DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY

+ + + + +

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 11, 2019

+ + + + +

The Board of Commissioners met in the 2nd Floor Board Room, 1133 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 1:00 p.m., Neil Albert, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

NEIL ALBERT, Chairman
KENNETH D. COUNCIL, Vice Chairman
JOHN FALCICCHIO, Commissioner
DYANA FORESTER, Commissioner
NAKEISHA NEAL JONES, Commissioner
JOSE ARNALDO ORTIZ GAUD, Commissioner
WILLIAM SLOVER, Commissioner
FRANSELENE ST. JEAN, Commissioner
LEJUAN STRICKLAND, Commissioner
ANTONIO TALIAFERRO, Commissioner
AQUARIUS VANN-GHASRI*, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

TYRONE GARRETT, Executive Director ED KANE, Deputy General Counsel ALETHEA MCNAIR, Manager of Board Relations

*Via teleconference

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

Call to Order and Quorum 3
Approval of Minutes, 7/10/19 Board of Commissioner's Meeting
Executive Director's Report6
Resolutions
Resolution 19-25 .44 Resolution 19-26 .98 Resolution 19-27 .114 Resolution 19-28 .139 Resolution 19-29 .151 Resolution 19-30 .164 Resolution 19-31 .170 Resolution 19-32 .174 Resolution 19-33 .181
Adjournment 316

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

(1:16 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Neil Albert and I'm Chair of the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority. This is our regular monthly meeting being held here at our headquarters building.

It's September 11th at 1:17 p.m. Thank you all for coming. We do have a pretty packed agenda today. As a reminder, please silence your cell phones and other electronic devices.

And as is our custom, at this time I'm going to ask you to join me in observing a moment of silence.

(Moment of silence)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. So, I'm going to turn it over to --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, if you don't mind. Can we take a special moment for the day of September 11th?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I appreciate it.

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

(Moment of silence)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Madam

Secretary, can you establish a quorum?

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Council?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Forester?

Commissioner Neal Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner

NEAL R. GROSS

Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Forester?

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: And, Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: We have 11 Commissioners present, one via phone. You have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Commissioners, I want to turn your attention to the minutes of the July 10, 2019, Board of Commissioners meeting.

I hope you have had an opportunity to review this, review them rather. At this time I would entertain a motion for approval of these meeting minutes. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: All those in favor

say aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

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

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Any opposed? No oppositions. At this time we'll now turn it over to our Executive Director for a very brief report.

MR. GARRETT: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. Good afternoon to members of the
public and to the staff. First, I just would like
to begin by thanking everyone for being here.

I know there was a short break and intermission in August but it's good to see everyone again. First, I want to start off with the Employee of the Month for July.

And that would be Ms. Jacqueline Johnson-Holloway from the Department of Human Resources. I just want to say this about Ms. Holloway.

(Applause)

MR. GARRETT: She has served as a coordinator for DCHA's summer youth program for the past 18 years and has worked with and impacted the young lives of our students over those 18 years, over 2,000 youth.

Jackie has not only endeared herself to

many of the youth that have come to work for DCHA over the past 18 summers, but has herself made an endearment and a mark on the members of the staff and her colleagues, especially with the Department of Employment Services under the District's guidance which oversees our summer youth employment grant program.

Jackie also, along with the Agency has been recognized this year as being one of the four out of 100 District agencies that our summer youth employers have always called the best summer youth program in the city. So, I just want to say thank you to Jackie in all her efforts and congratulate her on being the employee of the month for July.

MR. GARRETT: Our next employee of the month will be for August. And that is Mesketem Eshetu. And now, it took me a while to be able to pronounce that because I didn't get through all of it right.

(Applause)

But Meske (phonetic) goes well beyond the great lengths to ensure that the capital funds

in the Office of Capital Programs and other various city grant payments are made in the tune of \$5 million a month on average.

During all of these years Meske has been processing the vendor payments and not once has she received a complaint from any of our vendors regarding payments being late.

And her diligent approach towards her job, her courteous approach toward her colleagues is recognized and appreciated year after year. And many times for us as a staff and me as Executive Director we don't always come into contact with every member of our team on a daily basis.

So, it's good for us to be able to recognize everyone from time to time to let them know that they are valued and very much appreciated not only by the Housing Authority itself but also by the stakeholders who work with us on a daily basis. So, Meske, thank you.

(Applause)

MR. GARRETT: So, Commissioners, I know Mr. Chair wanted me to be brief and I'll do

the best that I possibly can. But I just wanted to, I have a few comments coming down to the end of the year.

On an annual basis we usually close out with some information for not only you but also for the public in general. And I just want to start by saying we really appreciate your guidance and your support over the last year.

And as I come to you today, I wanted to make sure that we're cognizant that within the second term for me as it's coming to a close and energized for the road ahead our energy in all honesty has been focused, laser focused on our transformation plan and building upon the work we have done through our independent assessment of all of our units.

And we're keenly aware that maintaining the status quo is not an option for us at this point in time. I've been asked for and we have delivered a plan that we've made public to transform our properties and transform our Agency overall.

I've been also asked to deliver a plan

that has allowed us to think outside of the box and you've challenged me as an executive director to change the game and we've begun to do so.

We know that this is only our first step and harder work awaits us and we're ready to take that challenge on with your help and your support and also the support from the public as a whole.

We're hoping that we may transform the experiences of our residents. Earlier this week I was in Ward 6 at an ANC 6D meeting to speak about the Greenleaf redevelopment effort that has undertaken by DCHA.

The Commissioners there and the residents themselves were exasperated and I joined them in their frustration. And the reason I do so is because they have so many expectations of the Housing Authority and they want things to happen at a pace.

They're waiting for DCHA to deliver on a promise of increased affordable housing and the retention of a precious -- precious affordable housing units within the District. We know that

it's not sufficient to retain those properties or these units in the state of repair that they're actually in.

Rather, we must transform them into the units and communities that we can live in with comfort and the comfort and the safety that they deserve. So far this year we've brought on, at least 70 units back online within the last three months.

And we're continuing to bring more units online at our other properties so we can have more capacity for our residents themselves. I say that to you today because we have more to do, we have more to sacrifice.

We have to pick up the pace in order to meet our effort. We know that there is HUD matters in these issues that we are facing and we know that HUD has somewhat walked away from the commitment to us.

But we're living in an environment where the unfunded mandate and doing nothing is not an option for us. We must act and ignoring these

challenges is what's, in all honesty, gotten us here before.

And with all transparency we've made it clear that we're uncomfortable with this truth and we can't ignore it.

We are going to be continuing in this particular third year, with guidance from you as the Board of Commissioners, to take the necessary goals and accomplish the necessary expectations and with a keen understanding of our fiduciary responsibility and the moral imperative that we have been bestowed upon us. Our children, our families, they deserve better and no doubt, we're more than capable of delivering for both.

I realize and understand as an Executive Director, as a leader of this organization that there are vulnerabilities on all sides meaning that there are going to be situations where we're not always going to agree while we take this whole journey.

But I think the mission of the organization itself coincides with the mission of

our residents. And that is to provide a safe, strong environment for them and their families to thrive.

So, over the next year we're going to be moving forward in that direction as best as we possibly can and at a pace that is sufficient to guide us. So, I'm just going to go into a couple of last items just to let you know about what we did accomplish this year.

There will be a formal document being given to not only to you as the Board of Commissioners but also provided to the public on our page over the next two weeks. I'm going to do it this way then.

I'm going to keep my composure, let me do it this way, okay. So, when we look back over the last year what we're trying to do again is to piece together puzzles.

That puzzle will be the development and transformation plan, the property management operations, our organizational efficiency as a whole and resident initiatives along with our

voucher administration.

Now, our organizational efficiency you need to know and a lot of these things are behind the curtain, you're not aware of what's actually going on at any time. We always see the bricks and mortar. But we don't see exactly what the studio is actually producing until you get it.

We recruited leaders to execute a clear business model for this organization centered around urgency, efficiency and innovation. And we restructured certain departments for operational efficiencies.

The Office of Capital Programs, Offices of Housing Choice Voucher and the Property Management Operations. We have continued our true focus on workforce training and professional development along with comprehensive training programs for our residents and the community as a whole.

And we've added some internal components where we've recognized potentials for key positions with our staff. We've enhanced

accountability and we've also enhanced performance metrics.

Those are some of the things that we did not have in place before that we now provide so that we can allow for true accountability of the staff. And we have utilized new technology and tools to enhance responsiveness and data traffic on site and at DCHA properties.

And one example of that would be our Veracity tool that we use. It's now an app that is on everyone's phone.

So, when we're doing those relocations for the lead interim controls we're actually tracking that in real time through a handheld app that's on everyone's phone or on an iPad which gives us the opportunity to have better technology and give us real time information.

Along with that we also have the Voyager System which is an internal component software system that we utilize in order to deal with our residents on a daily basis. And then we have the overall use of our technology cybersecurity which

we talked about earlier when we were dealing with the insurance contract.

We've also implemented new property management operations. We've reduced work orders by almost 9,500 in just Fiscal Year 2017. Now, we realize that the increase of work orders were generated by our environmental initiative.

But that raised our work order total to over 14,000 beginning year between 2017 and 2019 to date. But we've been able to reduce that by about 9,500.

Again, we've implemented the Voyager software. We've also, I don't think you were aware, we created a night shift. The night shift was not originally here.

That was an effort to reduce cost in overtime but also to get responsiveness in the evening hours from our staff. So, we have a night staff and a night crew that works on behalf of the property management operations.

We've also implemented a new management structure to increase again, accountability. Our

resident initiatives, you are more than aware that we have a 90 percent job placement for individuals that come to the Southwest Enhancement Center or the Frederick Douglas Center.

And we've exceeded our three goals by over 150 percent by adding almost 191 jobs for our residents to individuals outside of the Housing Authority.

We've awarded over 17, well we were awarded 17, \$700,000 for a grant that we're implementing and using now and we've expanded our Envision Center Program.

A voucher program has also conducted over 8,000 voucher holders workshops, workshops for over 8,000 voucher holders. And we've established a relocation division within the Agency.

You heard me talk about it. That was something that we did not have before because we want the experience of our residents during relocation, interim controls or any type of initiative which requires residents to relocate to

be able to move efficiently and without being too anxious and put upon.

And the success of this relocation plan without, nothing is perfect in what we do. But when we established through the department what residents, we had kinks, we had bumps in the road.

But we were able to establish a clear program and a clear team to work with so that in the future when we look at other sites we will be very efficient.

The development of our transformation plan, as you know, it's on the website now. It's available to the public to offer comments up until the end of the month. From that we'll create a final document and we've been, I think, very successful in engaging residents and also the advocate community in discussing the transformation plan itself.

Now, that also falls in line with our Office of Capital Programs. With Office of Capital Programs I just need you to know that we delivered over 220 units at Parkway Overlook. We

self-financed over 170 units at the Harlow.

We submitted and secured the demo/disposition application for Park Morton and we've submitted the demo/disposition application to Sibley and with your approval today of the resolution we should be able to get a response from HUD within the next two weeks of an approval for that one also.

We've also secured \$17 million for Kenilworth redevelopment which you will be hopefully approving a resolution to accept that money from DHCD. We've also initiated the interim controls at 18 properties. That was for the lead initiative.

We've invested over \$6 million in five properties updating 115 units in 2019 already. We've secured the \$24.5 million, another resolution which we'll be discussing today where we're going to be putting that into play within the next 30 days.

We've also developed that 20 year comprehensive transformation plan to aggressively

reposition our properties. Looking ahead over the next year and beyond, it's going to be necessary to, you know, create the transformation plan and develop a program that will be comprehensive and take us all the way through the next 20 years, if not longer.

We want to also create the developers selection of Green Leaf which is out now. You'll be hearing those RFPs. As we speak we should have someone selected for the end of this year.

There is also potential of at least three Section 18 applications in the fall to be submitted. And with that, we will be able to produce not -- excuse me, at least four RFP's on the street by first quarter 2020.

And that will give us the opportunity to start retaining and identifying general contractors and/or development partners to work with us on our transformation. So, everything somewhat goes hand in hand when we're moving forward.

Continued workforce assessment and

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

2.1

optimization of our organization itself. What I need everyone to know is that we, HR is now working on an optimization plan for our organization to see exactly where we fit and in fact how the transformation plan impacts our staffing level and some of our goals in the future.

And that's something that's going to play out for us over time. So, it's not all one size fits all. We are all distinctive in terms of what we can do with our particular housing authorities based on our communities.

We've integrated also a creative funding option where you heard doing a presentation from Andre Gould (phonetic) about our, you know, layered subsidy sources to try and get redevelopment projects moving and completed as quickly as possible.

And the idea would be to be on time and on budget in all cases so that we don't run into any obstacles and we can return residents to their units as quickly as possible for those who have actually been relocated.

And one other thing that I think is very important, I think you've seen here on my team at least up now there's a great deal of transparency where we're open and honest about exactly where we are, where we stand and where we're trying to go.

Even if it's not the most agreed upon route, I think we all can say that the discussion is there. We're able to talk about what the real issues are and we're able to try together as a team, and I do mean team between the Housing Authority, the community and other stakeholders the opportunity to try and figure out what the solution may be.

Now, we may not all agree on what the solutions are, but we all do know what the problem is and that we need to put ourselves in a position to provide better housing, better opportunities for the residents that we actually serve.

So, I thank you for the opportunity to just take a few minutes to talk about this. Again, something more formal will be given not only to you but also uploaded to the public in the next week

or so. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much, Mr. Executive Director. We're going to go into our resolutions. We actually have nine resolutions on the agenda today.

It is our custom to have members of the public provide any kind of comments on the resolutions. There are two members of the public that have signed up, Debra Fraser and Taylor Healy.

Debra has signed up to speak on many resolutions so she'll have five minutes. And Taylor has signed up to speak on one. She will have one minute. So, is Debra here, Debra Fraser here? Why don't we bring the mic to you?

MS. FRASER: I don't need it. You really want folks to speak on the resolutions. But somehow you assume that the audience here would be smaller than it usually is.

Because you were so efficient in sending out your plan more people are engaged and the more of the Housing Authority you

underestimated the number of copies we needed for the resolutions. So, I can't speak on any of them because I don't have a copy.

Thank you. Please from this moment on because you're doing all of this PR, recognize and prepare for there to be twice as many people in here and then give us the tools to be able to engage in that.

So, I can't speak on anything without a copy of the resolution.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I will make sure that you have copies of the resolution. I thought we gave out copies, handed out copies before the meeting.

So, my apologies for that. Taylor. And you're here to comment on 19-25?

MS. HEALY: I am. And I timed myself at three minutes and 38 seconds. So, if I could have that --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I think we can give you that.

MS. HEALY: -- that would be great.

NEAL R. GROSS

Thank you. Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Taylor Healy. I'm the community lawyer and project supervisor at Bread for the City.

Since 2014 I've been representing the Kenilworth Courts Resident Council as it relates to the redevelopment of the property. So, first I want to provide you with an overview of the broader framework of the Kenilworth redevelopment beyond just Resolution 19-25 that's before you today and then ask for a commitment from the Agency to honor the promises it made to the residents back in 2016 regarding their right to return.

As some of you may remember, initially the Kenilworth Resident Council opposed DCHA and the private development team's HUD application before the Zoning Commission citing the inadequacies of the resident relocation plan and the lack of a clear right to return to the property.

In order to rectify some of those concerns the Resident Council secured a commitment letter from former director, Adrianne Todman in 2016 which was also filed by DCHA with the Zoning

Commission promising among other things the expansion of DCHA Resolution 16-06 to Kenilworth which in short authorizes the DCHA Executive Director to take the steps necessary to ensure that resident screening at mixed financing redevelopments will not be more restrictive than what's required to be admitted to public housing.

In addition to this letter, DCHA agreed to incorporate these additional resident protections into the Kenilworth relocation, re-occupancy plan. That plan now states that residents are protected before, after and once they return to the site.

It mirrors the commitments the Resident Council was able to get in writing from former director Todman. And most importantly, it states that additional resident screening barriers will not be put in place by private developers to keep out the individuals and families who this Agency is supposed to house.

Finally, the Zoning Commission's order states that prior to obtaining a Certificate of

Occupancy for this first redevelopment phase, DCHA and the developers have to finalize a written tenant selection screening plan that mirrors the tenant screening requirements of 16-06.

All of these promises, commitments and orders however, require DCHA to take additional steps to ensure enforceability. A resolution and a letter from the director and a relocation plan in the Zoning Order are not the same things as having the actual commitments laid out in legally enforceable regulations or the legal contracts that the Board is being asked to authorize further negotiations on today through this resolution.

Namely, the HUD declaration of restrictive covenants, the recorded regulatory and operating agreement and other recorded affordability covenants. These documents and contracts are where the resident protections need to be spelled out in detail and expressly give tenants the right to enforce them.

If right to return protections aren't in these contracts private developers and

management companies can continue to engage in enhanced credit, criminal and rental history screening like they do at every DCHA mixed property to date.

Director Garrett has spoken publicly as it relates to the repositioning that resident return to mixed finance communities is a top priority and that Resolution 16-06 should apply to all redeveloped properties in the DCHA portfolio.

The problem is that 16-06 isn't enough on its own. It states an overarching policy goal of the Agency. But it isn't enforceable against a private developer who chooses to conduct enhanced tenant screening.

DCHA executive directors change, Agency staff change, property management companies change. The truth is that residents cannot and should not keep relying on informal written or verbal commitments from this Agency because they're simply not enforceable once properties convert to mixed finance redevelopments.

We anticipated this enforceability

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

problem back in 2016 which is why former director Todman's letter to the Resident Council states that DCHA agrees to memorialize these and other commitments to the residents prior to the closing of the first phase.

We're asking today that the Board pass the proposed resolution but keep its promise to the residents by expressly requiring here today that DCHA work with the Resident Council and me as the Council's attorney to ensure that the promised resident protections are memorialized in the contracts and covenants that actually control these individual properties so that people can return to their communities after the redevelopment.

We want Kenilworth to be an example of how things can go right especially when the Agency is considering privatizing a huge portion of its portfolio. I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you, Taylor.

Can I get a copy of your --

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

(Applause)

MS. HEALY: Sure. I also have copy of Director Todman's letter from 2016 and copies of the Zoning Order for everybody if that would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes, you can leave them here with me.

MS. HEALY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Any questions from any of our Commissioners? Commissioner Slover?

Can you hold one second?

Question and more of a comment or an observation.

As the Commissioner who, I think it was the only time in the history of this authority brought a resolution to the Board and had it passed, which is this resolution we're talking about, I feel a lot of frustration about how nothing was ever really done with that resolution.

And I think what we're hearing in this testimony is that we need to people proof these processes. So, what we tend to do is make promises

that are people specific.

And so, I think it's time as a Board and an authority and as whatever you want to describe us, is that we need to be very firm and poignant about what it means to have this right to return.

What does it actually mean? And where is it legally, can somebody point to and say there's no discrepancy here, this is it? Someone made me a promise. I don't where that person is. They're gone.

The fact that this hasn't made it in beyond a resolution is very frustrating to me. And so, I would actually ask, Mr. Director, that you respond to that actually now and say how is this enforceable when we go into these mixed finance situations where we do not, no longer own the asset and therefore we do not control the lease, we don't control the process?

Where is it that we can point to people and say, don't worry?

MR. GARRETT: I'm going to have, I'm also going to have Ed Kane and also Andrea come up

from OGC to add some information because I'll get it started.

And normally, Commissioner, those documents are or those issues are highlighted within the master developer agreement, management plan and/or a written operating agreement within the financing pack along with other documents in the financing package when you move forward to close the deal, redevelopment deal.

That's where it's normally identified. Through advocate meetings we have been told that may not be sufficient for their liking.

And so, we have committed to going back and looking at exactly where we might be able to place it or what would make everyone feel comfortable especially when we're talking about the right to return. So, Andrea.

MS. POWELL: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I do think Taylor had some specific recommendations in her testimony that are practical and implementable. And we can use that as a starting point.

MR. GARRETT: We did just want to say,
Mr. Chair, she did mention management plan and I
agree with that. I agree that's where they should
be.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: All right. The only commitment I can make to you is that we'll keep you informed but certainly the residents informed.

MS. HEALY: I think what we're asking is more than being informed. It's that the former director made a commitment that these would be memorialized before the first phase and here we are, you all are voting to move forward on that first phase.

And we're still waiting for them to be memorialized in these documents. So, I want a commitment from the Agency that we won't just be informed, but that we're going to be a part of the conversation and that we're going to be seeing drafts of these documents before they're signed.

I don't want to find out afterwards that it's not in there.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes, but I think what

I'm saying and what you heard the Director today is, so he's been out over the last two years meeting with almost every public housing resident giving that verbal assurance and commitment.

That will continue. What I'm saying as the Chair of this Board is we're going to take it more than his word and memorialize that in specific property by property agreements, the same thing that Commissioner Slover has been asking for, for a number of years.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, I just, I don't want to pile on. But history has proven that this is not an efficient or sufficient course of action because the authority granted by these resolutions is too wide and too broad.

And things happen as a result of broad authority. And there is no opportunity for these things to be checked prior to implementation I think is the issue.

The issue is that by the time anybody gets to weigh in on these things they're done by virtue of the way we operate as a Board and the

authority which we vest in the Executive Director through these resolutions. It's an issue I've had since I've been on this Board for a decade. I've not been able to solve it.

I thought I solved in Resolution 18-17, but now we're back to it in 19-25. And so, there is no final check that the Board gets to weigh in on based on the way these resolutions are written.

So, when the deal is fully cooked, so right now we have all these hanging issues, like the right to return and like, you know, some of the things that I'm going to go through when we get to the resolution.

But the way the resolution is written, not to be repetitive it just -- we don't get another chance to confirm all these things are done. And that's an operational flaw we have.

MR. GARRETT: So, Ed, can you just speak to what we've done thus far?

MR. KAINE: Sure, Executive Director, Ed Kaine, Deputy General Counsel. I think the thing that is perhaps different about this moment

in the history of these transactions is that we've committed to a process to actually achieve what Taylor is asking for.

I think that is, we've committed to identify both the provisions and the specific documents to work with the legal service providers in actually fleshing out language referred back to both 16-06 and subsequent documentation.

And so, I think that there frankly is a process that's initiated that's running parallel. It's not expressly referenced in the resolution. But it has certainly been running parallel to that process as a part of the overall rollout of the transformation.

So, there has been, you know, at the very least an acknowledgment not only of the need to have all redevelopment properties address this specific concern, that is that residents rights be preserved and that the properties be operated in a way that don't insult or trample on those rights even after they've changed from a traditional public housing platform.

But also, to figure out exactly how we can enhance, how we memorialize those provisions and those requirements beyond the traditional leaving it to be spoken to in the regulatory and operating agreement.

So, the process is lagging a bit behind this resolution in terms of the level of detail. But it is a process to which we have committed and it's part of what is now an ongoing conversation as opposed to just an idea that is a bit of a one-off.

MS. HEALY: I'm worried the closing for this phase is slated for probably January and we may not be done with that process. And so, I sort of want to have them be bifurcated.

Like I'm speaking say not just as an advocate who cares about public housing, but as the attorney for the Resident Council at this property where we have a written commitment where if DCHA doesn't do it you can't get a Certificate of Occupancy for your building.

So, it makes sense, I think to just

commit to including the Resident Council and myself in the conversation so that we don't have to get to that point. And I do believe that was how it was envisioned in 2016 that it would be a conversation.

Again, I have the letter about a commitment to continuing meetings with residents and myself, sharing critical documents. That's not happening. So, we need to revisit these promises.

MR. KAINE: So, I think, I can't speak to the on the ground part of the process. There has certainly been lots of contact with the, with residents in connection with the project.

Perhaps it has not been the formal conversations to which Taylor is referring. But I don't think also that the critical documents you're talking about are anywhere near being drafted yet.

So, I think that there is certainly time to loop this whole set of concerns into the process of drafting and reviewing those documents and that

it's, you know, a reasonable and easy thing to expand the discussions that are ongoing with residents to ensure that we're responsive to this part of it as well.

