinding?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I understand what I'm saying. I'm saying that personally I went for the vote that I went for in the beginning, which meant that I understood that the developer was going to be the developer, you was going to build on 882.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So you're reaffirming your vote is what you're --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But you're not reaffirming your vote?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Am I reaffirming?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

 $\label{thm:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I'm saying} \\ \mbox{that I'm staying where I'm at.}$ 

MS. ANDREWS: So then --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No, you're not.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: She's sticking to her vote from 19-40 before.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Excuse me?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: You're just

sticking to your vote from before you said no?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Correct.

So that's exactly what I've said from the day I sat on --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. ANDREWS: Understood, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Are you --

MS. ANDREWS: So the question is a different question. You might have answered -- you might have voted no to 19-40 because you didn't support that deal. At this point is the question is should that resolution --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I said that

I did not support 19-40 deal.

MS. ANDREWS: Right. And so at this point do you support rescinding the 19-40 resolution or do you support allowing that vote to remain in place?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I vote to remain in place with the vote that I had when I read in the beginning, I've already told you. I know what I'm saying so don't confuse me.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I voted -the first time I voted no. I read what I said.

I -- the deal was that --

MS. ANDREWS: The question is a different question.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. ANDREWS: The only issue, Commissioners; and this is what I'm trying to avoid obviously, is the minute we walk away there's going to be questions in regards to what was voted upon today. If --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I don't think it's clear. I think we're unclear on what we're voting on. So I don't know how better to describe it, but --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: You're getting rid of the deal that we already had, yes or no?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: No. That's not a --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. So we understand that part. Now what you're getting ready to do is you want us to rescind because you're going to build -- not you, but I'm just saying us. You want us to rescind to build -- to have a better deal.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

understand that. I know what I'm saying. I'm telling you no because you're not going to have a better deal. You're going to come up here with the same crap. I'm standing where I'm standing. I'm not confused. Just don't get confused because I'm

not going along with everybody else.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: All right.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Changing mine to yes. I'm staying with mine.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: All right.

MS. GEBREYES: Changing to yes?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So yes?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Now he's a yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: He said a

yes.

PARTICIPANT: You want to rescind this or what do you mean?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So can you -Commissioners --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Because he said it. Then everybody say something different. Go ahead.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: So she's going

to explain what a yes and a no mean.

MS. ANDREWS: Okay. Yes. All right.

So in December there was a vote taken by this Board, Resolution 19-40, that authorized the Executive Director to enter into binding agreements for D.C. Housing Authority's redevelopment of the 1133 parcel.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Okay.

MS. ANDREWS: This emergency Board meeting was called and questions were asked, and at this point Commissioner Slover has presented a motion to this body to rescind, take away, the power that was previously given to the Executive Director to enter into agreements.

PARTICIPANT: So a yes means what?

MS. ANDREWS: A yes for that motion would mean that you are telling Director Garrett to not enter into any agreements.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Correct.

MS. ANDREWS: A no for this vote would mean you are telling Director Garrett go ahead and sign whatever documents related to this

transaction.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: That's correct. Now I don't know about him not understanding --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- I'll tell you again I knew what I was saying in the beginning.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you

for --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. ANDREWS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: --

counselor.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Then I stand

with no.

MS. ANDREWS: Stand with no.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I'm staying

with no.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I'm not trying to influence your vote.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Go ahead. What's your vote?

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Neal

Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: No.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MS. GEBREYES: Commissioner St. Jean?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: Yes.

MS. GEBREYES: We have three yeses and three noes.

PARTICIPANT: Is there anybody on the phone?

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: No.

MS. GEBREYES: There's no one on the phone.

MS. ANDREWS: So the motion doesn't pass.

MS. GEBREYES: Should I call the names?

And who's not present or do I need to name --

MS. ANDREWS: No.

MS. GEBREYES: Okay.

MS. ANDREWS: So the motion does not pass.

MS. GEBREYES: Yes.

MS. ANDREWS: Correct. Thank you.

MR. GARRETT: JEAN: Commissioners, I

have to run to the Riverfront bid for a presentation. I apologize. I have to leave.

VICE CHAIRMAN ST. JEAN: All right. The next Board of Commissioners meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 12, 2020 at 1:00 p.m. at DCHA Headquarters, 1133 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20002. Thank you.

Meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:36 p.m.)