MR. GARRETT: And just to close it out,
Commissioners. We've already had several
meetings with the advocates thus far. And this
particular issue has come up not just with
Kenilworth but as a whole with the other properties
that we're looking at in the future.

So, this isn't something that's new to us. This is something that's very aware. And the Housing Authority and the administration committed to having ongoing discussions with the advocates.

And so, I don't see why we can't come to a resolution at some point in the near future because we committed to having those conversations and also drafting documents that will be suffice.

MS. HEALY: So, for this particular property, can I be in the room as the attorney for the Resident Council to see and help draft these documents? I'm not going to say I'm going to

critique your entire R&O.

But for any portion that affects the promises that were made in 2016, can I be a part of that dialogue? Can the Resident Council --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well, I think the dialogue should probably occur -- so you're the attorney for the residents.

MS. HEALY: Resident Council.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Heads or attorney, I think that's a great place to start the conversation. And then hopefully bring back, Ed is a really great guy to work with despite how he looks.

But I think that's a great way to start the conversation and then just have those recommendations float up to the Executive Director and to us if you think that makes sense.

MS. HEALY: So, what was the last part?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: If you think that makes sense. If you think that will work.

MS. HEALY: Just speaking with -(Off-microphone comments)

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

MS. HEALY: I'm hoping to follow up with Ed about this.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And I'm not just asking for a sort of offline conversation. I'm asking for a working conversation with you and Ed.

MS. HEALY: Yes.

MR. KAINE: And as the Executive Director is saying, we have committed to that. I think and, yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: I've got something to say. Mr. White and what's your name again?

MS. HEALY: My name is Taylor Healy.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: One thing that I'm doing, I'm trying to ask for is the rights for the tenants, every tenant should have one. The update they should have one so they can read it themself because most of your issues are coming from that, their rights.

MS. HEALY: For Kenilworth we do have a relocation, re-occupancy plan that was given out

to residents back in 2017 that does outline a lot of those rights that they are supposed to have.

But it, as my testimony said, it requires this additional step so that the developers are aware of these things as well.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Correct.

MS. HEALY: So, that's what we're asking for. That was step one. Now, we're at the next phase.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Okay, got you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much. And you can leave them here with me.

MS. HEALY: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much,
Taylor. Let's go to Resolution 19-25. I'm going
to turn it over to our Executive Director.

This resolution will authorize, enable the financing of redevelopment of the first phase of Kenilworth Courts. Mr. Executive Director.

MR. GARRETT: Okay, yes. Commissioners, we're going to continue to move

forward with a brief presentation from Andre Gould from the Office of Capital Programs.

MS. HEALY: The residents who are here from Kenilworth today are, I don't know if they were slated to testify on the resolution or --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes. Only two people signed up for the resolution. But we have a list of folks if we have time. Andre.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Taylor, do they want to testify on the resolution? I think there is some confusion out there about timing on testifying.

So, I would offer that if they have something to talk about on the resolution it is little of no value to hear it after we vote on it.

MS. HEALY: I didn't read everybody's individual testimony. There are, a lot of people are here today to talk about right to return but also about relocation that's happening.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But it's just, I think it's unclear, Mr. Chairman, to a lot of folks and we hear this every month why we are testifying

after the resolutions.

And so, I'm not saying that's happening here. I'm saying if people are here to testify about --

MS. HEALY: The Resident Council president is here and would like to testify.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, we're going to be here for the duration of the meeting. So, whether we hear it now or we hear it later the comments will be included in the public record.

I'm going to ask Andre to do a really high level overview of what the resolution accomplishes or seeks to accomplish then we'll have some comments from the Board and then we'll vote on the resolution.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm sorry. But if people are here and they want to testify about the resolution and their comments will not affect or inform any vote if we take the vote and then hear their testimony. That's a little backwards.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I don't think people knew -- what I'm trying to say is I don't think people were aware that if they didn't sign up for that particular spot that they weren't going to be heard before the vote.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I understand what you're saying. I hear this same thing at every meeting. And my response is the same at every meeting.

We're going to make an effort to make it clear at the future meetings that there are two opportunities to speak, one specifically on the resolution. We're going to record every comment on this resolution and every other resolution that's in front of us.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Can you just say for the public record that you know that there are people out there who want to testify about this resolution but you're not going to let them testify until after we vote?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, Commissioner, again we do this every --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I just want, just say it. Just say that's what you're going to do.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I want to ask
Andre to go through just very quickly the proposed
resolution and then have our Commissioners provide
commentary. We will, there is time.

If you signed up to testify, have you signed up on this list?

(Off-microphone comment)

MS. HEALY: People didn't know they had to specify the resolution number. People didn't know the number of the resolution. But they're all here from the community.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Are you trying to suggest that you don't understand the issue?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can you hold one second? Rather than politicking, can you let me ask the question? How many people are here to testify on this particular resolution?

Two, did you sign up for the resolution?

MS. HEALY: They didn't put the

resolution numbers. It wasn't clear to people what number it was. They all signed up to testify and didn't realize they had to put the number.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Got it. So, what are your names?

MR. SMITH: My name is Carl Smith, the Resident Council President.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay, Carl, why don't you come up? And who else is on the list that signed up?

MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Delores Williams.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Delores, why don't you come up and then as soon as Carl is finished we'll have you go. We're going to give you three minutes to provide comments on the resolution.

We had five from multiple resolutions.

You've got three for each resolution. So --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: What do members of the general public get?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, if you are a resident --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: What do members who are not in public housing get?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You get three minutes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, residents and members of the public get the same amount of time? That's never been our policy.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, Commissioner Slover, I would encourage you to read the signup form which we have at every meeting. It specifically says person wishing to speak on a single resolution have three minutes to speak.

Persons wishing to speak on multiple resolutions have five minutes to speak.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Is this a policy that you changed because --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: It's a policy that I'm reading. I think you're confusing the public comments --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm not confusing it.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: -- for the comments

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

on resolution. I think it's hard to admit when you're confused. But go right ahead.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Wow.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Executive Director, Commissioners. My name is Carl Smith.

I'm the Resident Council President at Kenilworth

I'm here to testify today about the problems residents are having during the phase one relocation and to follow up on a letter that our Resident Council sent to Director Garrett on August 15, 2019, asking for voucher extension for phase one families who have been unable to locate new units.

We have concerns with the HOU group that's contracted to assist in the moving of the residents. They are not there every day. We have people waiting to talk to them.

They have one full-time and one part-time worker to work with the residents and the community. We talked about, back in 2016 they talked to, DC Housing talked about credit

Courts.

counseling that we never got.

Some people are being denied because of their credit. In our letter to Director Garrett we were concerned that we had told you at least Commissioners at the last Commissioners meeting that only four out of five families were having trouble locating new units with their vouchers before the September 30th deadline.

In reality, we now know that there are 27 phase one families with vouchers who have not located new units. In response to our letter DC Housing has now given 23 of those families extensions because they were never given six months to find units.

We have now located new units because they need larger bedrooms and we have people with disabilities. We want these four families to receive extensions and additional help finding places to move that will meet their needs.

We also want to make sure that the Board is aware of how many of our families are still struggling to locate housing with vouchers even

with the relocation staff on site. More needs to be done to help our residents through this transition.

That's basically what we need help with. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I'm going to ask a couple of quick questions on that. So, do you have a sense as to how many residents still need help in finding housing?

MR. SMITH: We have 27, I think it is overall. But we have a deadline with the vouchers that's coming up now this month. And people are very stressed.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I think the deadline was extended. Director --

MR. GARRETT: We extended and I think Ms. Healy can testify that we did extend that deadline.

MR. SMITH: We talked about the extension for the ones that got their vouchers late. But we still need more time for the ones that didn't get the extension.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: So, sorry, if I could piggyback on this because I know Carolyn Punter is not here. Is Anissa here or Chelsea because that was my problem with Kenilworth because when this demo/dispo happened.

MR. GARRETT: I prefer, Commissioner, in all honesty, I prefer that Deborah Jackson come forward please.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: So, Deborah Jackson from mobility. So --

MR. GARRETT: Let me, I got it. I have it. I can do it. Thank you, Deborah. Just give an update on where we are, please for the public.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner Falcicchio, was your question related to this?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: No. It was just if 23 are extended, how many were not extended? And maybe this is, so it's just four, those four were not extended because?

MR. There might GARRETT: be a particular reason why not, sir.

> COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

Maybe the staff report.

MR. GARRETT: They had the appropriate amount of time.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes, okay.

MS. JACKSON: Okay. Just to let, just to give numbers without giving any names, we have actually only 13 residents right now that have a voucher that have not found housing.

At this point we have eight residents that were approved and they're waiting for inspections and then the RFTA packet to be submitted. We have six residents with applications pending.

We have three residents who are going to public housing. We have two residents scheduled to move this week and we have 14 residents who have successfully relocated.

So, there's a breakdown of each resident by name and what category that they fall in. We also have two additional staff arriving tomorrow who are mobility staff.

And Manuel Sistrem (phonetic) is

downstairs looking for units as we speak to connect each resident to multiple unit offers on top of what they've already been offered.

MR. GARRETT: So, Commissioners, originally HOU was the entity, third party entity that was working with the relocation of the residents. When we created our Mobility Relocation Team we took over the full process and not, and we are doing the relocation of residents.

So, the extension of vouchers was in response to the fact that many of the residents had not received their vouchers in a timely manner to give them the opportunity. We'll work with this remaining four that's been identified by Mr. Smith if we possibly can.

I believe there is possible ways where we can work with them to ensure that they have the opportunity to find a unit before the end of the year. And that's our goal.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: John.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: No. That addresses it just for the four that are most at risk

right now.

MR. GARRETT: We'll do the best that we can.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Let's make sure that nobody is left behind. I want everybody to get vouchers so wherever they get housing should not be left behind.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Can I ask --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm lost here.

There are four that the voucher expired? And were those folks reached out to after one month and two months and three months and provided assistance?

MS. JACKSON: So, we can get confirmation with HOU who was the provider on the property. Like Mr. Garrett stated, we have stepped in now to assist the residents with the Mobility Team. We can get that information.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: That's fine.

But, you know, we have a lot of requests from the

Board that don't get implemented one of which was

reaching out when a voucher was issued after 30, 60, 90 days.

MS. JACKSON: Correct.

MR. GARRETT: Going forward --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Let me finish.

MR. GARRETT: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And so, instead of creating a big issue about this let's just get the four vouchers fixed and extend them so they can get housing and not really have another conversation about it.

MR. GARRETT: So, Commissioner, I just want to make a --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Go right ahead.

MR. GARRETT: I just want to say, Commissioners, and for the public, the reason we have the mobility counseling team is so we don't have to rely on any third parties. So, Commissioner Slover, you're exactly right.

When the vouchers were originally issued there was a third party that was supposed to be handling the outreach and the contact. Since

that point we realized that doesn't work for us.

So, now we're using our own people to handle it. So that outreach that you're talking about, the 30, the 60, that's how we work now.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I appreciate that. But there's no point in having these four people worry that their vouchers are not going to be extended. Why don't we just not make that commitment?

MR. GARRETT: I committed, I just committed when Commissioner Falcicchio stated I said we would do that.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Very good. Thank you so much for your commitment. Could you state your name?

MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Delores Williams.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Delores, why don't you go right ahead.

MS. WILLIAMS: The circumstances, I'm one person, I haven't received my extension on my voucher. I have not received my extension on my

voucher.

And this is very stressful, I'm telling you. It's a stressful situation that is putting people under, not only just me. Trying to find a place.

You go to some of these places, the price is not right. You go back. You've got to go back again.

You keep going out, in, out, in. Then they say that these prices are not right on the paper that were submitted that stated that this was going to be the price for this apartment.

People rejecting the Section 8. You go back and forth. You've got to pack. You've got to go pack out. You're doing -- it's very stressful and it took me through a lot of stress.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, is there someone from the Housing Authority that's helping you personally?

MS. WILLIAMS: Me, myself and I. I go,
I look for my stuff. The city, they did an
outstanding job, yes, they have with trying to work

with.

But all I'm saying is this stuff right here it don't make sense. None of this makes --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So --

MS. WILLIAMS: May I finish talking?
CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. WILLIAMS: It doesn't make sense that a person got to be stressed out to try to find a place that they was already living in and now you've got to find, you've got many years, you have to throw away half of your belongings which don't make sense.

You have grandchildren or great grandchildren you might want to give these things to. My little grandson asked me, Grandma, where's the books? I said, I had to throw them away because I have to move.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, how best can we assist you?

MS. WILLIAMS: How can best you assist me? You can assist me with a bigger place instead of the cracker box that I've been going and looking

at. Ain't big enough for a rat to get in.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, Deborah, if you want to identify yourself.

MS. WILLIAMS: And I've been through the --

MS. JACKSON: We work together. So, I'll continue to work with her. I want to make sure that she is available for the meet and leases.

She did attend the meet and lease that we had on the property. But because of certain circumstances I think you came afterwards.

MS. WILLIAMS: I've been coming to all the meetings.

MS. JACKSON: Okay. And so, I'll talk again to her after this. I don't want to talk personally about the situation in front of everybody.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You got it.

MS. JACKSON: But we'll talk after this. And again, tomorrow somebody will be on property and we'll go to your door and we will sit with you, okay. But again, we can't --

MS. WILLIAMS: Sit with me and find a place, I haven't even received an extension. Mine expires on September the 30th.

MS. JACKSON: Okay, okay. We'll meet with her. We just have to make sure that, you said you wanted a bigger space. We have to make sure that again, we meet voucher bedroom size.

MS. WILLIAMS: And what happened to the, okay, well what's going to happen when -- see what I'm doing is I'm in a four bedroom unit which is a lot of stuff that I have to throw away in which I don't feel like throwing it away.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well we can give you as much help as we can in downsizing. Trust me, I moved from a bigger house to a small house, had to part with some of my most precious possessions.

I understand how hard that is. We're going to encourage our team to work with you to make sure you can transition as much as possible into your new surroundings.

But if you can give me and give our Executive Director constant feedback on how that

process is going we're then able to make sure that you are accommodated in the best way that fits your needs.

MS. WILLIAMS: And I can understand that, and I'm going to talk on one of my neighbors they cannot be here because of the fact that their mother, they have to take care of their mother.

They've been looking for a five bedroom unit each and every day. Can't find a five bedroom unit.

And it's very hard and it put a lot of stress. I mean, I'm really stressed out trying to do, I mean, I'm trying to do the best, do the right thing.

And I'm not getting, you know, people say, no, we're not going to take this certificate.

Okay, you've got to move here. This price is wrong. This price is right. It's very stressful.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. So, just make sure you connect with Ms. Williams, please. Thank you so much.

MS. WILLIAMS: Can I get some of this

in writing that this is what's going to be happening because I don't, I mean, I'm the, I mean I heard this and I heard that. And I mean, I'd like to see it in writing.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, my colleague just said she was working with you. Whatever commitments you would like to get from her in writing she will give it to you in writing if you just make sure you connect with her today before you leave.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much. How are you? Are you testifying on 19-25?

MS. SETTLES: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great.

MS. SETTLES: So, I'm here to publicly say in honor of Denise Stanley and this 2016 bill, I'd like to declare that this bill be passed in its fullness on her behalf and be memorialized.

So, I think everybody here is familiar with who Ms. Stanley is. She deceased. And -CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can you just state

your name for the record? Not everybody knows who you are.

MS. SETTLES: I apologize. I'm Karen Settles, Citywide Advisory Board rep. So, the reason why I feel it's necessary, all that needs to be said, and thank you, Mr. Slover, I mean, Commissioner Slover for weighing in on the relevancy of this.

And I also thank, Commissioner St.

Jean. We must understand the weight of the people.

The Commission, I'm not, I don't understand the balance of what this Commission, the great weight or whatever you would call it as far as the Commission is concerned.

But I need to know what the way in, I don't care about votes right now. I think by show of the audience and the relevancy of this particular resolution it already, it must be moralized now.

And I'm just seeing dancing around it. So, I would like to have it memorialized in Denise Stanley's name.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Appreciate that.

Thank you. So, Ed, are you around? I don't know if there's a mechanism to do so.

But is there a way that we can recognize Ms. Stanley in the resolution or some way at the request of Ms. Settles and I'm sure it reflects the sentiments of others.

MR. KAINE: Sure, yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, can you research that and let us know?

MR. KAINE: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay, great. Thank you. He's pretty quick. We'll probably know before.

MR. KANE: I think adding, in particular to the general statement with the honorarium and the name is not a problem at all. So, you have the answer now and we will make the change to the document as quickly as possible.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, 16-06. So, not the current resolution. Well we retroactive --

MR. KANE: Right, if you want to --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: We can do that retroactively, Ms. Settles. So, we'll probably have to bring it back to --

MR. KANE: There is likely to be Board action taken around the things that we talked about earlier that are to be worked out between the Resident Council and the Authority based on the conversations that you all directed that we have with Taylor Healy.

And so, there might be opportunities there as well.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner Strickland.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes. I was going to ask can we, since we're talking about amending can we add some line to this resolution just to say that we will add those protections to the resolution, 19-25?

What's the language look like? Even if it's just a line that says, you know, like on probably between eight and nine or between seven and

eight on Page 4, just to say that, you know, the Executive Director will not close the documents without having, you know, proper language to ensure, yes, ensure the residents right to return.

MR. GARRETT: How can we capture, Ed, that we have the opportunity to review with the actual language as prior to just accepting anything that's presented?

MR. KANE: Well, I mean, based on what you all directed earlier, I mean based on what you directed earlier for purposes all of this resolution, we can add a line to what you resolve that we address the issues that were raised with specific language in the documents as appropriate to be worked out between us.

So, I mean, you can have sort of a placeholder as you described in there. keep thinking about how to make it more precise.

> MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Ed.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. Thank you, Ed. So, Andre.

> MR. GOULD: Good afternoon,

NEAL R. GROSS

Commissioners. My name is Andre Gould. I'm a development project manager in the Office of Capital Programs.

Resolution 19-25 to authorize the execution of documents to enable the closing of financing for the redevelopment of the first phase of Kenilworth Courts. Kenilworth Courts has been a redevelopment project since 2012 when we received a \$300,000 Choice Planning Grant.

At that time we worked with the residents and the rest of the community stakeholders to put together a redevelopment plan. That same year, 2012, we selected the Michaels Development Company and The Warrenton Group as co-development partners for this project.

And we moved forward with PUD in 2016 which was approved where there's a 42 unit senior building, 65 unit multi-family building that sit along Kenilworth Courts and the balance of the site is stacked flats and townhouse units.

There are a total of 166 units in this first phase of redevelopment for Kenilworth Courts.

We plan to replace 118 units in this first phase.

Our plan calls for replacing all 290 units at

Kenilworth Courts.

The overall plan calls for approximately 532 units overall for the first phase. But, I mean for the entire site. But the first phase will encompass a total of 166 units.

Now, for the resolution today we're asking your authority to do the following. First, we would like to give authorization to the Executive Director to actually accept a Housing Production Trust Fund Award that was awarded to the DCHA earlier this year.

It is approximately \$17.6 million of Housing Production Trust Fund funds. Secondly, we would like the authority to create an entity for DCHA to serve as a co-developer in a joint venture development with Michaels Development as well as the Warrenton Group.

Thirdly, the Deputy Mayor's Office, DMPED, has provided \$4 million in funding. We would like the authorization for the Executive

Director to sign an MOU for those funds at approximately \$4 million for demolition and infrastructure for the project.

Next, for the 42 unit senior building we need HUD's authority to make that a 55 and older designation for that senior building. And we need your authorization to make that request to HUD.

Also, as part of our request to HUD we need to submit a development proposal on mixed finance agreement application in order to get approval for 101 ACC units.

And the reason that we need to do that is, go to our Faircloth and request those 101 ACC units is that we need the additional subsidy.

Initially, as part of our Resolution 17-32 the Board had provided allocation of project based vouchers. We would like to ask the Board's approval to use one of our MTW initiatives, a local blended subsidy in order to layer on the subsidy to ACC as well as use those 78 project based vouchers as a block grant to provide subsidy for the affordable units in this project.

Next, we need your approval to also submit a disposition request. We were only awarded demolition approval from HUD for the first phase. So, we also need to request from HUD the authority to dispose of the first phase of the redevelopment.

And we would like to dispose of that to DCHE and also execute a ground lease to the joint venture entity. Are there any questions on this resolution?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I have a question. Commissioner Vann-Ghasri is on the phone, joining us by phone. And she asked me to ask you a question on this resolution.

She says that, are there any Union employees, apprentice or journeymen Ward 7 employees that will be working on the project?

MR. GOULD: Yes, there will be. We're currently working out an agreement with DOES as well as a Section 3 agreement with DCHA. We would like to report back to you at a later date what those negotiations were.

But in the very least we would be holding

the contractors to the strict guidelines of the District because it was Housing Production Trust Fund, funds as well as our Section 3 commitments as well that DCHA would like to provide for this first phase of construction at Kenilworth Courts.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you.

Commissioner St. Jean.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: We have to be persistent so this is a yes or no answer. Whether or not there is Union support, then there is DPMG. Then there is residents of Ward 7.

What specific residents of Kenilworth Parkside who are apprentice or journeymen has been reached out to work on this project as well because those are different categories? And if there have not been any then I recommend highly that it takes place.

MR. GARRETT: So, Commissioners, I will go through --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,

Commissioner Vann-Ghasri.

MR. GARRETT: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri

and Commissioners, I will go through the Office of Resident Services through the listing that we have of residents in the ward, also residents of the property also.

So, that process will go through that -COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And the
reason why I say journeymen is because I know that
through many of these projects there are no Union
employees. Most of the Union employees live in
public housing or are Washington D.C. residents.

Most everybody that works on our projects are contractors. So, there should be a model where Union apprentice and journeymen who live in the District of Columbia, who live in public housing, specifically Kenilworth Parkside will be hired as a model under your leadership, Director Garrett.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,

Commissioner St. Jean.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Will there be

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

opportunities for families to purchase for home ownership in the town homes versus just renters?

MR. GOULD: This first phase is completely rental. But we've actually looked at and part of our PUD calls for approximately 22 home ownership units.

That's currently shown in the third phase of the redevelopment of Kenilworth. But we can look at that further as we get closer to those phases and we'll be updating the Board as we come with each phase as well.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Questions from other Commissioners? Commissioner Slover.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I have a couple questions. So, the ultimate development will produce 532 units when it's all done?

MR. GOULD: Yes, that's what the current PUD is approved for.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And how many of those will be replacing the 290 units that exist today?

MR. GOULD: We plan on replacing all 290 units.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: On the footprint?

MR. GOULD: On the footprint. The balance right now is going to be a combination LIHTC and home ownership they set aside.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, the 290 public housing units that exist there today, how many, is there any offsite replacement that's counting towards that 290?

MR. GOULD: No. This is all on site.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay, good.

Moving on, how did you guys determine the 30 percent split to the joint venture partner? Why did we get 30 and they got 70?

MR. GOULD: We actually negotiated that as part of the MDA. There are actually two development partners.

The Warrenton Group is actually a minority development company and they actually get a split of the 70. So, in fairness we negotiated

30 percent for DCHA.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, you think it's fair?

MR. GOULD: There is actually three partners at the table. So, it's almost a three way split.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, we are a 30 percent equity partner according to the sources. So, one the things is the, so the, a lot of what you're asking for is authority to accept money, \$4 million from DMPED to DCHA; \$17.6 million from the Housing Production front to DCHA. We're providing the land, correct?

MR. GOULD: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And it looks like we're going to basically throw the land into the deal for what I think a nominal fee. So, you know, I have the same issue all the time.

It seems like we're not a 30 percent partner. So, I'm wondering what they're doing for the 70.

MR. GOULD: They are providing

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

guarantees for this project.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: For?

MR. GOULD: For the project overall. They're providing all the guarantees. DCHA is not providing guarantees for this project.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Completion quarantees?

MR. GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Who is guaranteeing the first mortgage?

MR. GOULD: They are as well.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: 100 percent, no recourse to DCHA?

MR. GOULD: 100 percent. And also the Housing Production Trust Funds will be a soft loan to the project. It's not a grant.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, can you tell me about the million dollar loan from DCHA via Resolution 15-11? Where is that reflected in the sources and uses?

MR. GOULD: Those funds will actually be paid back to the Agency --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ GOULD: -- will be reimbursed as part of the closing.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, we're going to get that money back.

MR. GOULD: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Very good.

Another question, I have a lot of questions I'm trying to keep it all straight here. So, the 55 plus designation on the 42 units, is that, what are we doing it?

Do we have a need to do that? Is that a requirement? Is there some value to it?

MR. GOULD: It gives us a little flexibility in the amount of, the people that we can put in that building. It's just been the trend that if you can reach the 55 and older population it creates a good environment.

And it also helps with leasing the building as well, that you can reach back to 55 as opposed to 65.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, it's, okay.

So, in the notes you say here that we have, there's a requirement to submit a development proposal to HUD to get approval for the disposition.

But it sounds like you're asking for authority to do a financial closing and a lease disposition.

So, one of the issues that I raised earlier and one of the things that we got figured out in Resolution 18-17 was that one of the concerns I have about the way we operate as a Board is that we give this overarching authority way too far in advance.

And so, is there a reason why once you get everything figured out, once you get the right to return resolutions figured out and once you get the financing figured out and once you get everything figured out and you get your approvals from HUD and you get your approvals from everybody else, everybody is happy, that you don't come back to the Board and say, look, we got everything figured out?

Can you approve the disposition? Is

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

there a reason you need all this authority right now?

MR. GOULD: It's a timing. Right now we're projecting to try to close the second quarter, I mean the first quarter of next year. Dealing with HUD is, we can't control their timing.

So, as soon as we can get in front of this and present how we want to layer the subsidy and get their approval the better we can stay in front of our time line to actually close the project.

MR. GARRETT: Andre, can I just ask one question? In reference to LIHTC and locking in the dollar amount, is that if it goes into the next year with the dollar amount changed that we're being offered --

MR. GOULD: The pricing will definitely change.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But none of that requires you to have the authority to do the land disposition right now. So, that's all, so a long time ago in 2016 I finally dug up the memo, I got some at least feeling a little more confident about

being on this Board because we had the right once the disposition came forward to have final approval which would allow us then to look at the final deal's terms and conditions.

So, the concern I've had historically is after the fact we see the deal terms and conditions and they're not necessarily favorable, i.e. 30 percent to 70.

MR. GOULD: And when we actually ask for the Board's approval of the pre-development loans those terms were part of the resolution when we presented it to the Board. That was years ago, I agree.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right. I'm sure I had the same comments then. My point is I don't want to cede all opportunity to improve things.

And so, I'm wondering why you need approval for, why you need to have the authority for land disposition at this point in time? You just said it's not going to be until the first quarter of next year.

MR. GOULD: As part of the development

proposal that we'll be submitting them to HUD we're telling them who we're going to dispose of the property to.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: That's great. You still don't need, my point is you still should come back and tell us once you have the whole deal figured out which you don't right now.

MR. GOULD: But we're disposing of it to DCHA. It's not going to anybody else. It's going to be ground leased to the JV. It's going to stay

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, the ground lease is going to come back to the Board?

MR. GOULD: I mean, we could provide a briefing and show you the ground lease before it's executed.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Was the ground lease worth the, this is, we --

MR. GARRETT: So, Andre, the ground lease component to this particular transaction was provided to the Board early on, correct?

MR. GOULD: No, we haven't put together

a ground lease yet.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: My point is we don't know the specific terms and conditions. We don't know what we're getting. We don't know anything.

You're asking for wide ranging authority that historically has lasted years and years and years. It may not happen this time.

But I feel like a broken record. Every time these things come up I have the same conversation.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, Andre, what does HUD require from us as part of our disposition submission?

MR. GOULD: We can't even request disposition until the development proposal has been submitted. And part of that development proposal will be saying that we want a ground lease at the property to the joint venture entity and the basic terms which would be at a nominal cost, 99 year ground lease.

If there are additional items that the

Board would like to see in that ground lease we can discuss them now.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And what's HUD's time frame for approving the request for disposition?

MR. GOULD: We're going into the next fiscal year. A lot of folks are coming back from summer vacations.

So, it's kind of hard. We're about to run into the Christmas season. So, I wouldn't want to put a timing on it. But I would like to get it in front of them as soon as possible.

MR. GARRETT: And there are other Commissioners and there are other redevelopment deals and transactions that are going to the same department that are also trying to close before the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, we are vying in position with other housing authorities for HUD's attention.

MR. GARRETT: Who are also trying to close and lock in their dollar amount, their pricing before the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Can I ask one more question? Why do you need 78 project based vouchers and 17 LSRP vouchers to support 118 units plus ACC contract?

MR. GOULD: Initially this project was underwritten with 118 project based vouchers. But as part of 17-32 we were only approved for 78 project based vouchers.

So, that's one of the reasons why we're reaching to our MTW initiative to bring back the ACC in order to layer the subsidy in order to stabilize the project to make it work operational as well.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, we had a situation a couple months ago where there was an attempt to avoid Davis Bacon charges and we tried to fund 30 plus ACC units with five or six vouchers.

And that, I was assured by a lot of different people that was plenty of project based vouchers to support those number of ACC contracts.

So, why is that not true here? I mean, why do we need so many PBVs to support a lot less

ACC contracts?

MR. GOULD: Currently the way that we're layering the subsidy it can support the project.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm not denying that. What I'm saying is it should be less PBVs. We should be able to do it for less because we were able to do it for less before.

MR. GOULD: But these PBVs are going to support 101, 118 replacement units. One hundred and one of those are going to be supported by the 78 project based vouchers.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right. And before we were going to do it with six for 30. So, the numbers, the math, I mean, I'm not a mathematician.

But it seems like that's a lot more vouchers required to support a lot less ACC in this situation versus the last one because I was a little surprised to be honest with you how few PBVs it took to support those other units.

And maybe this is not an apples to apples

comparison.

MR. GOULD: It's not. Now I understand your question. That project had a market component that could help support the lower income units.

There is no market component in this project. It's all affordable tax credits as well as the other subsidies.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. Do we get any resolution on whether we need this authority for land disposition or whether that's going to come back?

MR. GOULD: What we would like to do is present the ground lease to you before its executed.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Just to show it to us or to get it approved?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I would recommend that we include it as its stated in the resolution given the fact that we are, as the Director said, we are in line with other housing authorities for HUD's approval.

You mentioned earlier the crush during the holiday season. What I would like to recommend

is that this Board gets to see the ground lease at least before its executed.

But I don't know, our general counsel is not here, if we need to approve the ground lease. But at least we'd like to review the ground lease before it's executed. Any other comments on this resolution?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, is it going to be similar to Number 3 which is the \$4 million MOU is going to be presented to the Board before execution? What does that mean presented?

Does that mean presented for approval or presented for reading it?

MR. GOULD: Actually presented for your review to make comment before its executed.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Are you talking about the funding from DMPED?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm talking about Number 3 in the resolution which says that the \$4 million funding from DMPED, the MOU will be brought back for a review before execution. So, that doesn't mean approval.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I've been on the Board two years. We haven't approved resolution between two government agencies.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We sure did.

MR. GARRETT: We accepted.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I've been on the Board two years. We have not approved a resolution between DMPED and DCHA to my knowledge.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, we did. It was \$10 million and it was a bit of an issue because Brian voted on it and then signed it on behalf of the city.

So, that created a conflict of interest conversation which is still going on. So, we did actually have a vote in the past on accepting resolutions because as a Board we're supposed to accept anything.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: But I think that's what you were trying to capture in this resolution because one of the elements in the resolution, and there are like eight or nine elements, is the MOA, Memorandum of Understanding from DMPED to the DC

Housing Authority.

So, wouldn't this vote provide the approval of that MOU that you're looking for?

MR. GOULD: Yes, yes, Mr. Chair.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But why then review it? I mean it seems odd to say we can review it after it's been approved. For what value?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, it may just be a wording issue here. But if we're voting on nine components in this resolution, we're approving nine components.

I don't know if it's nine, it's five or seven. We're approving those five or seven components of it.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Again, it's trying to get a process down that is people proof, as we talked about before, versus like different every time. And so, why would we write in there that we have an opportunity to review it but not approve it?

It just seems like an attempt to try to maybe suggest we get to review it and not let us.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, let me just read specifically what Item 3 says. It says authorize the Executive Director of DCHA to take all such actions to execute MOU and DMPED for \$4 million of funding for demolition and infrastructure costs.

So, we're authorizing the CEO of this organization to do the transaction with DMPED. That would effectuate the \$4 million coming over here to the Housing Authority.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And it goes on to say terms of the MOU to be presented to the Board before execution. I don't understand, I mean -
CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Right, so I think that portion is redundant.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Maybe you should strike that. Well, it's not redundant. It's irrelevant.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Same thing. You say irrelevant, I say redundant.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: Strike that, that's fine.

MR. GARRETT: So, I'll just strike

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

that.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Other questions?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Who would the 4 million be recoursed to? To the JV partner or to the Authority or who is going to be the, is it a grant? Is it a loan?

Maybe John, Commissioner Falcicchio, you can weigh in on that.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Well, there's not a recourse because it would be outlined in the memorandum. So, it's a direct, if you want to call it a grant would be the easiest way to understand it. It's a grant.

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Yes, typically it's been a grant.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, not repayable by the project or --

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: And then we would loan it into the project.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Any other questions on this resolution? Hearing none, I am going to entertain a motion for approval of Resolution

19-25. Is there a motion?

PARTICIPANT: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can I have a roll

call?

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Council?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: No.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Forester?

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Abstain.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Guad?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes, with that amendment for the placeholder for the tenant protection.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes, with just two additions or two recommendations. So, I want to make sure that we memorialize the conversation that would occur between Ed and Taylor.

So, we're going to figure out a way to have a placeholder in this. And then to Commissioner Slover's point about the redundancy of the language from DMPED I want to make sure that the resolution removes that piece of redundancy in the language.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: One other cleanup, it says 167 in my copy of the total number of units. It's 166.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: No, I actually think

it's 167. One of the units is going to be available for a manager.

MR. GOULD: Full-time manager.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Full-time manager.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. I heard him say 166. That's what confused me and it adds up to 166.

MS. MCNAIR: Okay. Your vote total is seven yes, three no, with one abstention. The resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. So, Taylor, we're going to ask that you and Ed get together as soon as possible.

And then at some point in time we're going to ask the Executive Director to come out and meet the residents and send a report out on the agreements that you've made to fulfill the requirements that you've talked about today.

Great. So, let's move to Resolution 19-26 which will re-adopt Resolution 18-17 which will authorize the submission of application to HUD for demo/dispo of Sursum Corda and Sibley

Townhouses. Andre, you want to --

MR. GARRETT: You know, Commissioners, I'll do it very briefly and if Andre needs to chime in. This is going to be a resolution that, we are resubmitting this resolution to the SAC Office for approval.

They have gone through our application with demolition/disposition which you've already authorized. But because when we sent in this particular resolution the date on this resolution versus the date of the mayor support letter, the mayor support was after the resolution.

And technically, it should come on, it should come before or on the same day as the resolution by the Board of Commissioners. That being said, we just want you to actually reaffirm your original position with the new date for the resolution.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Any questions or comments on this resolution? Commissioner Slover.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Just out of

curiosity, why did it take the mayor so long to respond to this? And is this normally something that has to happen, the mayor has to support these projects?

MR. GARRETT: Correct. Every jurisdiction requires a letter from the mayor or the city official in charge of the District or of the municipality to confirm that they are in support of the application.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, does it normally take that long to get a response?

MR. GARRETT: It happens sometimes. It gets mixed up and reviewed. But it can happen, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And as I referred to before, in this resolution and like the last resolution there is, we had inserted in here the need to, I'm trying to get the 18-17, the need to bring it back to the Board.

It says further be resolved DCHS shall seek, review and obtain approval of the Board of Commissioners of the redevelopment plans for Sursum

Corda and Sibley Townhouse projects including financing and selection of any developer.

So, you're coming back to get approval before any disposition of the land.

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Why is that? Why this one and not the last one?

MR. GARRETT: Different administration, different approach to make sure that we get it right to make sure that you have every opportunity to look at it.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But we just passed a resolution.

MR. GARRETT: Correct, you did. But the one thing about this, we're just talking about, right now we're just talking about, and the difference between this particular resolution and the resolution previously was that one was demolition, one we separated demolition and disposition, correct, Andre?

MR. GOULD: Right.

MR. GARRETT: Versus this one where we

NEAL R. GROSS REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIE

have it, we're combining it together in one.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm not sure, that doesn't compute because the point is to get the deal fully cooked and then bring it to us versus get the approval and then go cook it. That's just as simple as it gets.

So, on one resolution we just gave the authority to go get everything together and cook it and this one we're saying once you cook it let us check it out before we eat it.

MR. GARRETT: But it was the same, it actually was the same process because remember the previous resolution with Kenilworth was to, because you have the addition of the disposition attached to it, Commissioner, I think that's the uniqueness of this particular application.

Right now we're just doing step one which is the demolition disposition. We would have been bringing back similar items that we have for Kenilworth back to your attention for financing and any ground lease or anything like that in a resolution that will resemble and be similar to what

we just did for Kenilworth.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You may recall, Commissioner Slover, Andre explained earlier that on the previous resolution for Kenilworth this Board already approved a demolition application to HUD.

The Resolution 19-25 was just approval of the disposition side of that application. So, I think that was the difference I think that Andre explained.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It's a timing issue, Neil. I think it's something as a Board we've got to really start discussing the transparency of the way we operate.

And so, I find it confusing and I would like a process that's consistent and not project by project based.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well, I'm not opposed to a process that's consistent. I would like a process that's efficient which certainly means that, you know, we're not taking, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri, could you mute your phone for a second

because we can get your feedback?

I'd like a process that doesn't take seven years to execute a project. We've had, let's use Kenilworth as an example. We have had this community in limbo since 2012. It's 2019.

And so, if I was living at Kenilworth I would be totally upset with every one of us sitting on this dais today because it's been seven years without any kind of surety. And so, I'm all for process.

But I'm all for efficient processes.

And so, if this Board wants to spend a day sort of figuring out with the team how we streamline our processes, I'm game for that.

But it has to include a process that we, it has to include a conversation of how we make things more efficient. You know, we are the Board of Commissioners. We are policy making and an advisory group.

We are not staff. And so, our job is to give sort of high level direction to the folks who get paid to run this organization. So, let's do

that. Let's set up policies.

Let's set up systems and procedures that work efficiently, agree to them and so we're not sitting here every month posturing on what policies are efficient or inefficient. That's the work of this Board.

I've heard it too often. Let's set aside some time to do so.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We also have a fiduciary responsibility, Neil. We're not just a policy and advisory board. And so, I respect what you just said and I appreciate it.

But a lot of the projects you're referring to have issues with our partners. We don't have control of the future or the destiny of them.

And so, there are a lot of different things that go into what you just said. But at the end of the day, this Board actually has a fiduciary responsibility so you can't just punt.

And so, one of the things we have to do is make sure that when we dispose of a piece of real

estate that we know the terms and conditions of it.

And the way this Board has operated to date we don't know the terms and conditions of those things, okay.

So, part of any process has to have that.

I realize it slows down some of the processes you guys are trying to run. But it's what we need to do.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: It's not a matter of slowing down the process. I've worked in District government. I understand how bureaucracies work. I understand how our systems work.

We have to strike the balance between being obstructionist and moving an aggressive agenda that supports the residents that live in public housing. At some points in time I get the feeling after being on this Board for two years that we nitpick every process under the guise of fiduciary responsibility.

There is a balance. And all I'm saying is that we've got to find a way to make that balance so we can allow this team to do their jobs, to do it efficiently, to deliver services to our

community in a timely manner.

And the process that we go through right now to do this isn't working. So, I want to get off of my soap box for a second. Other questions on 19-26?

Commissioner Vann-Ghasri asked me to ask a few questions and she would hold it against me if I didn't. So, why did DCHA have to do a special application for Sibley and Sursum Corda Townhomes?

MR. GARRETT: There's no special application for this particular. It's just an application for demo/dispo.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay, next question.

Is there a community benefits agreement in place?

MR. GOULD: We haven't gotten to that point yet.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And before she chimes in I'm going to say, why not?

MR. GOULD: We're still early in the planning stages. We're not exactly sure how we're going to proceed with this property just yet.

MR. GARRETT: And we are in the process of also, we are also in the process of putting out an RFP for a co-development partner for this parcel along with a design build team. So, this is just the first step to move residents out of their particular units which are in need of great repair.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Finally, what type of vouchers, if any, will residents of both communities receive?

MR. GARRETT: Federal vouchers, federal relocation vouchers.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner St. Jean.

I ask is for when a demo/dispo is when it gets approved, when you guys actually put it in and when it comes back to us because I don't want the same issue that happened at Kenilworth where the vouchers just kind of sat down for a couple of months.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. And, Commissioners, the second stage to that is actually

submission of the demolition application, approval of the demolition application and then the request for the relocation vouchers.

So, there is actually a third step to this particular process.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: So, whatever the steps is, I just want to make sure the Board gets the approval, the date and time when it got approved, how many vouchers and how it was allocated to the residents, the participants.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: We can certainly do that. Commissioner Slover.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Did I hear you say you were looking for a co-developer?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Sorry, my Board lost power.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Did I hear you say you were looking for a co-developer?

MR. GARRETT: Quite possibly. Yes, we are going to put out an RFP for a co-developer. It doesn't mean that we have to accept one.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, part of, you know, not to be nitpicky, Neil, but part of the thing we had agreed to as part of our process was that the first place we were going to start was developers.

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And then if we were going to move away from that, that you were going to present to us the rationale and the reason for that. When are you going to do that?

MR. GARRETT: We'll do that before we select any co-developer if we desire to. There is one piece about that parcel, Commissioners, in terms of actual density.

We originally thought we would do about,
I think it's 130 units, correct. We are still
looking at whether or not we could do more density
on that particular parcel.

And doing more density for our particular capacity might require bringing on someone else to work with us. But if we go in that direction we're definitely going to come back to the Board and we're going to give an explanation as to

why we've moved away from doing a self-development opportunity there.

That's all it is. We're expanding all what our options are.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: To hone the process a little bit maybe you could bring it back sooner rather than later because you've got a lot of development expertise and city expertise in some of the folks on this Board.

Neil has done a lot of work with the city. A lot of people have done a lot of things. Maybe you should bring that back to the Board and tell us why you're moving in a certain direction as part of a briefing at that point.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And then I would agree with that. I would also agree that we need to address as a Board this whole question about co-development, using external developers.

We've gone sort of back and forth on that. I don't know that there's a clear consensus on which way we go as a body.

But that's part of the conversation we need to have, Commissioner Slover, and to have some other forum. So, we're not going to solve that today, I promise.

Any other question or comments on 19-26? Hearing none others, I would entertain a motion to approve 19, Resolution 19-26. Is there a motion?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Second, is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Second.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Seconded, roll call.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Forester?

COMMISSIONER FORESTER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Guad?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes. I just want to confirm this is just approving the exact same resolution as 18-17 with this exact same language.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay, yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

Commissioner Vann-Ghasri? Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Okay. Let the record reflect, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri said, yes. You have 11 yes. The resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,

Commissioners. Let's move to 19-27 which will

authorize the District of Columbia Housing Authority operating budget for the Fiscal Year 2020.

We're going to ask Barbara to come up or whoever will be presenting this.

MS. CHEN: Good afternoon, Commissioners and, Director Garrett. We are here to present Resolution 19-27 to ask the Board's approval to approve the District of Columbia Housing Authority operating budget for Fiscal Year 2020.

It's required that every year prior to the beginning of each new fiscal year Public Housing Authority is required to prepare an operating budget in the manner prescribed by HUD. The Public Housing Authority's Board of Commissioners must review and approve the budget by a resolution.

Each fiscal year the Public Housing
Authority must submit that to HUD in a timely manner
prescribed by HUD that approve the Board
resolutions. This year the resolution requests
approval of the consolidated operating budget for

all DCHA's operation for Fiscal Year 2020.

Attached to this resolution is the proposed operating budget for the District of Columbia Housing Authority.

For Fiscal Year 2020, the proposed operating budget in the amount of \$540,281,146 is to administrate and operate a TW Housing Authority and expended -- Public Housing operating subsidies, Housing Choice Vouchers, system payments and the capital funds allocations.

As I mentioned the total operating expenses for this Fiscal Year 2020 is \$540,281,146 which includes a special item this year that is including a one-time expenses for \$14,803,725 for the in rent control to pay for the in rent control cost.

We are here to ask the Board's approval to approve this proposed operating budget in the amount of \$540,281,146 for the Fiscal Year 2020. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes. So, I have a couple of questions and I know I asked them, I asked

you those questions earlier today but I just wanted you to put it on the public record.

So, your budget reflects the use of some reserves.

MS. CHEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: About --

MS. CHEN: \$3.86 million.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes. So, what are you using those resources for and then after those resources are expended what would be the level of our reserves that's available?

MS. CHEN: The total we asked the Board's approval to transfer the \$23,860,365 from the DCHA's reserve to cover three categories, three items. The first one is that \$14,803,725 to cover the in rent control due to the environmental issue. That's a onetime expense.

And another one is we also budget include \$4,231,500 for housing system payment for lowest families that they transferred from public housing units to the private housing.

Another one is we asked the Board's

approval to transfer another \$4,825,140 to cover the housing system payment for the existing family. Due to the higher, the rent in the market.

And we are working on the, after this we can maintain, we maintain about two months of our operating reserve which to cover our two months partner so can they have payment, our housing system payment also two months of our administrative and operating expenses.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much. So, what would be the balance in our reserves after we use these funds?

MS. CHEN: After this one we probably, for DCHA it's going to be over \$70 million.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Questions from other Commissioners?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: I'm reading something that Commissioner Vann-Ghasri asked. She has three questions about the budget. Her first one is why did DCHA do three transfers? That's her first question.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I think that was,

that's the same question that I asked the transfers from the reserve.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Right. Her second one did the transfer impact any of the other accounts? If so, which accounts did it affect?

MS. CHEN: The transfer is basically from our reserve. The impact is just on DCHA's reserve accounts.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay. Her last is the payment standard. Explain the record and how it impacted the Agency where there is any impact on our constituents.

MS. CHEN: The payments standard, the HCVP (phonetic) standard is 187 percent of the HUD's payment standard which allow our families to move to some of the area that was a much higher rent.

The impact for us that we are working on to evaluate and we will try Mr. Garrett's goal is that we're going to provide a premium amount helping for the family. So, we are evaluating everything.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner Slover.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: A couple questions. First of all, recognizing this is just a budget and it's not written in stone, numbers can move around, this is what we hope will happen, I'd like to ask some specific questions about things because I think it sort of shows a direction or operating priorities of an Agency.

So, can you tell me about the capital budget, where it is on here and how much it is? How much, what's the size of the federal capital budget which is essentially the money that we use to maintain our traditional public housing units? How much is that money?

MS. CHEN: This year kept, first of all I want to point out the capital expenses is approved by the Board in another, in our ten month meeting, yes. So, it's not part of this operating budget.

This year we, our capital fund for Calendar Year 2019 our capital fund is approved. We are HUD approved and awarded a budget of \$19.2 million that we allocate a little bit over \$11

million for capital expenses but which include \$5.5 million for our tax service.

If you recall back in 2005, '06 this Agency utilized the capital funds CFMP, the finance program to borrow against our capital funds revenue to make improvement for all various public housing units.

So, although we can say we spent \$11 million -- over \$11 million in capital improvements.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, of the funds that we get from the federal government you're telling me today that \$11 million of it is actually used to do work on the properties?

MS. CHEN: Yes. This year, right now we have a few of the federal capital fund program limit of \$11 million. We also received the LSRP.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. I want to stay focused on the federal money.

MS. CHEN: Okay, sure.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Because what I recall from the other meeting that there was a lot

of the money that didn't actually go to the property. Last year, as I recall, what hit the property was about \$2 million from the capital fund. Is that accurate?

MR. GARRETT: 2.1.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: 2.1, okay.

MS. CHEN: Yes, but that was after the debt service.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But that's what I'm asking. So --

MS. CHEN: If you include the debt service it's about \$8 million.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, now it's eight million?

MS. CHEN: Well, I mean because the \$11 million included \$5.5 million for --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, what I asked, let me ask the question more specifically. What is going to go to helping maintain the properties if five or it's going to debt service of the 11 then that's not going to help the properties.

What I want to know is how much money is

this Agency spending on maintaining its properties?

MS. CHEN: We also, if you look at the budget this year we also budget over \$15.2 million in the maintenance expenses. That's our ordinary operating maintenance.

So, we also do a lot of dollar, money in the maintenance. This \$15 million is just for the material contract.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Mr. Slover, can I ask it in a different way and see if I can get you the answer that you're looking for?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I already know the answer. I just want it on the record. I mean, I just want people to understand that a lot of our capital budget is used for other things and it might be why our properties are not in the best condition because historically we've diverted a lot of our money and it doesn't hit the property.

And so, I just need that to be out there.

And so, the next question I have is given all of the expenses that we have and given all, we hired a consultant last year to help us about staffing and

about looking at the Agency and trying to find out if we were staffed right, if we had people in the right place, if there was, what was the result of that work?

MR. GARRETT: That was, and Barbara, I can answer that question. So, Commissioner Slover, you're referring to McKinsey. And, Commissioners, we brought on McKinsey originally to work on a strategic plan.

But as we started to move forward what we also recognized was that without knowing exactly where we needed to go over the next ten to 20 years it would be very difficult to create a strategic plan that would acknowledge and identify exactly what we needed to do from a staffing level and an organization level.

How many people we actually needed to perform the actual tasks that we were going to need or going to pursue in the future? In addition, when reviewing this particular budget for Fiscal Year 2020, it's clear to us that we need to implement some other greater controls and increase some

efficiencies.

So, what we have decided to do in addition to addressing what, and really this is addressing what Commissioner Slover brought out.

When we decided to, when I made the decision and determination that we needed to go in a different direction in utilization of McKinsey as the consultant that was in fact a decision that we felt was necessary because we did not know what we would need in the future based on what our priorities would be in transforming the organization and our properties.

Also, there was a caveat to engaging McKinsey which allowed us to look at our actual image or our housing stock to see exactly how that would impact us and create a strategy for that.

So, we prioritized that being the residents and the conditions of the actual units over looking at the overall Agency from a staffing level. Now, that doesn't mean that we're not going to look at it and we are beginning to do that process.

In fact, we've already taken some steps in that light where I stated earlier where we created the night shift to start looking at how we can save money. And that actually resulted in a \$700,000 savings for this particular fiscal year.

And we're looking at other leadership moves that will allow us to save up to a million dollars over the next three years. And those are other things that we're doing.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Are those findings publicly available some place?

MR. GARRETT: We can put them out for the public to look at, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And have you taken some of those, have you looked at like size agencies in terms of what they deliver in terms of vouchers, in terms of traditional public housing and sort of what they need to do and the number of staff they have versus the number of staff DCHA has? Have we done any of that work?

MR. GARRETT: We're actually taking another look at it. There was a previous plan that

was done but that was some time ago.

Instead of utilizing that as a basis we're going to do it again with another group taking into consideration how the transformation plan might actually impact us if it was fully implemented.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, again the budget informs priorities. And so, for me, you know, we have a rather large crisis looming and a lot of opportunity to, you know, cut our budget. But we haven't done it.

And so, I personally can't support the budget because, just because of the capital component alone just like I didn't support it last year because I just think we need to spend more money, as a real estate company we need to spend more money on our property.

And whether that requires us to spend less money somewhere else then that's a price we have to pay. And the bottom line is we're going to have to start to, we're going to have to figure out how to be more efficient.

Our properties are deteriorating and we

spent \$2.1 million out of our federal capital budget last year to maintain 8,000 units. That doesn't work.

So, you can't pass a budget with those kind of numbers in them.

MR. GARRETT: But I think Barbara also identified that we had --

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: You said what, five million is debt service?

MS. CHEN: About 5.4, yes.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: And so, we borrowed money to do something. What was that borrowed money used for?

MS. CHEN: Like I said, back in 2005, 2006 this Agency borrowed over two loans over about \$70 million to make a one-time renovation to rehab all the public housing units.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, we are spending that to support to support renovation that has occurred.

MS. CHEN: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: Renovations that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

actually took place. But the question is we're at that 20 year mark again. So, but still playing debt service on previous money that we borrowed.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I just want to understand the math a little bit. So, you've got over \$11 million in federal payments annually, rough number?

MS. CHEN: Capital fund this year was \$19.2 million.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: \$19.2 million. So, of that \$19.2 million, how much of that goes into taking care of our properties? I'm not talking what goes to the police force, what goes to wherever else it goes.

Of that \$19 million how much of it goes to actually keeping our facilities clean, safe, healthy, rough order?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ CHEN: Excluding the debt service about \$5.5 million.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: But you just told me the debt service was \$5 million.

MS. CHEN: Yes.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, you're saying --

MS. CHEN: So, overall a little bit over \$11 million in total considered as capital expenses. But \$11 million.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. So, I am either slow because it's 3:15 or I'm not understanding the math. So, you said there was \$19 million in federal funds.

MS. CHEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What does the 11 represent?

MS. CHEN: After that we allocated -CHAIRMAN ALBERT: How do you get from 19
to 11?

MS. CHEN: Yes, 35 percent of the \$19 million we allocated to pay for our public safety to pay for the training, all the capital, the OCP staff, the --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It's overhead.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Wait, wait. Let her finish.

MS. CHEN: And another 15 percent we

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

allocated to help us pay for all of the other operating expenses. So, the 65 percent, pretty much percent of the grant is for capital expenses, yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I must say that is a ridiculous number given our needs here in the Housing Authority. And I will vote for this budget.

But with a caveat that you guys will come back to us within a couple of months with a plan for drastically increasing the amount of federal dollars that actually goes into the renovation of these properties.

So, I know we hired McKinsey to help us do that assessment. McKinsey has been on board for how long now?

MR. GARRETT: Over eight months.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Over eight months. So, we should have a sense as to how we absorb some of the operating costs that's being funded through facilities through the capital budget.

And so, I want to ask you guys to come

back to me within two months. So, today is the 11th. So, by November 11th I would want to see a plan as to how we divert, not divert, we use more of our capital dollars for the purposes for which it was intended.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, I want to make an observation, Neil. Last year this Board voted down the budget for this very exact same issue, the same thing.

We had the same conversation last year. We voted it down. You had a special meeting.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I forgot that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We all got together and had the same flipping conversation and now we're doing it again. And so, the question really becomes, I mean what's the point in having these conversations continuously if nothing changes? So, now we're a year later.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I do recall that, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: We're a year later. The exact same story. We're starving our

assets. We have this massive redevelopment plan underway.

We've got a lot going on. All I'm saying is the budget informs priority. And if you pass this budget you're informing a priority of starving our assets of the capital money that it needs.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, thanks so much for reminding me that this is deja vu all over again. We did ask this group last year around this same time to do the exact same thing, so to come back to us with a plan for moving more of our capital dollars into its meaningful use.

So, I know the fiscal year starts in two weeks or less. In my private sector company if I don't give my Board what I want, what they want I don't get to spend my money for the next fiscal year.

So, I would probably be a hypocrite if I did something other than what my Board would have expected of me. So, I want to move that time line up a little bit.

So, you've had McKinsey here for eight

months. So, you must have a sense as to how you would use efficiencies and savings to move most of that, more of that money into the capital fund.

So, I want to ask the Board to table the vote on this. If we need to call a special Board meeting to accommodate this we will do that.

But I'd like to make sure that we see from you guys within a week a plan, the same plan that we asked for a year ago. So, I know it's in the works.

So, you have a week to polish it up, get it to us so that we can review it and then we'll call a special Board meeting if the Board will support that.

MR. GARRETT: That's fine, Commissioner. Mr. Chair and Board of Commissioners, I just want to point out \$5 million of that capital fund goes to support the Public Safety Department.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: No, we get that. And I think we heard that same conversation --

MR. GARRETT: So, that's how we get down

to --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: -- last year.

MR. GARRETT: So, that's how we get down

to --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I can't remember who said it. But someone said, I don't think it was you, Slover. I remember what you said. But someone said we've had, I think I said we've had a police department for as long as the Housing Authority is around.

We have to have figured out by now how to fund that Public Safety Department within our operating budget. And so, when the city goes on hard times it doesn't raid its capital funds, right.

It figures out a way to live within its operating dollars. And so, all we're asking you is to figure out a way to do so. And so, Barbara, I hate to do this to you.

You know, I think the world of you. But I think we have to sort of try and instill some physical discipline within the organization. So, we're going to table this conversation for a special

meeting if the Commissioners would agree to that.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Can I ask, sir, one question?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: The next time they come up can they have all those other buckets together, like the capital money. Like, I know, Commissioner Slover had asked for it.

But it would be good to have it all together. I know we had it in a previous presentation. But when you come back to us can we just have the other funds at the same time.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes. So, just one observation. So, this body, this Board makes a lot of requests from the dais and sometimes I feel it gets lost in thin air.

I just want to know if there is like someone who is charged with just recording all the commitments that are made to the Board. And Alethea is saying that she is. So, we thank you for owning up to it.

I think what would be helpful is if, you

know, soon after these meetings there is sort of a recap with a pullout or a point out of the commitments that the Executive Director has made to not just me and you but to the community.

So, that would be helpful if we can get that implemented, Alethea, we will be happy.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: And, Chairman, on that too with a deadline for when it's going to be delivered too.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: With a deadline, correct. Great. So, Alethea is committing to have the follow up items come a week after.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: I'm sorry.

I meant each item that's enumerated that it has a deadline with it for when it would be delivered to the Board or to the residents.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: No, I see what you said. But I think I want you to call it out. So, like today I'm saying I would like to see within a week a revised budget that shifts, that uses savings and efficiencies to move capital dollars that are currently being used for operating purposes into

the operating budget.

And then you're going to tell us when you rediscover \$6 or \$7 million in new capital dollars what is that going to be used for. Which properties are going to be affected?

So, and again, happy to spend a Saturday afternoon with you guys figuring this out if you need help. But I know you don't need help from me.

All right. So, let's move on to the, so my iPad died so I don't know what the next resolution is.

MR. GARRETT: 28.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I'm going to turn it over to our Vice Chair. So, these other resolutions should be quick and painless.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Resolution 19-28 to approve the renewal of DCHA insurance policy with the Housing Authority Risk Retention Group.

MS. FOLWELL: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. My name is Mary Grace Folwell.

I'm from the Office of General Counsel. And this

resolution is the renewal of the Authority's insurance policy.

We come to you every year to renew our insurance policy for, you know, the same term as our fiscal year, October 1st through September 30th. We work with a company, Housing Authority Risk Retention Group that specializes in working with housing authorities.

They understand our housing properties, the fact that especially these East Coast housing authorities we have a lot of very old housing with a lot of issues. They also understand our resident population and, you know, appropriately insure us.

So, the biggest premiums are for our property insurance and our commercial liability. And then the other types of insurance that are listed in the resolution they go out to market and bid those types of insurance out to other companies who are skilled at underwriting those types of risks.

And the good news for this year, for this renewal is that our total premium is actually one,

at this point 1.2 percent lower than it was for Fiscal Year 2018. That's due to a slightly lower premium in the cyber liability and a couple of other coverages.

They managed to go out to market and get lower rates. And then of course, many of the other coverages remained flat.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Could I ask a question?

MS. FOLWELL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: What's the, would the -- what about the residents because you've got the, it's called rent insurance.

MS. FOLWELL: Renters insurance.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: It's a liability with them because some of the apartments or houses it might be our fault.

MS. FOLWELL: So, what -- when you buy, when the Housing Authority, when DCHA buys property insurance that insures the property. But it does not insure the contents of the residents possessions.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: But, you know, the residents, but they've got rights because so many of the residents budget is not nothing.

And you're just telling them to go get rent insurance for something that happened in their apartment that is our fault we should be liability, not them.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: I don't think she asked us to give insurance.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: You see what I'm saying?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: But I'm saying in this resolution it doesn't address renters insurance. I know that was a sidebar conversation we had in the Brown Bag.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Right.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: But this particular resolution does not address renters insurance, which I do think at some point should be a broader discussion on how we view renters insurance. But this particular resolution --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Right.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: -- does not talk about renters insurance.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: But you're talking about insurance for everybody to be included. We're here for the residents.

MR. KANE: So, Commissioner, the resolution that you're reviewing is about the Housing Authority's insurance to cover its exposure and its liability.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: I understand that.

MR. KANE: So, we have --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Would you just --

MR. KANE: Sir, let me finish.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: You just said Housing covering them. But who is going to cover the rent insurance for the people that we're here for?

MR. KANE: Well, as was discussed earlier the staff had the authority having been given this charge before has been looking at trying

to find ways to assist residents in acquiring rental insurance to cover their possessions.

The Authority does not have a responsibility for individual residents possessions. Certainly in cases where the Housing Authority is liable which is an example that you brought up, that actually is something that would be covered by the Housing Authority's insurance if there were a claim made, for example, because the Authority caused damage to a resident's property or a person, right.

So, that would be something that would fall under this. But this is strictly about protection of the Housing Authority's assets, protecting the Housing Authority's exposure.

There is an ongoing exercise to try to help bridge the gap that you're talking about with individual residents getting renter's insurance.

And there have been outreach to a few different companies to discuss it trying to figure out how we bring people in.

There have even been, we have even gone

so far as to discuss how to do it on a way that is affordable and accessible for people. But that's a separate exercise that is ongoing from the one that you are being asked to approve today.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Are there any more questions?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Is there anybody else, sorry? Quick question, I'm sorry, I stepped out for a second. Which of these covers the actual real estate? Is that the first one, general liability?

MS. FOLWELL: That's the property insurance.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: The property insurance, the second one.

MS. FOLWELL: That's right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: 1.38. So, the general liability insurance covers?

MS. FOLWELL: It covers, you know, basically people suing us for bad acts. It covers public officials insurance if someone would sue the Commissioners.

It also covers if we get sued as employers, if our employees sue the Housing Authority. There's a long list. It covers pesticide insurance.

So, you know, we have a new person who focuses on, you know, pest issues. And so, any liability that arises from that. Actually terrorism insurance if we lose, if we have loss from terrorism incidents.

There is separate terrorism insurance for our properties. We also carry terrorism insurance under general commercial liability. There's actually some mold coverage and third party discrimination.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And what are the coverages? What's the coverage amount?

MS. FOLWELL: So, there's a ten million limit. They purchase it in two chunks. So, there's a ten million limit and a five million limit.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Per incident or total?

MS. FOLWELL: Total. And then it's one million per incident, ten million total.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, we have total coverage of \$10 million for the year. So, we pay \$1.1 million to get ten million in coverage.

MS. FOLWELL: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, if we get sued for, if there was a \$20 million judgment we're \$10 million out of pocket or do we have reassurance or --

MS. FOLWELL: They pay ten million. We pay, our total premium is, you know, the 2.8 million.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MS. FOLWELL: They would cover us up to ten million.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So, what happens if we get a judgment for 20 million against us?

MS. FOLWELL: We go into receivership.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right. So, again we're buying \$10 million of coverage for 1.1 million. Is there any way to get more?

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

MS. FOLWELL: If we pay more.

MS. FOLWELL: This, you know, is generally what we consider advisable.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: The right coverage.

MS. FOLWELL: You know, we don't normally, fortunately so far we haven't had awards or claims that are that, you know, even approach being that excessive.

So, it's a balance of the risks based on the past history of our Housing Authority and other large housing authorities.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay, all right. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Let the record show these two questions are coming from Commissioner Vann-Ghasri on Resolution 19-28.

Okay. Her third question was the non-profit management liability impact.

Which non-profit management whether any

Commissioner on the DCHA Board is a member of a non-profit management which if so, which resolution is speaking of?

MS. FOLWELL: So, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri, I believe she's asking about the coverage which is the non-profit management liability. And that coverage is for DC Housing Solutions and then all of the affiliated entities that come off DC Housing Solutions.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: That is the only non-profit that DCHA has that is under the insurance policy, correct? In other words, would you just said to me is that the non-profit liability impacts the non-profit DC Solution.

So, it doesn't impact DCHE or no other subsidiary because they're not non-profit management liability.

MS. FOLWELL: DCHE has a separate insurance from a separate provider and that would be addressed in the DCHE Board meetings. They purchase it from Scott's Insurance.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay. With no

further discussion let's take a vote. Can I get a motion?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Motion.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: I'll second,

I'll second.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay, second.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Neal Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Guad?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: And, Vice Chairman

NEAL R. GROSS

Council?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Let the record reflect that there are eight yes. The resolution is approved.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Thank you.

Resolution 19-29 to authorize the contract for uniforms and personal protection services. Ms.

Bonds.

MS. BONDS: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Lorry Bonds, Director of Office of Administrative Services. So, this resolution before you is again to authorize the execution of a contract for uniforms and personal protection equipment services.

And we're requesting, making a recommendation for a contract with Cintas Corporation for three years in the amount of \$1,080,000. It's approximately \$360,000 per year.

Again, our property management operations will be utilizing the uniforms as well as additional services under this contract which

includes again, laundry service for the PMO staff.

So, in addition to again, the uniforms that they currently have they will receive another set of uniforms as well as again laundry service weekly. Again, part of the service is also to be able to check for any worn, torn material, replace that without having to be requested.

Again, part of this is to make sure to maintain the professionalism of the PMO staff as far as their uniforms are concerned to maintain that purpose. With regard to again, our Section 3 compliance currently we are requesting that they increase the Section 3 compliance that they have provided.

Right now it's for first aid, CPR trainings which currently we pay for. They will be providing those trainings in addition to the three, for at least six times per year. Right now they are approximately \$1,500 per training.

So, we would get the benefit of that.

And they are also committing to provide assistance with regard to scholarships for our young people to

be able to help them as far as being able to go to college.

Unfortunately, because they are located in Landover, Maryland hiring for them is, hiring for us would be a challenge because obviously we would be requesting our residents to have to travel to Maryland in order to be gainfully employed. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I had a couple questions. So is \$360,000 a year for 330 employees?

MS. BONDS: For approximately 334 employees, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Three-hundred and thirty-four. So that's an average of \$20 a week?

MS. BONDS: \$823 a year. I didn't break it out by week.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Eight-hundred and --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: That's per person?

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

MS. BONDS: Per person, I'm sorry. Per person, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: 360,000 divided by 330. That's \$1,000, right, per person?

MS. BONDS: \$823 per person.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Am I, am I math-challenged? That's \$1,000 a month, right? \$1,000 per year, per person?

MS. BONDS: Approximately.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay, so that's \$20 a week, per person. Is that an, is that an average, is it just for the uniforms, and cleaning them, and having them available? So it's, that's what this contract's for?

MS. BONDS: That is what the contract is for, for property management operations, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So that's a, I just did a quick internet search, to be honest with you, and that seemed like it was a lot cheaper than that, so --

MS. BONDS: Well, again, it's not only for the uniforms, but also they are getting an

additional set of uniforms, so --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right. That's

MS. BONDS: -- it's 11 pairs of shirts, 11 shirts, 11 pairs of pants. They're also receiving a three-season jacket that will be included, so that, again, that will also provide them with that equipment for the winter. Three layers of a jacket, so they can be able to use that interchangeably.

So that's the increase of that, which is, again, a total of actually, they provided the breakdown of \$15.83 per person, per week, which is total of \$823.16 per person, per year.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Not to belabor the point, but \$360,000 divided by 330 is \$1,000.

MS. BONDS: What are you dividing? I'm sorry, I don't, like, I'm not following your math. I'm going based on what the, what we accepted as far as their proposal.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: You said \$360,000 per year.

MS. BONDS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And the resolution for 330 employees.

MS. BONDS: Approximately, yes. So presuming, again, it won't stay level, we have to be able to include the opportunity for other employees to come, and also receive the uniforms, because we want to make sure clearly that any staff that is hired, they have the opportunity to be able to receive uniforms as quickly as possible. So we don't want to cap it and keep other folks from being able to get their uniforms.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: I have no idea what you just said, so --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I think I understand it a little more because it came through our committee, is that they're asking for spending authority for higher than the actual amount of what is needed. Am I correct on that?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes, but you didn't say it.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right. And so

that what, it comes out to less than 900 per employee.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: I just think that \$20 a person is expensive, and probably think we could do better, so I'll not be able to support it. I wasn't there at the meeting, but I think it's expensive.

MR. GARRETT: Laurie, you are using a co-op program, correct, for this?

MS. BONDS: We are. Yes, Mr. Garrett. So this is a straight-line procurement process that, again, Cintas is the national company that we were able to utilize, again, because of the fact that we went through a cooperative agreement, so they had done not only the procurement, but done it for, on a national basis, through Omnia Partners.

And so it is competitively solicited, as far as, again, providing that level of service, as well as the cost.

MR. GARRETT: And one of the reasons we use the cooperative is to try and find the best dollar amount billable to the authority --

MS. BONDS: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: -- for certain items, correct?

MS. BONDS: Yes, that is correct.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Can you tell us how this compares to prior solicitations that you've done in the past?

MS. BONDS: So the other solicitations we've done have been, again, for companies mostly have been local respondents, so we currently still have a contract with Muscatello's, that is here in the District.

But they don't provide us with any additional services, so they can provide us with uniforms, but we're also competing against other agencies here in the District with regard to receiving our uniforms. Our fire department, police department.

So a lot of times, there was a wait with regard to us being able to receive uniforms, and then for us to get personalized service was much

more expensive with regard to, again, having the names on the shirts, having the department on the shirts, so that they could be recognized by not only other staff, but the residents, as far as that's concerned, and we couldn't get that locally through the current provider. So again, this was an opportunity for us, without us having to do a separate solicitation, and trying to reach out to national companies.

When they're in cooperative agreements, they don't respond to the same solicitations, because they already have done the actual procurement. And so that's how we're able to reach out to them. Similar way that we've done with HD Supply.

Again, companies where we can be able to reach to national companies that can be able to give us a broader amount of service, as well as types of uniforms and equipment we can receive.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: All right.

Again, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri asking questions,

what employees will the uniforms impact,

specifically, and her second one, with the uniforms impact the police department or the property managers?

MR. GARRETT: It would just be the property managers, Commissioners, and -

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Actually, the question, the first question was, when, the question on the uniforms for employees, am I correct with, is, was this a union issue or concern?

MR. GARRETT: Yes. Yes, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri. It did, it --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: That's a yes or no answer.

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

MS. BONDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. And then, the next question, what employees will the uniform impact provide, who, specifically? And for example, I would say, will it impact the monitors? Will it impact the police department? The property management? Who?

MR. GARRETT: Property management,

Commissioner Vann-Ghasri.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. But the key thing I wanted to know was whether or not it was a union issue or concern, and you answered yes. Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any more questions? All right. Can I get a motion?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Second?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Second.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Ortiz Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferror?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: And Commissioner Neal

Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have eight yes. The resolution is approved.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Thank you.

Resolution 19-30 to authorize a contract of, to modify the pest services for authority-wide.

MS. BONDS: Yes, Commissioner. So this is, this resolution is to authorize us to enter into a contract modification to extend the current contract for just a few months to give us additional time and money to be able to do that, so we don't have a lapse in service with regard to the pest services, but also so that we get the opportunity for our next solicitation to be better informed by staff that have been hired, who are going to work make again, to sure that, the services, preventative maintenance that we do include in this

solicitation will make sure that we have increased service with regard to our pest services operation.

So this request is a, for six months. Again, the six months we're anticipating would be, would cost no more than \$170,000 in order to be able to cover that additional period of time. There's an additional 545,000 that you see that is referenced, and I acknowledge, for that, again, we would've been paying that amount, as far as the service was concerned, but my office made the error, as far as the contract is concerned.

The contract would've ended in March 2019, because you all approved the resolution of February 2016, but unfortunately, we put in the contract that it would expire September 30, 2019. So as a result, it caused the contract to just be overspent, as far as contract authority, but again, as far as the services are concerned, still require the services until the actual solicitation can be issued.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any questions?

Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

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

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Which resolution was that?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: 19-30.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: One question was, how many administrators errors have your department made, and whether or not this office will put in place the quality assurance being for the future as a protection mechanism for error?

MS. BONDS: Yes, we will, and we'd -MR. GARRETT: Yes.

MS. BONDS: -- like to think hopefully that that was an anomaly, and we have gone back to check our other contracts.

MR. GARRETT: Right. So it's being done, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri. When this was, when this came up, we decided to go through all of our contracts to ensure that they're appropriately, the expenditures are appropriate, and none of them have actually expired, and we're going through that by department.

And also, our voyager system that we have created now will also give us an additional,

the additional aid with some technology to flag certain issues.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And so within our previous, within our previous, with our previous directors, there was no mechanism in place to protect for errors? That's just a yes or no answer.

MR. GARRETT: Obviously not.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Well, maybe, that's not for you to answer. It would be for Ms. Bond to answer. She worked for both administrations. And in the same, well, in one administration, maybe not the same capacity, but I do know under Lisa Dean's capacity, there was a quality assurance mechanism for errors.

So I'm asking, under her leadership, when she took that leadership role, was that same process in place, or was there none in place for errors? And so therefore, that means that a new model will be created to ensure, you're going to always make errors, but I'm saying, to assure that errors may not be made, and usually a person would

have a triage team, or some type of a protection quality team. So that's what we're talking about, correct?

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

MS. BONDS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BONDS: You're welcome.

commissioner slover: One quick observation. We've, obviously, every year, done this pest control thing, and every year, people come up and say, why are you giving anybody any money for pest control, because it's not working? I understand we have a different philosophy, and different strategy in the works.

Is there a way we can get that message out and promote it a little bit, instead of just passing, you know, funds to a service that, for all intents and purposes, for whatever reason, is not working? Can we get some sort of PR thing going on this?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, Commissioner

Slover. In fact, PMO is setting up going to each property to discuss exactly what the new standards and the new methods will be as we bring it, the majority of the pest control into, in-house, to actually perform the actual services.

So residents are going to find out about exactly what we were doing. Judiciary House was the first, in what we consider to be one of the, a pilot in dealing with pest control internally.

And now, we're rolling it out to other properties, and what we'll also have is an actual schedule for the time frame in which we're going to go to those properties, and we'll be able to let residents know at that time also.

So it is going to be a new method, and they will be aware of it as we start to move through the properties. Now, some properties have more issues than others.

The properties with the major issues are what we're going to get to now, and we have, this is, you know, goes to what we were talking about earlier, but with our transformation, in some

instances, we grow just a little bit, and we're going to bring on, internally, we're going to bring on staffers internally to deal with our pest control, pest control issue. And we have something different, as you, as you're aware.

We have an actual pest control coordinator now on, with us on a daily basis, as part of our staff, who will not only direct this new team, but also direct the pest control management company itself on their actions that they're taking on a daily basis.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Director, is it possible that he could stand up and just introduce himself?

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

 $\label{thm:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND:} \quad \mbox{I see him in} \\ \mbox{the room.}$

MR. GARRETT: Mr. Burke.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Mr. Burke?

MR. GARRETT: There he is. Oh, I was, maybe he was sitting over there. Yes, there he is. Alan Burke is our pest control coordinator under the

PMO department. So thank you, sir.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any more

questions? Motion?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Second?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Second.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferror?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Vice Chairman Council?

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have eight yes. The resolution is approved.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Thank you. Resolution 19-31 to approve an acceptance of HUD's Capital Fund Grant for lead hazardous clean-up for the District of Columbia Housing Authority, Grant number DC39L00150119.

MR. MORRIS: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Alex Morris. I'm the chief of planning design and construction in the Office of Capital Programs. This resolution, 19-31, is to approve the acceptance of a \$1 million HUD grant for the identification and reduction of lead-based paint hazards in two of our properties.

The properties were selected based on the criteria in the grant application. You have to, you know, basically look at the criteria they're asking you for, and then design the project to that. Kim Cole, my colleague, is coming up. She was the applicant, the grant writer, so she may be able to answer additional detailed questions about those

criteria.

MS. COLE: Sure. So the criteria was pretty specific, but they were looking for properties related to the number of children in households, number of occupied units at the site.

So we looked at the list of properties where we needed to employ interim controls, and selected those properties that we thought would score the highest. So the two properties we selected were Benning and Highland.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: For the record, your name?

MS. COLE: I'm sorry. Kimberly Cole,
Director of Policy and Strategic Initiatives.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Thank you. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Which resolution is this one?

MR. GARRETT: 19-31.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: 19-31. 19-31.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I got it.

Okay. My question was, what are the interim

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

controls under HUD, and is there a HUD mandate for five years for interim or abatement, and explain for the record, what is the difference between interim and abatement.

MR. GARRETT: Interim controls, Commissioner, are processes and paint repairs that we make that are temporary. We have to come back on an annual basis to remediate the hazard, if necessary.

Full abatement would mean that the hazard is actually physically taken out of the particular complex, or totally removed in some way, shape, or form. So we have to come back every 12 months when we only perform interim controls, to make sure that they're intact.

HUD has given us correspondence as of just last week, which states that we need to fully abate all of our properties of any lead hazard within the next five years.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So does this \$1

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

million have an abatement requirement, or

remediation --

MR. GARRETT: No, it's just for interim, just for interim controls.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Interim controls?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And was there any more money available, or did we go for the, for the \max ?

MS. COLE: That was the max.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: All right. Good work, then. Congratulations.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any more questions? Motion?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Second?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Second.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferror?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: And Commissioner Neal

Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Vice Chairman Council?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have eight yes. The resolution is approved.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Thank you. Resolution 19-32 to authorize an allocation of local rent supplement program base, project-based vouchers for existing units.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. So Commissioners, we have Annisa Jones, the Deputy Director of the Housing Choice Voucher Department, and also Andrea

Powell from OGC.

MS. JONES: Good afternoon, Commissioners, and the public.

MS. POWELL: Good afternoon.

MS. JONES: We're here to present resolution 19-32, which is the authorize an allocation of local rent supplement project-based vouchers for two projects. In fiscal year '18, for effective fiscal year '19, the Council of the District of Columbia awarded funding to DCHA to provide project-based assistance for projects that are already online.

There was a concern by some people in the development community that they only could apply to the DC Inova if they were seeking to do development. So the Council did approve funding. It required that we put out an RFP, which the housing authority did. There were several respondents, in a couple of rounds. We have, based on the evaluation panel, DCHA has recommended two projects to receive local project-based vouchers under the local rent supplement program.

One of them is Mission First, a project called House of Lebanon on O Street Northwest. The second project is sponsored by Jubilee Housing. They have three projects in northwest Adams Morgan area, Fuller, Mozart, and Ontario Road.

One, for Mission First, we are recommending 17 units. For Jubilee, 7 units for a total of 24 units. The criteria that was evaluated included unit mix, units is low poverty areas, units that would be able to come online within six months.

So we are here to recommend both of those projects to move forward with project-based assistance under the local rent supplement program. They serve people of extremely low income, 0 to 30 percent of area medium income and District residents.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any questions?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: For 19-32,
the question is this, for me. How many DC residents
have been served by these organizations, such as
Jubilee Housing, in comparison to the other two
organizations?

If you do not know the answer, it's something good to research, because I know for a fact that Jubilee Housing has been around a long time, and if we do not know the answer, can we just find out for future understanding and trends, who's benefitting from these programs?

Example, you can live in New York, come to Washington, D.C. for one week, get hooked up with Jubilee Housing, and you can be referred to one of these local vouchers. Now, you have a lot of people that are in D.C. homeless shelters, especially like 2nd Street, to be specific.

How many people from 2nd Street are being served, that are D.C. residents, by Jubilee Housing and the other two for these programs? This is just some history and clarification.

MS. COLE: We can look at that.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Because I want to go on record on that, and if anybody can find that information, I think that would be very, very good for us to know, because housing authority's always been the middle person for other people's

vouchers.

And on one hand, we get slapped on the face by everybody. However, we do allow, being that D.C. is not a state, and it's only a municipal corporation, we do allow homeless people from Maryland, D.C., I mean Maryland, Virginia, and everywhere else can come here.

And they're not even registered voters, and they're the ones maybe benefitting more than the residents that actually live here and being in shelters. So I just want to know the answer, because I just think the housing authority should have a clear understanding of that, and so should the Mayor's office. I wanted to go on record with that.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri. We'll gather that information for you.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: My question is the two places that you've mentioned that we're going to place vouchers, what type of organization

is that? Are those apartments, or are, or are they considered transitional homes?

MS. JONES: No, they're apartments. They're permanent homes.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay. Any more questions?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Do these providers provide stuff beyond housing? Are they, do they have services they provide to the, to the folks that are going to be in these --

MS. JONES: Definitely --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- in these units?

MS. JONES: -- Jubilee Housing does.

I'd have to check on Mission First. Yes, we'd have
to check on Mission First, if they specifically are
bringing services.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay. Any more questions? Motion?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Second?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Second.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferror?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: And Commissioner Neal

Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Vice Chairman Council?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have eight yes. The resolution is approved.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Thank you. Last resolution for today is 19-33 to authorize

rehabilitation work to stabilize Judiciary House,
Kelly Miller Townhouses, Langston Additions, and
LeDroit Apartments.

So Commissioners, this MR. GARRETT: money is the, is funding from the, from the District government in the tune of \$24.5 million, which will stabilize four allow us to properties, approximately 463 units, taking those 4 properties list of off the original 14 from transformation plan. And Alex Morris from the Office of Capital Plans is here to offer further information, or answer any questions that you may have.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you. Yes. So this resolution was drafted in response to resolution 19-20, where the Board of Commissioners asked for a chance to review and approve our starting of any repositioning or redevelopment or renovation and rehab work any of the 14 properties. These are the first four. This is going to be done with Council money.

The actual amounts were a little more

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

than we thought. We're going to be getting 23,925,500 in the 2019 allocation and supplemental, and then 1,024,000 in the 2020 budget for projects specifically targeted toward one. That was a specific requirement. So it's almost 25 million.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any questions?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Question. This is 19-33, and I want to go on record saying that, for the record, a lot of, a lot of the public get confused with Langston Apartments and Langston

MR. MORRIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And I want the record to reflect that they are two different communities. Langston Terrace is public housing, and it's the only historic preservation public housing in the District of Columbia. For, and the reason why I'm saying this, I saw an article, and it had the two confused.

So sometimes, I think it would be very specific that we definitely say Langston Terrace, the public housing, so people can understand the

Terrace.

difference of the two. And also for the record, in layman talk, explain specifically how this resolution will impact Langston public housing, and how did these communities get selected versus other public housing communities.

MR. MORRIS: I'll start with your last question. How did they get selected? They got selected based on the fact that we needed to find an amount of money that the council was willing and able to allocate, and a size of project and scope of project that would fit within that allocation.

The four properties here that we're describing, Judiciary House, LeDroit Apartments, Kelly Miller Townhouses, and the Langston additions, the capital needs assessment, and the scopes of work that we were able to figure out for those four properties fit within the bucket of the 24 and a half million, now actually more like \$25 million.

We do have the opportunity to expand beyond the four properties, if there's money available. We're going to use it here first, but

if we find there's contingency money left available, we were going to flip to another 1 of the 14 and try to do additional capital improvements, if we can. I'm forgetting your other questions. I'm sorry. So I hate to ask for a repeat of those questions, but --

MR. GARRETT: Commissioner
Vann-Ghasri, which question did Alex miss?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I don't think he missed any.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: Okay. Thank you. I thought I did. Sorry.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any more questions? Motion?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm sure there's more questions, so I want to defer to others.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: I'll jump in.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Can you tell us, these are local dollars, so can you tell us how

CB participation will be prioritized and monitored?

MR. MORRIS: Yes. We're going to, the executive directors asked for a monthly update on all construction activities, and it goes into his monthly report, which he uses then to report out to you.

We are going to add to that report our participation in dollar amount, and hours work for all of our categories of local and disadvantaged business enterprises. I made a statement in a prior comment that was incorrect. I was going off of memory. I should never do that.

We have, currently, over 13 selected contractors in the, in the job order contracting system. 6 of the 13 are CBE, but 11 of the 13 have 1 or more categories of disadvantage business enterprise.

They're either a minority business enterprise, a woman business enterprise, or a Section 3 company, or a CBE, and many, in many cases, they're multiple categories. So we feel like we're going to hit all of our targets and beyond without

any difficulty.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: So tell us the target for the CBE.

MR. MORRIS: There is no, there is no mandated target for CBE. We're required, as our, as part of our administering by HUD, we're required to hit targets for MBE, WBE, and Section 3, and those percentages, I did have in my notes.

The percentages, I'm going to say, are 40 percent MBE, 5 percent WBE. Those are minimums, and 10 percent of hours worked, Section 3. The CBE is not a, not a formal requirement that we're obligated to meet, but based on the number of firms in the CBE list, and the amount of dollars that they are obligated, I see no difficulty in hitting 40 percent or more.

just, I anticipate that even though the council didn't put that caveat on the, on the funding that was sent over, I do believe that they probably would say that their intent would be that CBE participation is maximized.

MR. MORRIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: And I would imagine that they'll be looking at these first sort of actions that we take to make sure that we do have CBE participation, and that if they don't, I'm sure they will mandate it with the future order money that they send over.

MR. MORRIS: That's very understandable. We have three contracts ready to go out, and I will prepare a summary of what we have to date, and where we stand, and prepare that for the first month's update, and then as we go forward, we'll continue to update the Board members through the ED's update.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Okay. And so through the ED's update, we'll know which projects are started --

MR. MORRIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: -- how long they expect to take. So we'll get that sort of on a monthly --

MR. GARRETT: Yes, we can start doing

that October 1st.

MR. MORRIS: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: In fact, some projects have already started, as I, as I mentioned before, on a few of the properties utilizing part of the repair and maintenance that was left from the, from the previous fiscal year in addition to moneys that were ready to deploy October 1.

We'll do a separate report for that, so you can clearly be able to see that. And I don't know whether or not your suggestion would be that we send something over to the mayor and council at the same time.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: That would be good. I think also, though, if you made that available, or made that part of your monthly report to this body, I think it would be good for the Board, for the public, and for our stakeholders at the Wilson building to follow along.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. That's fine.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: So I think that would be, that would be good to have.

MR. GARRETT: That's fine. We can do that.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: I just have a question about clarity. So it doesn't matter the source of the funding. We're saying that the housing authority, keeping money that the housing authority spends is subject to federal guidelines.

MR. MORRIS: Correct. Well, yes. I mean, we're, we follow HUD regulations in regards to our commitments for contracting.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But should there be a requirement from the council, then we would follow that to get the money --

MR. GARRETT: It could.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- right?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, it could, it could be.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. GARRETT: And this is somewhat --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So --

MR. GARRETT: -- I just want to say,

NEAL R. GROSS

this is somewhat --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Sorry.

MR. GARRETT: -- I just want to say it's somewhat unique --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: -- because this is really the first time we've gotten that type of dollar amount from the, from the --

John's maybe telegraphing is, you don't mind if I call you Commissioner, is that if we, if we should be mindful of the source of money, and try to drive as much of that to the CBE, so that we don't end up getting that mandate the next time. I don't want to put words in your mouth.

One of the questions I would have is, could we get, is, are the other 7 of the 13, do they not qualify for CBE, or they just haven't gone to get certification? Is there any way we can compel them, or see if they want to become CBEs?

MR. MORRIS: I think it's a mix. I think some of them are located outside the District

boundary in our, in our neighboring counties around Maryland and Virginia, in some cases.

In some cases, they may simply not be filling out the paperwork to get certified, in which case, we would certainly encourage them to do so.

MR. GARRETT: And Lorry Bonds, our, from OAS, she's been mandated by my office to also ensure that anyone that's on the CBE list that we have gets notification of opportunities, so that they're prepared and ready to submit, and come onboard as we move forward with more opportunities with the DCHA.

Especially if we're, and we try to use CBEs, and even if we're not utilizing District money, that was always something that we understood we needed to do, and we've tried to do that as diligently as possible.

Now, with this component coming on, where there may be opportunities for more funding, we understand that we need to redirect. So Commissioner, I mean, Commissioner Slover, one thing I asked Ms. Bonds to do was to reach out,

identify entities that, maybe not BCDs, and take them through a process or a class to educate them on exactly what steps they might need to take.

In addition to making sure that CBEs that we already have on our listing, because we do have an extensive list, get the information from us on a, on a regular basis, of what's going on at the authorities, where they can submit.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Let me ask, just for some clarity. So have the JOC program, and also we just embedded a bunch of sort of local, based on the emergency ones, right, correct, to a different list?

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Is that a possibility to also, is it just, it has to be used for the JOC program, or, because you have the other avenue, and you embedded the other contracts based on their emergency, so I'm just asking.

MR. GARRETT: No, I think what has actually happened, and Alex can speak to this, is that, because of receiving the \$24.5 million, what

we knew as the authority, and the administration understood, is that we needed to be able to move as quickly as possible, and JOC was that actual vehicle, where we would not have to go out for a long, extended amount of time to identify contractors to come in.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: No, what I'm saying --

MR. GARRETT: So I guess I'm missing your question then. I apologize.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: My thought is, so I thought it was a separate contract that we just apply, regarding their emergencies, that we have a list. I thought it was all 13 CBEs.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: That's what I'm asking. So I know they don't fall under the JOC program, but they're still contractors. That's what I'm --

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: So is --

MR. MORRIS: All are dollar amounts at,

NEAL R. GROSS

is it possible, because she presented, I think there was like 11 or 12 that were on that list. They were all under I think the \$250,000 threshold.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: So my assumption was, when they were talking, yes.

MR. GARRETT: Right. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Just something to --

MR. GARRETT: So I don't know if, did Lorry step out?

MR. MORRIS: I don't know.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: Yes, I'm not familiar with that particular issue. I will say JOC contractors can be the general, and they can hire sub-consultants and subcontractors that meet those requirements as well.

So I don't know if you want us to track it at that level of fine grain or not, but they often use subs to do, you know, some of the work, like painting or things like that. So Lorry, could you just --

MS. BONDS: And so I can also say, at the time, regardless of whether they're JOC contractors or not --

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Right.

MS. BONDS: -- any of our contractors, especially those that are in construction, they have to provide us a utilization report. So at the time that we work with them, obviously we can be able to encourage their use of CBEs.

We can obviously be able to also provide them listings of those in the different disciplines that we know they need, the different types of services we know they need. So that, again, the requirement is it comes directly from the contractor, but they can be able to get it from their subs as well.

And so that's why the utilization report is so important, because we can be able to see who the contractors are they selected. We can encourage and push them towards, again, utilizing contractors that we know can still provide the same benefit that are CBEs, or local firms, so that we

can be able to make sure we're always hitting that mark.

I'm sorry, this was probably something that Commissioner Slover would probably ask, but can we see these contracts? Because the difference of writing, say, there's a lot of roofing, there's roofing probably on all four of these, right?

If I bundle all four of these together, that probably would eliminate many smaller companies, but I separate it per project, that will allow a CBE or some local vendor to participate. And I'm just asking that when we look at these contracts, and we put them out, can we look at it through that lens, you know, and it may not be the, I would say the most cost effective on the surface, but the benefits that we get by local hires, and this, putting money back into the company, take that into consideration as we look through these vendors.

MR. MORRIS: So I can, I can allay your first concern. We're not bundling the roof

projects into one master contract. Each building will have its own roof contract.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: So that'll break it down.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MR. MORRIS: And they vary from 250,000, I think, up to about 1 million.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: But anything under the 250,000, another, just a side question -
MR. MORRIS: Right.

commissioner strickland: -- that we vet it, I mean the list of CBEs, we vet it for emergency purposes, that we know how much their bonding is, they've already been through a competitive process. Can we not utilize those folks outside of the JOC program for projects that are under the 250, that we looked at those for?

MS. BONDS: Yes, and we are, and those are some of the ones we brought to you off of the vacant unit --

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. BONDS: -- initiative.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. BONDS: Which, they're still working.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. BONDS: So it wouldn't be those. We'd obviously look to bring on some others who can be able to expand and do some additional work, because we do have all those from the vacant unit initiative working on all of our projects currently.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Right.
Okay.

MR. MORRIS: And the point I was trying to make is that if the, if the list of JOC contractors doesn't self-perform the particular services of some of the menu of things, like if they don't do the painting --

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Right.

MR. MORRIS: -- we can encourage them to look at our emergency contractor list to see if there's somebody there that can take a portion of that contract, and therefore, we're getting more

CBE participation, even if the, if the, you know, general contractor's not specifically CBE.

MS. BONDS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Okay. All right.

MR. MORRIS: So that the dollars, more of the dollars would stay here.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: I just have So just, and one more question. just for clarification. So for some of the emergency contractors, because I know they can do, when I saw the list of stuff to do, it's not really that, my question to you is, can, and I don't know if there's a vehicle for that, even, can they be considered to be sort of the same way that you're looking into some of the JOC contractors to be CBEs? actually come in, ask, and be added as contractors? I'm not sure if that's -

MR. MORRIS: Can they be added? No.

MS. BONDS: They can't be added as JOC contractors --

MR. MORRIS: Or --

MS. BONDS: -- because we already did the procurement, and did the award that you all voted on, so they can't be added at this point in time. Obviously, if we have a need, and we have more work to do, then the contractors that we have, then we can definitely solicit for additional JOC contractors.

MR. MORRIS: Right.

MS. BONDS: But what we have been doing is soliciting for separate services, which may be, which has been able to help smaller companies, who are not able to bond at the level and at the amount that some of the --

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: So --

MS. BONDS: -- JOC contractors have.

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: So let me rephrase it. But could we get it priced the same way as the JOC contracting? In a sense, meaning it would still be an equal --

MR. MORRIS: Oh, just, in other words, just do it as a separate solicitation, and ask for

a price from, yes. So we'll look at that. We'll step back and look and see if there's ways to diversify the pool by asking for certain things to be solicited separate from JOC.

I can't say for sure whether that will work or not, but we will commit to do that, and I'll come back with a report on our ability to do that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: If there's no other questions, I had some questions about the specifics of this funding.

MR. MORRIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: The 463 units that were picked, were they picked because of certain conditions? Why them out of the 2,610?

MR. MORRIS: They were picked, they were picked because the total scope of work, you know, can fit within the amount of money we thought we would get, and we were able to get, you know, the scope, and the, and the amount of money allocated from the council to fit.

One of the things that Director Garrett told us from day one was, I don't want to do

piecemeal interventions at every 1 of the 14 sites. I want to fix whole buildings, and put them into a state of long-term viability. And so we thought very carefully about, not just doing a whole bunch of bathrooms, but also fixing the plumbing inside the walls, so that the fundamentals of the building are intact. When you do the new bathroom, everything works. It doesn't get backed up, it doesn't leak, it doesn't create mold.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. Because this is an average of \$51,000 per unit.

MR. MORRIS: That's about right, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: For 463 units.

MR. MORRIS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So I always grapple with these big numbers that get thrown around. So 2,610, if you just run that out, using 51,000 --

MR. MORRIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- you'd have 133 million.

MR. MORRIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: If you run it out further, you don't get close to 2 billion, in terms of renovation. I get that there's varying conditions, but --

MR. MORRIS: That's a huge part of it.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- it's a huge

gap too. I mean --

MR. MORRIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- in other words, if you doubled the amount, you'd still be only at 300 million, which is a big number, but it's not with a B.

MR. MORRIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And so the question becomes, how real, now that we actually have real money to apply to a real project, we seem to be able to get 463 units done at what I would've thought was the number to begin with, but the numbers we kept getting and hearing were 200 plus thousand per unit.

MR. MORRIS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So now that we've

hit reality, you know, do we need to rethink these numbers we're throwing around and say, you know, the council could swallow, or somebody could swallow 200 million to --

MR. MORRIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- get 2,600 units online for 20 year viability, a lot easier than 1 billion.

MR. GARRETT: But is the various scope of work correct, Alex?

MR. MORRIS: Yes, it is. So I don't want to be overly optimistic, and I hear what you're, what you're saying is, can we do more with less? Can we think differently about this program and do more with less money, and make this more --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: No, I wonder, what I'm actually saying is, reality a lot less than what we've been, that's been being floated.

MR. MORRIS: I would love that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I mean, 2 billion

is --

MR. MORRIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- is --

MR. MORRIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- that's basically tearing everything down and rebuilding it.

MR. MORRIS: It's not tearing everything down, but the --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: At those numbers, it is. Come on.

MR. MORRIS: -- so I'll tell you, I'll tell you exactly what it is. So what it is, is we have 9 sites among the 14, I'll take Langston Terrace out, because Langston Terrace will be a rehabilitation to historic standards. But the other nine are among the most challenged family sites that we have in our portfolio.

And rehabilitation of those sites, in certain limited circumstances, we think will work, because we can fix the infrastructure, and we can rebuild the shell, but in many other instances, it will not, simply because these buildings are pushing 60 years old, in some cases.

In the case of Langston, it's 80. Langston, we're going to fix because we have an obligation to do that, and we understand it's a historic property, but in many cases, the amount of money we'd have to spend to rehabilitate the building exceeds HUD's threshold for obsolescence, and they would not justify spending money to help us do that, and so we have to think about redevelopment.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I don't disagree with that.

MR. MORRIS: Yes.

is, you've applied a 200 and plus thousand dollar number to all of the units, with your \$2 billion number.

MR. MORRIS: No --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MR. MORRIS: -- we haven't. Well --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It's 275,000 per

unit.

MR. MORRIS: Yes, if you do the math, if

you do the math based on the whole, you know, it's what, 41 properties, 6,815 --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. MORRIS: -- traditional public --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Which is the only

numbers that I have to work with, which is --

MR. MORRIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- these numbers you're floating around publicly --

MR. MORRIS: But --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- applied to our portfolio.

MR. MORRIS: Right. But if you, if you go property by property, in our report, we do the first 14, the most urgent. Each of those properties has a differing cost per unit, based upon what we're planning to do.

In some cases, it's rehab and redevelopment together, in a blend. In some cases, it's all redevelopment. In some cases, it's rehab. The cost per unit will be different on each one of those.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I said that earlier. I just wanted to mainly --

MR. MORRIS: It averages out.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- understand that.

MR. MORRIS: Yes, yes, yes. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But now we have proof of 263 units at 50,000, you've just freed up a lot of money on the other end. And my point is, these numbers are so enormous that they're, that they, that they just make you go, I mean, come on.

MR. MORRIS: I --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And so --

MR. MORRIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- I get, I get worried that we've over-suggested the amount of --

MR. GARRETT: I don't, I don't think we have, Commissioner, respectfully.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Of course, I get it. Of course you don't, but --

MR. MORRIS: And I don't need -(Simultaneous speaking)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- now we have proof.

MR. GARRETT: No, that's not, that's not fair.

MR. MORRIS: No. No, no, no. I --

MR. GARRETT: I think --

MR. MORRIS: Yes, I'm sorry.

MR. GARRETT: Go ahead, Alex, because I was going to, I was going to compare to, an example would be NYCHA, where they have a \$30 billion price tag on their units, for 116, and that equals out to about \$258,000 per unit, in terms of either a rehabilitation, which most likely they would have to do, versus a demolition disposition, or a demolition and a revitalization of a new, of new construction. So --

numbers are enormous. They're not based in, there's no land cost. It's \$258,000 per unit, is a construction cost. On the hard and soft cost, is, it's exorbitant. And so I just caution, because now we're about to bring four buildings back online

for \$50,000 a unit.

MR. MORRIS: So Commissioner Slover, I didn't want to get too familiar. Sorry about that. But I would, I would love to agree with you, and if we can find a way to make it cost less, we will all endeavor to do that. I don't think anybody on the staff side is looking to make this cost more than it needs to, but we've done several different runs through our McKinsey analysis, through individual performance that we wrote and vetted with other industry professionals.

We've look at this up and down. We've come up with a bracketed range of between 1.8 billion and \$2.3 billion, and when you average it out, it's 2.2. If we find that we can make, find creative solutions to make it cost less, I'm totally for that, and I would welcome any help, advice, recommendations, experience, whatever, to help get us there.

But at this point, I would be reluctant to say that it's anything less than about a \$2 billion problem. And that's just based on doing

all 41 properties, and looking at them up and down. It's not a whole lot less than that. It really isn't.

MR. GARRETT: And Alex, you've had experience at doing such similar --

MR. MORRIS: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: -- revitalization programs, correct?

MR. MORRIS: Right.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: We have.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Anyway,

hopefully we can get it for less, but --

MR. MORRIS: I hope we can too.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- maybe we can find 263 more units, take it to the council for this kind of money, and maybe they'll give us more money.

MR. MORRIS: See, I thought we did good, because I thought we were able to stretch this money, you know, it seemed like a, like a victory. I didn't want to turn it into a --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It is a victory.

It's --

MR. MORRIS: I don't want to turn it into a --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Anyway, thank you.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: And just to go back to, sorry, this point about the CBE spend, and what my intention was, what I spoke earlier, I think that if the District of Columbia government has it as a policy that CBEs are prioritized in its spending, if they're sending dollars to this agency, I think they'll have that same expectation. So that was what my questions were about earlier, so I just wanted to make that clear.

MS. BONDS: I understand.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: And so I think that's just something we should keep in mind. You guys have made a commitment to monitor that on a monthly basis, as well as the starts and the finishes of the project, so I think that would be helpful to keep in mind. So that was my intention

earlier.

MR. MORRIS: We will do that, and when, I'll do one more. I will actually, I'll work with our staff to do a projection of where we'll be at the end --

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: -- just based on who we think might do these jobs. We can, we can project it, and I think we can get to a comfortable number that everybody can see as a target. We'll set that target internally, and then we will, we'll beat it.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Okay. And just, in order to anticipate even further, I think if those, if the numbers are what they've reported to be, somewhere between 800 million and 2.2 billion, I think that CBE requirements, first source requirements, those are all something that this agency should be ready to adapt to --

MR. MORRIS: I agree.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: -- for that, for those dollars.

MR. MORRIS: Yes. I think we all

agree.

MR. GARRETT: So Lorry, your department in OGC will look at how it can combine, because in some instances, we might actually be leveraging some federal dollars in there too, so we've got to figure out how to make it, how to --

(Simultaneous speaking)

COMMISSIONER

FALCICCHIO:

Understandable. But let's just be able to measure it, because it, we will be held accountable for it, I'm sure.

MS. BONDS: And we have, and just so you know, at least with the first source as well, we have already worked with DOEE, and so that, again, to make sure our Section 3 component is not lost in that, they've agreed that our residents would at least be able to be part of that program, to be counted, as far as that. So we have, we have done this, just not on this level, obviously, at this stage --

COMMISSIONER

FALCICCHIO:

Understandable.

MS. BONDS: -- for now, but we will definitely work and make it --

(Simultaneous speaking)

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Just as we begin to ramp up, let's make sure we implement it from the start, and we'll be, you know, set to go from there, because I think for us, District businesses, District residents should be at the forefront of this. That's really the way we should operate.

MS. BONDS: Duly noted.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Are there any more questions? Motion?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: So moved.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Second?

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Second.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Taliaferror?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Falcicchio?

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: And Commissioner Neal

Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Vice Chairman Council?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have seven yes. The resolution is approved.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay. We're going to have our witnesses or testimonies. Ms. Moore?

MS. MOORE: I have a plus one. Good afternoon, Board of Commissioners and DCHA staff.

My name is Thomasia Moore. I'm a resident of Potomac Gardens, resident, Potomac Gardens family.

MS. PETWAY: Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett and Commissioners. My name is Meisha Petway. I, too, am a resident at Potomac Gardens

Family, and we are here before you today to find out the status of the resolution that we presented back

in June, at the June Board of Commissioners meeting.

And so since presenting the resolution, in the resolution, we stated that we feared retaliation against President Vann-Ghasri, and since that day, retaliation and bullying have

They've been directly from her in several different ways, one being social media, when she posts things on social media about the two of us, constantly. The other has been verbally, where she has called security on residents in the resident council meetings for asking questions.

MS. MOORE: As well as the Metropolitan Police Department has been called on me for asking questions pertaining to the treasury report. I was told if I continue to ask these questions that she will call security on me, and that's what indeed happened at one of our last resident council meetings.

MS. PETWAY: She has also gone on to use

occurred.

profanity in front of the children, and apologized to them. President Vann-Ghasri posted the letters that we submitted to the Board from the two residents that had their address, phone numbers, and names on them, she posted them on social media, putting them in a great deal of harm. Whether something happened, I'm not sure.

MS. MOORE: As well as publicly shaming and humiliating them for speaking up and expressing themselves.

MS. PETWAY: And so last but not least, for me, since presenting the resolution, my daughter has been affected by this. She has been singled out during the graduate ceremony. My daughter was not able to get a check, and I was told by the treasurer that she, that her moneys were here at the Department of Housing.

Her moneys were the only moneys that were here, and it was also posted on social media by the president, your child's check is at the Office of Resident Services. Where else would your child's check be? Why would my daughter have to

have anything to do with this?

I'm not sure, but for her to just single out my daughter and make her a part of this retaliation was just not acceptable. So we're here to find out what, where the, where you all are with our resolution.

MS. MOORE: And lastly, we need, or we implore DCHA Resident Services to possibly hold a special election. We have a petition to dissolve the current Board. We are ready to submit that, as soon as we can meet with someone from Resident Services.

We ask DCHA Resident Services to hold a special election, if that's feasible, to elect new members, once we submit the petition for removal of the current Potomac Gardens Family executive board.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

MS. MOORE: And I like what you said, Commissioner, about the District residents should be at the forefront. If our bylaws are legal, the president does have the authority to nominate other members of the Board. We are not, the Resident

council does not have a full board, according to the CFR 115-C.

We do, they do not meet the standards of that HUD regulation. We have asked to be on the Board, to fill in those empty spots, only to be met with rejection. So we're kind of stuck.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

MS. MOORE: Thank you.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to ask Ed Kaine, from our Office of the General Counsel to come up and respond to your statements.

MR. KAINE: Thank you. Good afternoon again, Commissioners. The matter that was brought to the Board in June has been under investigation by our Office of Audit and Compliance, supported by the Office of General Counsel.

The matter is still under investigation, and it's pending as such, and as typically, we won't, we are not going to discuss pending investigations, but the matter has been taken up by both our Office of Audit and Compliance, and the Office of the General Counsel.

MS. MOORE: Could we, is it possible that we could have a date or a time frame in which we could expect to have some resolution? Because in the meanwhile, these vial and atrocious things are happening to us for simply exercising our right as residents, and it's not fair.

authority does not care about these things that have been going on. We've presented this to Resident Services more than a year ago. I believe Commissioner Ortiz was present at a meeting several years ago, where I constantly asked the same question of our Resident council Board about our treasury report, and it's never clear, it is never transparent, it is never concise.

It's a massive confusion, and it looks as if funds are being mishandled, and it's not fair to us. I've said this so many times. In order to leave at Potomac Gardens Family, you have to have children. If any moneys are coming through Potomac Gardens Family, it's for the children.

If funds are being mishandled, then you

are abusing the children's rights, the head of household's rights. It's not fair, and it has to stop. When is it going to stop? When are we, when is this going to stop?

MR. GARRETT: So Commissioners, as Ed pointed out, thank you, thank you for your statements. As Ed pointed out, this is under investigation. Now, the one thing that we want to do is be very, very mindful not to jump to any conclusions, so that's why we're trying to do a thorough investigation of the issues.

Now, putting a time frame on it, I would hope that before the next Board meeting, we will have some type of closure. That's the estimated time. If we do not, then we'll bring that to everyone's attention.

We'll bring that to the Board's attention, that we do not have closure, but I do know audit and compliance is working on an investigation to try and determine the validity of all of the statements that have been made, okay? So we are taking it seriously, but we do want to make sure that

we get it right. That's very important, okay?

MS. MOORE: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay. Okay, thank you. Wanda Thomas?

MS. THOMAS: Good evening.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Good evening.

MS. THOMAS: Ready? In my hand, I have a piece of paper that states sexual harassment is illegal. Fair housing is our right. Four of these are circled, because that's what I experienced. When I reported this gentleman, 2017, 2018, 2019, nothing was done. I was victimized, I was shamed.

I went to over 15, over 15 employees of Housing for help. And right now, I'm in the process of moving, because I don't feel safe. For me to come in every Board meeting, two of them, I was not able to speak, because they asked me not to, Housing officials, and I didn't.

One of them, I was with, I had my mayor liaison with me. Nothing happened. Nothing turned out. It was just, sweep it under the steps. She's not here. I felt like my, I was nobody. I've

been threatened. I've asked for, today, I want three things.

For months, I've asked for my complete file of my residency file. It was an investigation done in June with John Hardwick (phonetic). At this investigation, we all spoke individually to him, because it's more than just me.

I'm not the only victim, and there were witnesses. James Creek. The person who I'm speaking of is Oliver, Quantay Oliver. This isn't the first property, from networking through other properties, this isn't the first property he's done this to.

He was at Highland Terrace, and removed from there for the same things before he became our resident manager. By me reporting it, I didn't get help. I felt as though they were helping him and not me. I filed a, I did it verbally and written.

I met with Mr. Garrett on January the 23rd. He sent me two people, which would be Ronnie Thaxton and Stephanie, Ronnie Thaxton and Stephanie Jackson, whom I gave the information to, whom made

appointments with witnesses and victims, whom never showed up.

These women stay home from work for this, and they never showed up. When is somebody going to care about us, and our community?

I didn't deserve this, and I did the right thing, and nobody helped me or my, I have a son that has Wilms tumor, which is a form of cancer that attacks your organs. Who has the time to keep chasing this down, but I made it. I have isolated myself.

I had to go in therapy behind this man, and for them to look at me like I didn't matter, I matter. And today, I want something done about this. I went to too many people, so another question I wanted to ask the Board was, what's the proper procedure, when you go to a Housing employee and you're telling them you're being sexually harassed, because obviously no one knew?

MR. GARRETT: So Commissioners, I can have Ed answer that question for all of you.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Hold on. Are

you done?

MR. GARRETT: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Are you done?

Okay. I just wanted to make sure you got what you needed, Ed. Thank you.

MS. THOMAS: Any my lawyers have been trying to get these files. I had to go get attorneys for these files. He's trying to, he had me going to court to get put out. The reasons for the sexual harassment came behind a legal situation I had in court, so he figures sex was the way to fix it. And I just want to know these things.

I want my file. I want that investigative report, and I want to know what's the proper procedure when you've been sexually harassed, because I gave the paperwork. None of my complaint, my complaint didn't get answered, verbally or written.

MR. KAINE: So Commissioners, once the complaint reached our office, which it has engaged a third party investigator, that investigation was

not concluded. If we don't have the full results yet, I expect that we will have them very shortly, and be able to recommend whatever action would be necessary or not, on the basis of our review of the, of the recommendation.

The procedure is, if you have, in fact, made the complaints to our office, we can certainly

MS. THOMAS: It's noted.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MS. THOMAS: Whenever I came in this building --

MR. KAINE: Okay. So --

MS. THOMAS: -- you have to sign a document downstairs. That's a legal binding document in court. I came in here to see different people about this same thing, and every time I came, I made sure I came with somebody, so I could have a witness. And when I met Mr. Garrett, I came with a women's advocate, okay? We were never in meetings alone.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, and we also, and we

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

also had, and Commissioners, that was a public one-on-one meeting that I have with all the residents on an annual, on a monthly basis. I just want to add, as she stated, we did, I did refer her directly to the Human Resources Department, and they began an investigation internally, as Ed stated.

But also, the idea of this investigation, because of the nature, we decided, and the decision was made that we would use a third party, a third party investigator to call witnesses, investigate, ask the right questions, that undoubtedly the Housing Authority, in some cases, might not be able to ask.

As Ed stated, there is some closure to this particular investigation that we can provide to you. I just caution, I'll caution everyone that, you know, the investigation, I believe, was done appropriately, and that's why we handled it out to a third party, to make sure that there was no bias attached to it.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: The

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

question is, how did it take so long for --

MS. THOMAS: Exactly.

MR. GARRETT: I also think there was a combination of also getting --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: It takes time. That's --

MR. GARRETT: -- some witnesses in, and asking some questions also, was part of the process.

A big part of the process.

MS. THOMAS: But now, when the Mayor came, when the Mayor sent, I didn't never, when the liaison, I have, I had a phone call, and I didn't know, I never called the police.

The police chief called me, and he gave me report numbers for this incident, and then I received a phone call from Naomi Mitchell, from the Ward 6 Council Member's Office. I want to know, what is Housing going to do?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Can I, can I ask when you engaged the third party?

MS. THOMAS: In June, he said the investigation was almost over in June. The last

person he had to speak to was Mr. Oliver, and he said that I was very credible.

names to, including UDC Job Development, Southwest Enhancement Center, in which it happened in front of the building, where I've done great community advocate, I advocate for my community through the seniors, the kids, everything. I'm not, I carry myself as a young lady. I didn't deserve it. Just because we live in these neighborhoods don't mean we can be treated like that.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Mr. Garrett, I just wanted to ask -- I know that you've put some customer service standards in place in a lot of areas, and their time frames. I just want, we just residents listened to three talk about. investigations that they've put forth. service standards plans for our around investigations, and getting back to people?

MR. GARRETT: Well, I can ask, I can ask

Joanne Wallington, the Director of Audit and

Compliance, to talk about the standards that we have

in place, but also talk about the time frame in which it takes for certain investigations to happen, and to be finalized. I can, I can ask her to come up to explain that to the Board, and also to the public at the same time.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: And it would also be good to hear what kind of communication is happening with residents --

MS. THOMAS: None. None.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: -- as the investigations are in process.

MS. THOMAS: I haven't heard anything since the investigation. I've tried to call Ms. Campbell, Natasha, which, to no avail, and I just don't believe in her. I don't have no faith in her.

She's lied to me on numerous occasions, where I don't trust her. It's a trust issue too.

Once you go to so many people, how do you trust the Housing Authority uniforms? How?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So maybe part of what you're, you can tell us when the decision engaged the third, when the issue was first

surfaced, when the decision to engage a third party, and how long does processes typically take?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: And if there could --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And then -
COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: -- be a single point of contact.

MR. GARRETT: I don't, I don't think Joanne, for this particular case, I don't think Joanne's going to have the date. That would be Ms. Campbell, from the, from HR, if we could get Natasha to come in.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And another question would be, what's done in the interim? In other words, I understand that there's, everybody has rights in these processes, but if people feel threatened or harassed, is there something that is done in the interim while we're trying to sort things out?

MS. THOMAS: When all of this --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Make people feel safe in their environment. Sorry to interrupt.

MS. THOMAS: In August, I had already complained, so for me to find out that he, August of 2018 is when we had to get all these new, no, we didn't have a set manager, so I thought Mr. Oliver was fired, or you guys did something, to which I was waiting for the phone call. No. What I found out was he was promoted for the oversee of Southwest Properties.

MR. WILLIAMS: Whoa. Whoa.

MS. THOMAS: So do you, can you imagine how that made me feel?

MR. WILLIAMS: Whoa.

MS. THOMAS: That was a smack in my face, and it's not a leasing professional that walked in that office, that I didn't tell that to, what he did to me, even to the new ones, Ms. Roberts, which they looked down. I've been treated like, but I'm going to speak my truth. And I feel better today. All the shame --

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: I've got a question. When resident council going to own the, going to, I'm going to rent to them, and when I came

to Housing, and the day of the chief, they put up a thing for people who are being harassed. You report to be harassed, any findings, details, it may take three years or two years to take. You're supposed to be moved.

MS. THOMAS: No, they didn't move me. They left me there.

MR. GARRETT: And Commissioners, we take, the administration takes this very seriously, and we took the appropriate action to have it investigated.

MS. THOMAS: Where I came --

MR. GARRETT: We also are under a decree with the DOJ, in reference to situations like this, especially Housing Authorities. So we took the appropriate action. I know Chelsea Johnson has been dealing with the DOJ.

If Chelsea wants to add into some of the steps that we actually take when situations like this occur. But we have taken the appropriate steps. We believe there is an outcome that we will be able to show, share with everyone before the end

of the week, and I think that's the appropriate way to move forward with this.

I think Joanne can talk to Audit and Compliance, and how we deal with other issues, such as Resident council reviews, and different things like that. And if Natasha comes in, we can get the date for you, Commissioner Slover, of when this investigation actually started.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Also,
Director, this young lady's asked for the, her file
too.

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Is that --

MR. GARRETT: I have to, I --

MS. THOMAS: Not only that I've asked for that for over six months, and then --

MR. GARRETT: I have to --

 $\mbox{MS. THOMAS: } \mbox{ -- my attorneys, they said} \\ \mbox{we had to } \mbox{--}$

MR. GARRETT: I'm going to determine on whether or not she can get it.

MS. THOMAS: -- fill out a paper in

NEAL R. GROSS

order for me to get my file. So not only did I fill out the piece of paper. My attorney filled it out. That's been since June. May, June.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: No.

MS. THOMAS: Still haven't gotten my file.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Let's get an answer for you.

MR. KAINE: Yes. So the file, the file review is definitely in our office, and generally speaking, the only thing that slowed those, the, there's nothing that prevents anybody from having their file, so generally speaking, the only, there are only glitches that do.

So yes, so if you will come to my office today, I will either answer any outstanding question for it, or have it, and make sure you get it, okay?

MS. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. KAINE: So we can, that, we can take care of. With respect to the results of investigations, I just want to caution that, just

like I did not, I couldn't speak about the matters, the specific matters involved in the first one, that the expectation, certainly of members of the public, and even the Commissioners, is that details of investigations are not the things that we are at liberty to share, or should.

Obviously, you should know about the satisfactory conclusion of an investigation, when peoples' findings were affecting you, and whatever that was, and that the report backed that appropriate action, whatever is necessary, has been taken to Commissioners for oversight purposes.

But to, you know, there's a lot of, the more satisfying part of this for people not necessarily involved would be to know, well, what happened, and what did you do? I think that, we can certainly be able to report back that we made sure policy was followed appropriately, we took appropriate action where that was necessary, but you shouldn't expect that, in a public form, there is going to be an accounting of actual facts of matters under investigation. Okay? Either with

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

respect to employees of the Authority, or to residents of the properties, right? That's just, it just would not be an appropriate thing to do.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: And that's understandable. I think my questions were more about what is the policy?

MR. KAINE: You know, timing and process, understanding --

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Timing, process, like, the way that people are communicated with during the process --

MR. KAINE: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: -- as well as how people enter into the process, and even how we communicate, like, when residents actually have a grievance or complaint.

MR. KAINE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: How do they know how that goes through the DCHA system?

MR. KAINE: Yes, and I think between our two offices, both ours and Audit and Compliance, probably we, some gaps filled in, into the extent

that we need to do a better job of publicizing that, and making sure that folks outside the building know exactly how to approach it. If you didn't know where you were supposed to go with the complaint, clearly, that's on us. So I mean, we can certainly address that.

MR. GARRETT: Chelsea, is Ronnie Thaxton, can you see whether or not he's there? Natasha's out of the office, Commissioners, but Ronnie Thaxton handles a lot of this also, on behalf of HR, so he can tell you what the process looks like.

So he'll come in, but I do want Joanne just to come back up and talk about the Audit and, Audit and Compliance, when it comes to Resident council, while we're getting Ronnie in place.

MS. WALLINGTON: I'm sorry. We have two different issues, so Ms. Thomas, I'm going to just jump to Commissioner Neal Jones's response.

Joanne Wallington, Office of Audit and Compliance.

The way that our investigations or reviews work is, we, if we're doing a review, as we

do with a case of Resident council participation funds, or vending funds, we typically ask for supporting documentation, to support any expenditures, and there may be backup documentation that we need.

That process can be really quick, or it can drag on, while we wait for the people to respond. So we, as Director Garrett said, as Mr. Kaine said, we typically don't report until there is a final resolution, because we wouldn't want to be premature, but the timing is hard to really give a concrete timing, but I can assure you that I'm a bit of a task master, and I've never met a deadline that I don't like to beat, so I try to get these resolved and wrapped up as soon as possible, in general, for reviews.

For investigations, similar concept. We try to fact-find, but because a lot of our investigations either involve our residents, we can't even confirm or deny that the person is in our program.

So oftentimes, the public will file a

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

complaint, or neighbors will file a complaint. We can, we're very, very limited in what we can share, so we're not trying to purposely be vague, but HUD has prescriptions on what we can share, and how we can use our residents' information.

So in those cases, our goal is to always close investigations in one month's time, but it's very unlikely that the public will ever see a report, whether it's substantiated or unsubstantiated, because we're so limited in what we can share.

Sometimes, the public gets information from criminal records, but we wouldn't share that information in the Office of Audit and Compliance, or in the agency as a whole.

MR. GARRETT: Where's, okay, did Ronnie come in yet?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I don't, I don't think anybody wants to see the reports. I don't know where that came from, but --

MR. GARRETT: Oh, no, no, I wanted Ronnie to come in.

MS. WALLINGTON: But I just wanted to make sure that wasn't related to Ms. Thomas's concern --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: All right.

MS. WALLINGTON: -- what I just shared, okay?

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: The question I had, while we're, we have a moment, is, as part of our process, or the process that we're going to develop, what support do we have for individuals that come forward with these issues?

So it sounds like this has been an ongoing situation for a while. So we have this, we have an investigation going on over here, and yet, we still have this real-life situation, where there's interaction. Is there something we can think about in terms of, how do we support the individual as this is going on while we're trying to get to resolution?

MR. GARRETT: Right. And in cases like this, Commissioners, when we have a situation where an employee has been identified through an allegation, or through an issue, we move that

individual.

That individual is moved from that particular property, if it's in the maintenance department, or even if it was internally, we make arrangements to make sure those two individuals, if something has taken place, they do not interact while we go through the particular process.

So Ronnie is here. He can go through it a little more in detail, but those are the steps that we take while we're doing the investigation, Commissioners. So if it was a site manager, or someone, or from the maintenance department, that was onsite at a particular location, that individual would be moved.

MS. THOMAS: Excuse me, but if it has something to do with sexual harassment, why would he, why would the individual go to another property, or another place, just to do it again?

MR. GARRETT: They're --

MS. THOMAS: That's what happened when he came to James Creek.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: WE also have a,

well, just out of respect, that we do have a, there's an assumption of innocence until guilt. So I mean, we do have a, I get that part, so --

MR. GARRETT: We do have, we do have a zero tolerance, if it's found to, if it's found to, yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: Individuals will be removed from their position at the agency if anything, if any allegation was founded through the investigation. So yes, we do have a zero tolerance for that, and Mr. Thaxton, could you just tell the Board of Commissioners and the public the process? When an individual, resident or employee, comes to HR with a complaint of any sort against another, against an employee or a colleague?

MR. THAXTON: Hi, good afternoon, everyone. Yes, my name is Ronnie Thaxton. I'm the labor and employee relations manager here at the Housing Authority. I work in the Department of Human Resources.

As for the process for investigating

complaints, generally, we receive complaints from employees, or managers, sometimes even residents, and then we take the necessary steps to investigate those complaints, starting with the complainant.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. And then, keep going. Keep going, go through the whole entire -
MR. THAXTON: Do you want me to speak

specifically to --

MR. GARRETT: No, but just to give a general overview of exactly what the process is.

MR. THAXTON: Oh. Well, we contact the complainant, we meet with that person, him or her. Based on what information we gain from them, we just follow their lead and connect the dots. If they identify witnesses or provide evidence, we review that evidence. We speak to other witnesses that they've identified.

MR. GARRETT: And in some instances, we do use a third party to investigate some of these, versus doing it internally, especially when it deals with the circumstances, correct?

MR. THAXTON: That's, that is

absolutely correct. We, oftentimes, refer matters out to a third party investigator.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you. Commissioners, do you have any other specific questions for Mr. Thaxton in regards to this right now?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: I think I'd just like to take a look at the process --

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: -- and maybe it's something that we should take a look at --

MR. GARRETT: We can, we can --

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: -- to see --

MR. GARRETT: -- we can provide it to you, and I believe OGC has it in their, in their office, and we've gone over this internally with our department heads, at our team leader meetings, of exactly what the process is. Ken Slaughter, our general counsel, has made it very clear that we do have, that there is a zero tolerance policy coming out of the OED's office, out of my office, in terms of sexual harassment, whether it be towards

2.42

residents or other employees. But we do have a process in which we have to follow, and we can provide that to you.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Okay. What do you know about now, about how we communicate to, where, because, I'm sorry, ma'am, I forgot your name.

MR. GARRETT: Ms. Thomas.

MS. THOMAS: Wanda Thomas.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Ms. Thomas, I mean, it sounds like she talked to at least five different people. You know, how does someone --

MS. THOMAS: Over 15 people.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Oh, okay.

MS. THOMAS: Over 15 --

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Okay.

MS. THOMAS: -- Housing staff. The only staff that kind of helped me to reach people in Housing was my UDC Job Development Southwest Enhancement Center staff.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: How do we inform residents where to go --

MR. GARRETT: So --

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: -- so that that doesn't happen again?

MS. THOMAS: Even through this paper, it wasn't passed out in our neighborhood. You don't see this in our neighborhood. I found this in my UDC Enhancement Center Job Development.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. So Chelsea Johnson is going to come up and talk about some of the things that we do, based on our involvement and interaction with DOJ.

MS. JOHNSON: All right. Good afternoon, Commissioners. DOJ had reached out to our agency almost over a year ago, when the new law, there was a new law that was put out in regards to desperate impact and sexual harassment, and we worked in them, with them in partnership, in terms of coming up with a publicity campaign, in terms of informing our residents, and having a poster out for not only our residents and our employees in regards to what the process and steps would be in order to file a sexual harassment complaint.

Also, internally, we did a series of training, mandatory training for all of our employees that are out onsite. In addition, we have created an internal policy and procedure that we can share with the Board in regards to how we handle complaints internally, and make sure that we have our own checks and balance in place, in terms of if someone contacts one department, how another department also needs to be alerted, and how we have to track these things.

Almost a year ago, we presented to the Board an update in regards to sexual harassment claims and results, and we're probably due for another report, and we can do that at our next Board meeting, if the Board so desires.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. Thank you, Chelsea.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Ms. Thomas, I can see it's very emotional, and I don't want to keep asking you questions, but I assure you, I want to put a time frame on it. Before next month's Board of Commissioners, if you have not gotten what you

need, please return and let us know.

MS. THOMAS: Okay. Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Also, to Commissioner Jones's point about kind of our policy and procedures, I just wanted to, in December of 2017, Mayor Bowser did a mayor's order about all District government employees need to be trained in sexual harassment.

So what they do when they witness it or experience it, and where that gets reported. So the onus, I don't think, should really be on the residents. It should really be on our employees, to make sure that the employees of this authority are trained, and are aware of what the policies and procedures are.

So, and that, we have to, every new employee has to be trained in that within 14 days of onboarding, and then every employee has to get a refresher at least every two years.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So I think

to Commissioner Jones's point, I think that's kind of the assurance that this Board needs to make sure that your claims are taken seriously, and then in the future, other people know sort of what the policy, what the procedure is in order for it to be reported, and the onus should be on the employees of the Authority to execute that, not, you know, the residents just to kind of figure out which employee to talk to.

MS. THOMAS: And that's how I had to do it.

MR. GARRETT: Come on. Come on, Ed.

MS. THOMAS: I had to come in to different people.

MR. KAINE: I would just respond to, you know, that we, that is a part of standard DCHA procedure. It happens, it happens in onboarding as a part of the initial employee orientation, and then there are periodic trainings and additional training to policy, and these are the appropriate standards of behavior, as well as reporting requirements, as well as responsibility of managers

to take appropriate actions.

So that is part of the training that is, obviously does not speak exactly to the things that Ms. Thomas is talking about today, but it is a part of DCHA standard procedure.

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERROR: Excuse me, but it is part of training, but she went in 15 times, so somebody doing something wrong.

MR. KAINE: So I think that --

MS. THOMAS: The anxiety just from it alone, I'm packing up to live with my family. I just would be homeless. I don't feel safe.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: But it's a, just to close out on that point, just, if there are 15 people that you talked to, if you know who those people are --

MS. THOMAS: I do. It's in the report.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Okay. If you could share that --

MS. THOMAS: It's in the report.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: -- I think then we could follow up to make sure that our policy

and procedures are robust enough that --

MS. THOMAS: I kept every call.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: Well, thank

you.

MS. THOMAS: It's in the investigation.

COMMISSIONER FALCICCHIO: No, and

thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Ms. Thomas.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. UMAR: Good afternoon. My name is Muhsin Umar, Resident council member, President Council member of Garfield Terrace Senior Citizen Bureau.

MS. JONES: And I'm Racquelle Jones,
President of Can I Live, and I want to thank the
Commissioners that have --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: President of what?

MS. JONES: Can I Live, Incorporated.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay.

MS. JONES: Thank the Commissioners that have stayed after. You guys have done your

business, because it's now public comment, and half of the room is gone, and some of the Commissioners are gone, so that doesn't really feel inclusive of the process, but thank you guys, for those who stayed.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: But wait a minute, I have to ask you a question. Have you signed to speak?

MS. JONES: Yes, I'm --

MR. UMAR: Yes.

MS. JONES: -- with him.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay.

MR. UMAR: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: All right.
All right. Go ahead.

MS. JONES: So what I'm doing is prefacing what he's about to say.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay.

MS. JONES: And so Can I Live, well, one of the things I heard today was about the redevelopment plans, and you guys really wanting to be innovative, and things like that, and I know you

guys are aware of TOPA. You guys are aware that DCHA has an exemption from TOPA.

However, there's a federal statute that gives residents their own rights to be offered a sale in the case of demolition and disposition, and so what the Garfield collaborative, Can I Live, in partnership with D.C. Statewide Tenant's Association, Garfield Senior, Garfield Terrace cites, we are putting in an expression of interest to be a resident-led redevelopment project.

With all of the development that is happening, there's no way that none of these projects should be and include resident leadership in the development process. And so what you'll hear today from Mr. Bo (phonetic), and all the other members of the resident, of the Garfield collaborative, is the expression of that interest.

So we wanted to make sure that we put in the public record, on public record that this particular Resident council, both Senior and Terrace, will be formally expressing their interest in being part of the development team, choosing

their own developers, and going through the whole entire development process based on the regulations, and the authority that has been invested in them both through the general statute, the federal CFR, as well as through our local TOPA rights.

MR. UMAR: In the Garfield, the Garfield Terrace collaborative is excited to begin working with the, with its partners in effective to the forge the, of the new birth of excited economic opportunity that exists for the residents of both senior and family sites during the major rehabilitation and demolition phases.

We'd welcome, we welcome can we live, I mean, Can I Live and the other Ross grants on the Garfield premises. We have every, we have every intentions of working with them to establish the, their much needed presence in our, in our community, and hate that during a time of, a time like this, the, their service would not be available to families in other, in the other communities.

The Garfield collaborative work, will

work with them to ensure both economic opportunities are available for our, for our willing and able, and able families. With some, with so, with so many families moving and being relocated, we want to ensure residents are placed and, placed, are in place and ready to seize opportunities as owning, as owning and other opportunities operating and moving companies, landscapes, and janitorial companies.

We want to see residents organize and create property management companies. Again, we, again, and the partners of Garfield collaboratives are in position to leverage this great and awesome opportunity for us. And just exactly with, not just with that.

We're talking about with the, not just the landscaping. We're talking about opportunities for the seniors in the buildings that we don't get, you know, as far as, you've got, remember, this is senior building.

We don't do no sewing in the building.

They would like to do sewing, they would like to do

arts and crafts, they would like to do all type of opportunities that we're not getting in there, that we did have at, once upon a time, with the Ross grant, that we haven't had the opportunity.

We don't get the opportunity even to express our feelings. They come in the neighborhood, they don't say nothing to us about anything. These are the programs we've got for you. Okay?

But not telling us anything about, that we could be hired, we could be trained, or anything, of the new upcoming construction coming around there, anything. So we don't get anything out of that.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: So Mr. Umar, what are you asking from the Board of Commissioners?

MR. UMAR: To welcome Can We Live in a, and Ross grants into our establishments, into our building, because other that, there's nothing going on in that building. I mean, nothing.

We got space in there. We also, we got space in there. We done also, you know, went

through other changes about just receiving our money, period, other things that we did, and then also, even along with the construction on there, I heard that once, that they was mixing about the redevelopment.

We had a, we had a, we also asked once upon a time about an audit that they was doing things in our building for \$2.5 million that we had got, that I expressed to Mr. Garrett in February of last you and the whole Board, about, year, misappropriated, but misuse of \$2.5 million in our building from a, that was back in 2018, that they fixed the roof that was leaking. We got solar, we got over 200 solar panels on top of that roof. We just had an outing last month, and no solar work. The roof is still leaking, and he also, Mr. Garrett also got ahead when they did some major repairs on light fixtures and all that, that don't work, and didn't work.

You got an old building that you installed new thermostats in that don't work, that was, that we had to replace, and you still want to

put this man in charge of money that's been
misappropriated in our building?

A building that you're trying to say that you fixed, and you didn't fix it, because we got proof, because I put it on Facebook and various other sites. Every time we get big rain, we get rained on with the seas, in this building, and I'm tired of it, because I brought this down here once before in front of the whole Board, and got nothing done. I mean, like nothing.

It's like when you talk to Tyrone Garrett, you get a rack of excuses about this and that, and how many people you just sit there and seeing how many people that got to shift the gears on one issue. Do the right thing. It's right here.

You've got it, that you finish this, you know, and we would like the, like, this is the reason why we want people in our building that know we can, that know has been helping us. Can I Live and the Ross grant.

We want that in our building, and we have

the right, and we have a five-board committee, and we're willing to stand for that. It shouldn't be no problem. You know, they might've said that they bought that from some, well, no, we want that in our building. Can I Live, the Ross grant.

We have space for it in the building. The building has not been occupied about nothing. It took me so long just to get the keys to do anything in our building, because all I've got to do, when I go to it, Tyrone Garrett send me around the Board to everybody else. This person, that person, that person, until it just get back to him. He could've just did it from the beginning. Just from the beginning.

We're tired of all of the run arounds, and all the excuses that we keep getting, and you're going to have a meeting, we're going to have a meeting. What is being done? Nothing. Nothing. And he keeps saying okay, but nothing been done, and we've been requesting this. We've been requesting this information.

The roof is still leaking. The

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

thermostat's not working, but they were paid for out of \$2.5 million that Mr. Garrett approved that it was done in 2018, and it's still messed up today, and all I get is, we're going to send somebody. We're going to send somebody.

No program is in the building, nothing. Terrific, Inc., operating out of our building with a license. Contract been up, we said something about it. Nothing's being done. Now, would you want your mother to live like that, your grandmother, your grandfather?

Do you think you're going to ever get old? Because you're sure treating us like you ain't going to get old, because you ain't acting like you can. When is it going to stop?

MR. GARRETT: So Commissioners, if they, if the resident council would like to apply for a Ross grant with Can I Live, they're welcome to do so.

MS. JONES: So we wouldn't apply, because we, and I guess it's two separate issues that we're kind of dealing with, but they have

access to office space in their building that has not been utilized for some years, and they would like to have the Ross grant on that premises. And so what I had planned to discuss later on in the agenda is where we are with the Can I Live Ross.

I know that, Mr. Garrett, you just mentioned that you got, well, earlier you mentioned, like four hours ago, that you guys got like \$700,000 for Ross. Well, Can I Live has gotten \$738,000, which was our very, very first grant ever

MR. GARRETT: But --

MS. JONES: -- to serve families here on this property.

MR. GARRETT: -- Commissioners, that money has been taken back by HUD. We don't have that Ross grant money anymore.

MR. UMAR: Why?

MR. GARRETT: HUD made a determination

--

MS. JONES: Well, no, that's not true.

MR. UMAR: Why?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. GARRETT: HUD made --

MS. JONES: So what, well, hold on --

MR. GARRETT: HUD made --

MS. JONES: -- well, let me just say this.

MR. GARRETT: HUD made the --

MS. JONES: HUD has not taken anything.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

MS. JONES: So HUD has given us the money to be able to provide those services here, in these seven communities, however, I, that is still not, I'm not, I don't want to speak on my part, because I have a part that I would like to speak on, but HUD is in the process of trying to take those moneys away, because we were banned from seven communities, and that's the purpose of me coming here today, to tell you why I believe we were banned. So I want to be able to offer the Commissioners, which I was hoping to have a full house --

MR. GARRETT: Right.

MS. JONES: -- to offer, and if you want me to just, since I'm on the agenda anyway, to speak,

I can just go get the papers and give it to you.

MR. GARRETT: I would, I would like, you know, we can talk about the Ross grant right now. Mr. Williams is, was part of that process, so he can explain to the Board exactly what took place with the, with the HUD office in their investigation of the Ross grant funding.

MR. UMAR: He give you a lot of run arounds too. He gave me a lot of them. Let me hear this one.

MR. WILLIAMS: So Good afternoon,
Commissioners. Actually --

MR. GARRETT: Oh, is Brian, and Brian's here. I'm sorry. Brian, come up. Come up. I'm sorry, I apologize. I didn't see you back there. Brian Harris is the director of ORS. I know that Larry was working with the Can I Live grant before he moved over to BMO, so I don't know if Brian will also have something that he might want to add.

MR. WILLIAMS: And so at the time that the Ross grant was awarded, it was awarded to Can I Live, along with a few resident councils at the

time. I think it was Langston and Potomac. It was a group of resident councils.

MR. UMAR: Langston, Potomac -(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. WILLIAMS: There was various different concerns that DCHA had in terms of Can I Live operating in the parameters of what the grant specified they had to operate in. And then, HUD also had concerns about various expenditures and activities.

So at the time, ORS was communicating with both HUD and Can I Live, and we have, we had multiple meetings with Can I Live and HUD. They made a determination based on various different issues of concerns about expenditure and programs activity that they would put kind of some other parameters.

But after exhausting meeting after meeting after meeting after meeting after meeting with Can I Live, DCHA had the same concern. So yes, there was a concern from resident councils as well regarding the activity of Can I Live. So yes, Can

I Live was barred by DCHA until HUD made a determination as to how we were going to proceed.

There's so much, there's a lot of detail to this, and so, but HUD actually made the determination as it relates to the funds, because we were no longer Can I Live's contract administrator. And so once that relationship ended, HUD had to make a determination, and I believe HUD made that determination.

MS. JONES: They're trying to make that determination. However, what he's, what Mr. Williams is saying is, and this is important for everybody to know, because I have to go on public record today to be able to make sure that every Board of Commissioner understands what has really transpired.

So what I will say, I'm going to pass out, and Mr. Williams, you can be the first to get it, but everybody, I'm going to pass these out. What is, what you will have before you is, because I want this to be entered into public record, is what we believe is the first reason why we were actually

banned. Number one --

(Off-microphone comments)

MS. JONES: Come on. Come on, you have a copy. So my name is R.W. Jones. I'm the president of Can I Live, and I told you guys about how I felt about you and the staff. I was a commissioner. I housed, I chaired my Board, so I was a housing commissioner for almost 10 years.

I worked in a housing authority. I chaired, and led a family self-sufficiency department, and I also was a welfare mom. So I'm coming to you from all three areas of understanding public housing programs, number one.

However, there is an evil amongst you, an evil which we believe is the number one reason why we were banned like drug dealers from seven communities without any grievance and/or due process.

Can I Live, which is a national tenant's association, has served families and resident leaders for more than 16 years with never one complaint about our performance or our service

delivery. We were on the ground here in this DCHA property for 90 days, and were instantly banned. No notice.

We were, we met with the ORS for every week, we never had a notice that we were doing anything wrong. Ms. Vann-Ghasri, who was instrumental in helping us get this grant, okay, is also one of the main reasons why we believe we were banned.

We have residents here today who will attest to her bragging, her slapping fives, and giving high fives to other resident councils on how they had gotten Can I Live off the property, because we were not acting right with the money.

And so Can I Live not acting right with the money meant that we were supposed to make private rent payments to the Vann-Ghasri political think tankers, which you'll find out on page one.

We were supposed to bring resident leaders financial incentives in order to get their buy-in, so we were asked to pay resident leaders just to get the buy-in and access to the people,

which you'll find those sections on page 2 and 3.

And if Can I Live did not show up to these meetings, we were threatened with harassment and investigation complaints. You'll see that on page 4. And this is how things were being done.

Ms. Vann-Ghasri went on to say that she's not the only one receiving and/or asking for moneys, on page 5, which implies that there are other leaders who may be asking, and there are other service providers who might be paying leaders for access to people in the community, and I said that this is not just wrong, it's illegal, it's unethical, it's unjust, and it's, and it's damaging to families.

Because of this power move, our grant partner in Topeka, Kansas pulled out of the grant as well, because they did not know what was going on. What we do know is there was some communication that transpired on October 1st, and all I know is, two hours later, I got an email from Mr. Garrett banning us from all communities, from, for all seven communities.

And to this day, Can I Live has not been given the opportunity to address any of these allegations, which you'll find on page 7 and 8. We just got a notice, and what I'm finding that is consistent with this agency, because you guys have this authority, you have all of these attorneys, you kind of put this stuff out --

MR. UMAR: Right.

MS. JONES: -- and then, we have to kind of fight and defend ourselves against what has been done, and that is just not cool. These --

MR. UMAR: At all.

MS. JONES: -- obligations that we have not gotten one chance to even provide whether or not they were factual, and the suspension letter is on the back that says that you're going to take \$738 million, well, I wish it was that much, \$738,000 from families, because we, quote/quote, "misrepresented ourselves, and we called ourselves direct service providers." That's hearsay.

MR. UMAR: Yes.

MS. JONES: Nobody has provided any

kind of proof or evidence, and I will say, as long as Ms. Vann-Ghasri is on this Board and allowed to serve, she's a liability, she's a risk to your operations, and I say, Mr. Garrett, your vision is being jeopardized by greed and selfish ambition, and --

MR. UMAR: True.

MS. JONES: -- at the end of the day, maybe Ms. Vann-Ghasri was right, where, on page 6 she said that I needed to be educated on D.C. politics, that they are territorial, and if I didn't understand it, I better respect her, or else I would get intercourse or, in other words, I would get fucked. Excuse my language, F-U-C-K.

MR. UMAR: But it was said.

MS. JONES: And so it's my hopes that whatever she did, and how she did it, and I'm glad she's on the phone, and I wish she was here, because I told her, if I found out that she had something to do with this, I will make sure that I would expose her myself.

However, this was the beginning of us

being banned. You don't ban a service provider for not providing, you just don't ban them, one, two, three, for nothing. And so now, HUD is trying to take my \$1 million grant on the basis of something that has not been substantiated or found factual, and then, what they're saying, HUD is saying that, if you cannot get on the property, how can we give you the money to serve families --

MR. UMAR: Exactly.

MS. JONES: -- which is actually true. We can't get on the property, because we've been banned from the property. So we have found other resident councils that will allow us to come onto their property.

MR. UMAR: Garfield Terrace Senior Citizen.

MS. JONES: They have the power to bring us on their property, so we're saying that, okay, let's go. If you all don't want these seven communities that we got funding on our own to provide services for them, let the other communities, who do want us, let us serve them,

because ultimately, HUD still gave us the funds.

And even though there's an investigation --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I don't want to cut you short, but --

MS. JONES: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- we have a lot of other people, who --

MR. UMAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- want to testify, and we're trying, if you want to get to a conclusion request --

MS. JONES: I'm finished. It's just public record, just make sure --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MS. JONES: -- that you guys put this in your public record.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'm not trying to short circuit, I just want to show respect to everybody else who is here.

MS. JONES: No, no, no, and I appreciate that. I get passionate, and this is the first time that I'm addressing it, but I do want you guys to

know that these are the remarks, and that I will be filing my own OIG complaint and investigation, because I've been extorted and bribed by one of your commissioners, which these are the --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, we definitely encourage you to take all actions available to you.

MS. JONES: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So thank you for coming tonight.

MR. UMAR: And like I said, we do welcome them on our property.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: There's no need. It's on record, and we're going to further it to OGC. Mr. Umar, we have your public record. It is now part of the Board. Was there anything else you wanted to add to it, or are you done?

MR. UMAR: Basically, nothing in, nothing. Just when it come to dealing with you all, actually, you know, I like to come and deal with the Board opposed to just directly dealing with Tyrone Garrett and Lorry Williams, because every time I get

with them two, it's like dealing, I'm going to be honest, it's like dealing with clowns, and I'm being honest with you.

I don't care how they think, because my apologies for saying it that way, Mr. Council, but I'm just tired of every time I'm going through them, because I went --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: I understand that, but you've got --

MR. UMAR: -- we got \$29,000 that they keep playing with it.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: -- you've got to respect. We've got to respect.

MR. UMAR: My apologies. My apologies. Right? My apologies.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I think we have

MR. UMAR: But --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I think we have to have a level of respect.

MR. UMAR: Okay. My apologies. My apologies.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: That's not okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: But thing is, my apologies, okay? I'm just tired of dealing with people that we got to keep going around in circles, but when we could just get this stuff done. If you're going to be the director, be the director. Don't take --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay, look, I think you've --

MR. UMAR: -- you know --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- I think you've
made your point, okay?

MR. UMAR: Okay, I'm finished.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Thank you.

MR. UMAR: I'm finished. All right.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Mr. Williams,
Terri Acker, Ms. Carr, Ms. Connie, Ms. Saunders, Ms.
Billington. Okay, non-resident, Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: All right. Good afternoon, everybody.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Before you get started, I'm sorry to do this --

MR. JACKSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- but we had a discussion earlier about the three and five minutes. Why is it five and not three?

MR. JACKSON: Because I'm not a resident.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I get it, but you know, I've been here five hours ago and we had this discussion about how residents were getting three minutes.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: No, they get five.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Mr. Albert was very clear that it was three, unless you were tasked to find on multiple resolutions, then you got five. So I want to understand our policy, because I feel like our residents got short circuited earlier, and nobody else stood up and said, hey, that's not right. So what is it?

MS. MCNAIR: So we have two sign-in sheets --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MS. MCNAIR: -- when residents arrive.

One sign-in sheet is there for resident or non-resident that would like to speak on a resolution. If you have, if you're a resident or non-resident, you have five minutes, if you want to speak on multiple resolutions.

You have two minutes, I'm sorry, three minutes, if you want to speak on one resolution, and then the second sign-up sheet is for a resident or a non-resident, where they can speak on anything. And so a resident has five minutes in that portion, and a non-resident, three minutes in that portion.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay.

MS. MCNAIR: So that's the --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: I'd like to, I'd like to understand when that came to be, because I think that the residents should get five minutes on the resolutions, but we'll deal with that one another time. Thank you.

MS. MCNAIR: Okay.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: I'm sorry to interrupt, but I've got to go. I was on the list.

Could I just --

(Off-microphone comments)

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Well, you don't have six hours? You're not committed, are you?

MR. JACKSON: Hey, thank you for taking the time, Commission. My name's Kendrick Jackson. I am with the Garfield collaborative, working in outreach and engagement through My Senior's Keeper, downstairs in the basement at Garfield Terrace Network Center.

This is to address the issue of the lack of attendance and participating in planning and development meetings to the effected communities for the comprehensive plan. We are able to see that, both in physical attendance, and by surveying residents of the effected communities.

Since the beginning of the announcement of the plan, it has come to the direct attention of the Garfield collaborative that the current strategy by D.C. Housing Authority and advocates to engage with the 10 to 14 communities proposed, is not currently effective.

So for, so far, the resident council representation has been primarily with the communities of Greenleaf, Garfield Terrace Seniors, and Langston Terrace Additions. This is a unique opportunity to leverage and connect resources that are at the disposal of the Housing Authority, as well as the existing relationships, both on and off the Commission.

It also nicely aligns with current plans that the city has to educate residents with alternative housing opportunities. What we will be proposing is to build and execute an inclusive outreach strategy that would not only reach the residents, but to ensure that resident participation at the upcoming meetings is drastically increased.

This would be a win-win for both D.C. Housing Authority, the city, and the communities, by ensuring that everyone involved is properly informed and prepared for longer term conversions.

Being that we have a training facility at Garfield Seniors Network Center, with the help

of D.C. Housing Authority and the new communities initiative that is ran by the deputy mayor and Commissioner Falcicchio, we have identified, we can identify select individuals within these communities who can be trained to disseminate and articulate the current and future developments to their fellow residents.

Our team has broken down the development plan to bite-sized pieces, and transformed the learning process through clear and concise messaging, along with pockets of potential opportunities where they can see themselves in.

The executive director stated earlier that D.C. Housing Authority has their own internal process of outreach. The turnout at the housing meetings are not, that are not based on community, but here at our, but here at housing, are suggesting is a collaborative process that includes the both the community, D.C. Housing Authority, the administration's efforts for outreach that can be measured.

These can be measured through impact,

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

whether they're sustainable, and whether they're scalable to other communities that will be effected. Our approach is addressing the following issues within, that we've tested out in a two-hour training, maybe a little less.

We focused on the immediate action plan with a long-term strategy, whether it's 0 to 5 or 6 to 10 years, the process through Section 18 demolition and disposition, what is RAD, what are the project based vouchers, what TOPA and the other scale clause, located under Section 42, USS Code 1437, as well as Section 18 of the Housing Act IV.

This information has not been disseminated by D.C. Housing Authority to residents, and I believe that, in previous cases, D.C. Housing Community Development has given a waiver to D.C. Housing Authority because they have their own housing option purchase program.

So we want to just make sure that residents are also highly educated on that, as well as just following, in closing, that the human capital services are also very needed.

We ran into an issue yesterday with someone from the family who we had trained to be able to articulate and educate that community, however, due to justice-related issues, and mental health-related issues, they're not around to be able to help, so it's not just an intent to be able to educate them, but also provide them with the wrap around services to make sure that they have everything needed in order to be able to articulate what is happening within their own communities.

Thank you for listening, and I, if you have any questions, concerns, or comments, please let me know. Thank you.

MR. GARRETT: Not at this time. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Any questions?
No? Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: R.W. Jones.

MS. JONES: I've spoken.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Okay. Wallace

Kirby?

MR. KIRBY: I'd like to first thank the Commission, and the public as well for the opportunity to speak today. Again, my name is Wallace Kirby. Actually, I've been involved in community engagement efforts in the District of Columbia for almost 20 something years. Been involved in several other HOPE VI projects, such as the East Gate project.

One of my mentors, at the time, was Kimmy Gray, the late Kimmy Gray. One of the things that, you know, we know she left a legacy with, and we heard from some of the residents at Kenilworth today was about resident management cooperations, right?

That was a historic first for the District of Columbia, what Kimmy Gray and the team of seven was able to do over in Ward 7. Much of that, right, we like to emphasize how important that resident management cooperation movement has been, the impact it has had, right?

A lot of times, we're not even hearing about, you know, what happened over there with Kenilworth, and that resident management cooperation. And so I'd like

to just emphasize that, right?

I am a, I am one of the members of the Garfield collaborative, very enthusiastic about it, because over the years I've seen, what's been a really missing aspect of really informing, because what we're hearing today, over and over, is that there's this kind of missing communication, right, even when we're coming out to talk about, you know, the position, the re-position, and that, is you're having, Garrett, Mr. not being communicated in a related manner, in a digestible manner so that residents on these properties, in particular, say, the resident council executive boards, can digest it and be able to then serve their population by informing them in a way that they can grasp it without a whole lot of fear, because what we are noticing, there's a lot of fear in residents because of the kind of summary type of presentations that, you know, has been going on.

So we're just saying, we want to be a part of, right, elevate, right, this communication, the education, the information, to residents on

these properties, especially these 14 properties that, you know, you designated for disposition to demolition.

And what we'd like to also emphasize is that, let's utilize, I'm a former resident of public housing myself, as well. I still have family in many of the public housing developments as well.

I say, you lie to some of us in the process, right, so that we don't have to have a lot of residents coming down here saying that they didn't, they didn't understand, you know, what was communicated, they didn't understand policy, they didn't understand the procedures.

So we want to be able to set up educational informational workshops, trainings, with those residents, and we'd like to, we really want to be in a position to make sure that this is done, so that we can really show residents, because residents have really been handed a terrible deal in public housing over these many years.

Many administrations, and we know you inherited that, Mr. Garrett. So we want, we want

to make sure that what is occurring now is really in the best interest and advantageous to residents.

MR. GARRETT: I appreciate that. Thank you so much. Thank you. And we'll look forward to working with any community organization that we can find, and I also committed to going back out to the properties to have more conversation, because that was the initial meetings that we had with the residents, from the engagement, was just that initial touch.

We clearly stated we will be coming back out to have more conversations, and get down into specifics about each property. So it might be a combination where, and initially, we talked about RAD and Section 18 demo dispo as a high level.

We'll get down to actually what that particular property is going to be meeting, or what we're going to be developing for that, for that complex. So it might be just RAD, and that's all we'll talk about. We won't confuse them with anything else, but just have a conversation about RAD.

well-accepted. Clearly hear you, and we're going to, you know, modify our customary, our resident engagement as much as we possibly can so that everyone feels comfortable with what the Housing Authority is attempting to do. Thank you so much.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Michael Anthony. Sorry.

(Off-microphone comments)

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: All right.

DR. WISE: Thank you, and I apologize for, that I did have to go, but the rain precluded me from stepping out. My name is Daniel del Pielago, with Empower DC. We've been diligently knocking on doors at the effected properties in hopes of getting residents involved in what's happening, will happen on their property.

I know DCHA staff has had meetings at all of the properties, and I attended most of these meetings, but there is definitely a large segment of residents who have not heard about what's happening, or are unclear about what's happening.

And this is more directed to the Board rather than the staff, because the Board is going to be making some pretty serious decisions about the future of public housing, so I would ask that the Board, if possible, take time to meet with residents outside of this space.

You know, we get paid to do this, I get paid to do this. I am able to stay here, but many residents are at work, and come, you know, during these set times. So I would ask that the Board set up a meeting outside of this space to listen to residents, that Empower DC would be glad to help with, you know, reaching out to residents, and as well as locating a space to do that, and hopefully that could happen before some of these big decisions are made. So I would ask the Board, those of you that are left here, to consider that, please.

I also wanted to bring up a point that actually, I've been hearing a little bit about, and I've heard about this in the past, and I want to put this on your radar, Mr. Garrett, because it could seem worse than what it is.

I got a call this morning from a resident at Woodland Terrace who had received a 30-day notice to quit or vacate. This is not about the issue of, she could very well be, you know, not, she could be, there could be an infraction of her lease somehow. It's not about that.

It's more about the process that, to my understanding, the 30-day notice is a notice to quit or vacate. That's not a legal document to appear in court, or saying you will, you're going to be evicted. So her 30-day notice was up, and management, she said in an interaction with management told her, you know, your 30-day notice is up, you know, when are you going to go?

So I'm concerned that residents are being told that they have to leave, when that is not the process, right? And once again, the optics of this is so bad, because it is a property that's repositioning. So what are we to think in the community, right? Well, they're just trying to find any old way to empty the property.

So I wanted to put that on your radar,

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

because I've also seen that happen at Park Morton, and I've heard that on other properties. So just putting it out there that, you know, hopefully, you all can remind and/or educate your management companies, or managers, rather, that, you know, the 30-day notice is just that. It's a notice to quit or vacate.

I know it begins the process of eviction, and this is, once again, not a judgement on any sort of infraction that she may have made, but it's in this process of residents being felt, being told to leave, essentially, when they haven't done anything that merits that at this point in time. So thank you.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you for bringing that to my attention, and I just want to say that it's weird not, in the position, or not in the mode of trying to force residents out of their particular properties because of repositioning or redevelopment or anything like that.

That is not the administration's position, and we're not, that's not what we're

taking. Anything that we need to correct with management to make sure that we're all on the same page at how we address our residents, with whatever the issue is, we will do so.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Yes, and again, I think --

MR. GARRETT: Thank you for bringing that for me, to my attention.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: And I think it's just clear, like, you know, 30-day notice is not an eviction notice.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Claudia?

appreciate you bringing up the notice of meetings outside of this building with the, with the Board, and I hope that we can advance that idea, because I do believe that this is, this room may not be a place where people feel comfortable coming and talking.

For whatever reason that might be, they

may not be able to get here, and they may feel constrained by the space. Whatever it is, given the magnitude of what we're doing, I do think it's something we should consider, going out on a weekend, or a week night, or whatever it might be, where it's more convenient, and just having a listening tour, for lack of a better word. So the two of you that are still here, I hope you'll consider it, and somehow, we can socialize it to the rest of the Board.

(Off-microphone comment)

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: Oh, okay. You switch, okay. All right.

DR. WISE: Thank you, Chairman, Vice Chairman, Director, and the rest of the Commission for letting me speak today. My name is Dr. Connell Wise. I'm the founder and managing partner of Connell Wise & Associates. Connell Wise & LLC is our actual name.

We are a HUD Section 3 business concern, and a disadvantaged business enterprise with DDOT and US Department of Transportation, and a CBE with

the city. Our goal of our company is mainly to help low income and communities of color to basically build pathways to the middle class.

And today, I'm here to talk about a partnership with the Garfield Terrace collaborative, along with Can I Live. We are positioned to provide small business development through our Section 3 business incubator program, to help District residents living in these communities participate in HUD Section 3 programs to be a part of the economic opportunity and development happening around them.

We, along with the Garfield collaborative, work with residents to track the use of all Section 3 triggered activities throughout the development project. Our business incubator offers residents with an 11B certification to direct individuals who are in the early stages or advanced stages of their entrepreneurial process, as well as the tools they need so that they can turn their business idea into success.

The Garfield Terrace collaborative and

my firm go to promote Section 3 residents who want to help the residents within their community, but also, most of, as you know, if you start a business in the community that you work in, you're going to hire the residents within the community you work in.

But we also want to talk about today, because we feel like the current Section 3 program process is not truly transparent here in the District. As many Section 3 business prime contractors that work on District programs are coming from other jurisdictions to provide services, yet there is still a lack of work for local Section 3 firms.

Plus, many of the firms get exemptions, due to them saying, quote/unquote, "there are no firms or contractors to meet the requirement".

This is not true.

We requested DC Housing Authority and the Commission crack down on this program, and adopt a new style similar to the Department of Small Local Business Development's current set aside program, the Certified Business Enterprise Program. Thank

you.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you.

MS. BARRAGOR: Good evening. My --

MR. GARRETT: Good evening.

MS. BARRAGOR: Good evening. My name is Claudia Barragor. I'm a longstanding District resident and immigrant, and practicing community and urban planning professional for over 15 years. I am also a volunteer at Garfield Terrace Senior, providing my expertise in community development and language access for residents within the Garfield collaborative.

I also come before you as an urban and environmental policy expert, as certified by the DC Zoning Commission, and DC Office of Planning mayor's advocate. Every week that I spend with the seniors and families at Garfield Terrace without pay, I am reminded of their resiliency, and the fact that they can show me just as much as they can tell me.

Trust me, public housing residents have the capacity and expertise to advocate for

themselves, and to have decision making power over the right to housing, and the right to the city.

From the overall 150 seniors that I meet, to the wonderful tiny 10-year-old kid immigrant that also lives at Garfield Terrace Family, I'd like to go on record about some of the major community planning principles and concepts that the 20-year plan provided to the residents is missing.

Have a collaborative approach with strong resident councils and residents can in fact get you, D.C. Housing Authority, to set goals in the importance, and to get you to accomplish your goals.

You must set an important priority to language access, specifically to limited English-speaking residents. It must be prioritized in your outreach over communication and resources spent on, rather than spending resources on English-speaking advocates who are not public housing residents.

Earlier today, there was a resident here with me from Garfield Terrace Family, and she texted

me when she got here, and she was like, this meeting is not for me, and it goes back to what you were saying today, that this space is not welcoming to residents and immigrants who don't speak the language, even though she's been living there for a while now.

And she specifically told me, I don't think I belong here. I don't think this meeting is for me. Everybody's wearing a suit, right? I told her, no, this is for you. You are the center of this meeting, and you should be there. There was nobody here that would provide translation for her.

Let me tell you one more thing about this particular person. She also showed me, when she sat here, and I sat next to her and translated for her, she showed me a text that she's been receiving about Section 8 vouches, from a random number.

She is afraid of opening those links, not only because she doesn't speak English, but because that could, they could take her information. But let's talk about information.

Basically, someone is selling

information at this point, because she's getting these Section 8 vouchers, and let me tell you, like, what the issue is also, is that you need, you don't really need organizations like Empower DC to do the outreach for you. I am proof of that because I've been doing this work without getting paid, and I've been able to provide capacity to this, to residents.

So what you really need is you need to center everything on the residents. They need to be able to have access, and right now, this entire process, advocates are getting priority over immigrants, who are non-English speakers, but live in public housing, and that is not right, and resources should not be spent on that.

Furthermore, I wanted to also talk about the planning part. Equitable development encourages choice, not displacement. To ensure that growth benefits the most vulnerable marginalized and low income communities, increasing their role in substantive decision making process that results in public, in positive impact and equitable growth.

DCHA must prioritize equitable civic participation that emphasized residents and builds peoples' long-term capacity to engage and provide effective and diverse opinions, solutions, and benefit from the community development, which is the reason why the Garfield collaborative is actually asking DCHA to please follow every single policy written in the Section 18.

Specifically, Garfield Terrace is expressing their interest to be a resident redevelopment organization. By Section 18, they have the right. It's very much similar to TOPA, which we haven't even talked about in the 20-year plan that you have.

Every District resident, I'm a tenant, I have a right to TOPA. So should public resident, public housing residents. They should have a right to TOPA, and that's basically what we want to, what we want to make sure, that Section 18, you are following that so that this is going on record for them to expressing their interest.

Finally, I just wanted to, again, make

sure that, to let you know that technical assistance is available to you. Basically, the Garfield collaborative, we have, we are a model of showing how, when DCHA, specifically Mr. Garrett's team, needs support, and needs specific programming, specific information about equitable development, community planning, they should go to the residents, and they should also go to technical people like me.

You don't necessarily need to go to advocates, and you don't necessarily need to go outside to hire a contractor and put money on outsiders. We are here, D.C. is here, and a lot of us are here to help you. Help you, that is the main goal. Thank you.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Okay. Could ask I, could I ask a quick question? That's the second time I've heard, not necessarily to you, but about your testimony, so thank you.

The, this is the second reference I've

heard to TOPA. It's my understanding that residents of public housing, because of the financing, do not qualify, or there is no TOPA. We get a waiver from it, but I think I've heard twice now that there's a thought that there's some federal program that's available that mimics TOPA, that, do we --

MS. BARRAGOR: Section 18.

 $\label{eq:mr.garrett:} \text{MR. GARRETT:} \quad \text{Ed can comment on that for } \\ \text{you.}$

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes.

MR. KANE: Good evening, now, Commissioners. The Section 18, pursuant to which process demolition and disposition we applications does have a section that provides for opportunity to, an offer for sale to residents or representative groups residents, οf or non-profits.

Typically, in previous Section 18 applications, we have essentially operated under an exemption from that offer, based on the plan to develop additional affordable housing, as a result

of whatever the demo dispo is facilitating.

So generally speaking, in our applications, you will see that we have, we, in that section, generally, we've taken application, I would say this, that in most of those instances, there is not an identified resident organization or non-profit in the picture with whom we're dealing, and you know, I think as the executive director has explained, I think that our posture going through the repositioning is to, you know, look at all of opportunities, and not these necessarily automatically take that. But that is our position in these, in these applications, a number of which the agency has done, as approved by the Board.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Is it triggered because the demo dispo application results and the, and the ownership structure, that it is not DCHA? I mean, what triggers the right of the, of the tenants to, should they desire to? In other words, in TOPA, it's change of ownership, and so that must be what's going on here.

MR. KANE: it is the fact of the demo

dispo. I mean, it is, it is, it exists under the demolition dispo, that governs the application. So the right, the right exists in most instance, in our demo dispo applications, since the demolition has been, demolition or disposition has been facilitating the further development of affordable housing, we have been able to take, make use of an exemption, and therefore, and generally speaking, we have an imposition like this, where we're actually talking to groups who have expressed the interest. So yes, it seems as though that --

MS. BARRAGOR: And can I just add, based on the HUD law, it says that an organization has to, residents have to show their, that they are expressing their interest, in writing, and also on record, so that is what Garfield Terrace is doing.

MR. GARRETT: But, and I believe it also has to show capacity, correct?

MR. KANE: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And at some point, it's --

MS. BARRAGOR: And the capacity is

definitely there.

MR. KANE: It's not a qualifier.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right, it's not a qualifier.

MS. BARRAGOR: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: So the point is though, not to extend the meeting. It's got to be in the history books already. What is the trigger? The trigger is change of ownership. It has to be.

MR. GARRETT: No, the trigger --

MR. KANE: The trigger is the submission of the application.

MR. GARRETT: Well, I can just --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But the application itself, in other words, if we, let me just get this straight. If we put in an application to tear down the building, then we wanted to rebuild the exact same building as public housing, that wouldn't trigger their ability to buy the building.

MR. KANE: The demolition, the demolition --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: They would?

MR. KANE: -- and dispo application necessarily results in the removal of the declaration of trust, which is what imposes the -- COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right. That's

__

MR. KAINE: -- public housing. So -COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It's more than
demo disposition, it's removal of subsidy. That's
the trigger --

MR. KANE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- right?

MR. KANE: Yes, I mean, it's --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Because it's not demo dispo, it's trigger, there's got to be a trigger that's not just demo dispo.

MR. KAINE: The impact of a -COMMISSIONER SLOVER: It's dispo.

MR. KAINE: -- demo dispo of a successful demo dispo application is exactly that, right? So the subsidy's going to do, the declaration's going to come off, at least for the time that it's off, we can get, we can get put back,

right?

I mean, we have done mixed finance, we've done mixed financed developments, where the result was a post-demo dispo action that resulted in ACC units being a part of the mix that came back, right? So it could, so it can come back, but it is the fact of applying for the demolition or disposition, and the removal of the affordability

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. KANE: -- public housing requirements under the declaration of trust that triggers it.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Yes. So it could become a problem if people are able to, able to form groups with capacity, and --

MS. BARRAGOR: Or if you --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- just like TOPA. TOPA has evolved.

MS. BARRAGOR: It could be a positive thing, right, because you're actually going to be working with residents --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right now, I'm saying, I have the --

MS. BARRAGOR: -- to be able to be good

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: TOPA evolved because third parties came in and provided capacity through residents, and it sometimes works in their benefit, oftentimes, it doesn't.

MR. KANE: Right.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: And so we, as a body, need to mindful of making sure that, should this become an avenue, it's not something that's exploited, not saying, just saying it could be.

MR. KAINE: And in the first instance, there's no reason to necessarily think that our position in these is going to change --

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: Right.

MR. KAINE: -- depending on what the future development plans are.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: But the history of TOPA has not always been a good one --

MR. KANE: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- for the residents. In fact, it usually ends up poorly, and so we want to make sure that that's --

MR. KANE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SLOVER: -- should we, should this become an issue, we don't let that happen here.

MS. BARRAGOR: Center on residents. Thank you.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you. Thank you, everyone.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUNCIL: With that being said, it's 6:00 p.m. This ends our Board of Commissioner meeting. Our next one is Wednesday, October 9th, at 1:00, at Woodland Terrace, 2311 Ainger Place, Southeast, Washington, D.C. 20020.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for attending.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 6:00 p.m.)