DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY

+ + + + +

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY MAY 8, 2019

+ + + + +

The Board of Commissioners met in Sibley Plaza, 1140 North Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 1:00 p.m., Neil Albert, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF PRESENT:

TYRONE GARRETT, Executive Director ALTHEA MCNAIR, Secretary

COMMISSIONER(S) ABSENT:

KEN GROSSINGER BRIAN KENNER

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

Call to Order and Quorum
Approval of Minutes of April 10, 2019 Board of Commissioners' Meeting5
Executive Director's Report6
Resolutions A. Resolution 19-10
Adjournment

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

1:12 p.m.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Neil Albert. I chair the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority. Can you hear me well?

PARTICIPANT: No.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can you hear me at all?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. I'm going to try and speak into the mike. This is a regular monthly meeting of the Board of Commissioners being held today at Sibley Plaza. It's a little after 1:00. It's 1:10 p.m.

I'm going to remind us to please silence our devices, cell phones, and other devices. And as is our custom, I'm going to ask you to join me observing a moment of silence at this time.

(Moment of silence.)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. I'm going to ask for the Secretary to establish a quorum

for today's meeting.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Grossinger?

(No audible response.)

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Kenner?

(No audible response.)

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal-Jones.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz-Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Here.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner

Vann-Ghasri?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: On her way.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Present.

MS. MCNAIR: You have eight

Commissioners present, you have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. First item on our agenda is approval of the April 10, 2019 minutes of the Board of Commissioners meeting. It's been in your Board packet. I hope you had an opportunity to review it.

And at this time I will entertain a motion to approve the April 10, 2019 Board of Commissioners meeting minutes. Is there a motion?

PARTICIPANT: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: It's motioned. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: All in favor say aye.

(Chorus of aye.)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Any opposed, say no.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. At this

NEAL R. GROSS

time I'm going to turn it over to our executive director for his report.

MR. GARRETT: Commissioners, we're going to get started with the recognition of employees. I just want to say that continue to do the recognition of employees --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You may want to take a mike.

MR. GARRETT: There's a major reason why we do the recognition of employees, at least under this administration. It's because as we transform, as we make changes, there are individuals within our organization that are clearly understanding the direction that we're actually traveling in now, understanding what the purpose is, and understanding why.

And I just want to be able to continue to recognize those individuals as we move forward. If I could recognize everyone at the agency each and every time, I definitely would.

But there's always some individuals on a monthly basis that stand out. And so, I just want

to say it's customary, and I'm pleased to acknowledge that the District of Columbia continues to provide and maintain a high level of outstanding service, or we are striving to improve that service and be exceptional to our customers.

In recognition of that, I have the honor of recognizing an employee who has demonstrated performance in his tenacity, not only to meet the demands of his department, but generally and consistently provides outstanding services to our customers.

Our employee of the month for April 2019 is from Property Management Operations, Mr. Brian McBride.

(Applause.)

MR. GARRETT: So, we need Mr. McBride to come up front, please. Come on, Mr. McBride. Come on. Okay.

Mr. McBride is a valued employee, is committed to achieving the goals and objectives of the Property Management Operations through his professional diligence, demeanor and customer

service delivery in his day-to-day responsibilities.

He provides consistent support and assistance to the housing managers, gathers household information, and generates reports, notifies residents, and assists with the scheduling and coordination of our training programs and PMO.

Mr. McBride's exceptional work performance is merely a representative of his daily philosophy of demonstrating strong work ethics, and commitments and dedication.

Please congratulate -- help me congratulate Mr. McBride -- Brian McBride -- for his ongoing service and delivery to residents.

(Applause.)

MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, sir.

MR. GARRETT: Real briefly, I've had the opportunity to be discussing this with the residents, and also the Commissioners. You know we're still talking about repositioning. We're still talking about the efforts of the Housing

Authority to identify its portfolio.

From that, we've begun our efforts in discussion it with the public, our residents, on Monday. That engagement will continue until some point in time we're able to make a clear presentation to our Board of Commissioners of exactly the sentiments and input from the residents as we continue to move forward.

So, I don't want anyone to think that this is something that we're not serious about. We are very dedicated to our concept of repositioning this authority based on the need, and you can understand and realize that from the Board of Commissioners and from the administration directly, we do care about what's going on.

This is not something that we take lightly. I'm dedicated to this, I'm committed to this, and I just wanted to put that on the record for the public to clearly understand.

The direction that we're traveling is not something that we just want to go through the

motions. This is something that we realize and understand will clearly affect our residents and their families for years to come.

So, again, we're still working on our repositioning effort we're still discussing with the Board. But now, we've actually started our public engagement to deal with residents directly.

So, thank you for the opportunity just to bring you up-to-date on what we're doing there. Okay?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much. So, we're going to go into our resolutions. And then, after that we will have a session open for public comments. A reminder, if you are a public housing resident, you've got five minutes. If you're a non-resident, you get three minutes.

No one signed up to comment on our resolutions, so we'll go straight into our resolutions.

The first resolution is Resolution 19-10, which would authorize the financing activities for Rental Assistance

Demonstration program conversions at Montana Terrace, Elvans Road, the Villager, Lincoln Road, and Ontario Road. And at this time, I'm going to turn it over to our executive director on this team. Come on up.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. Commissioners, we're going to have Alistair Smith come up from OCP to discuss this particular redevelopment project. This is a RAD that we had begun some years ago. It's coming to fruition, and through your support we can finalize the financing plans, submit to HUD, and move forward with this particular initiative.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, Alistair, if I can sort of try and direct your testimony today, so the importance of sort of give us a sense of, to what's RAD, why are we doing it at these properties, and why now, and what's the benefit to both residents and the Housing Authority?

MR. SMITH: Sure. Absolutely. Good afternoon, Commissioners. Again, my name is Alistair Smith. I'm a development manager with the Office of Capital Programs.

So, we are seeking authorization to pursue the Rental Assistance Demonstration program conversion, the RAD conversion, for the five properties that you listed.

We picked these five properties out because they are each relatively small. They're between 13 units on Ontario Road, up to 64 units on Montana Terrace. It makes sense to put them together in one package for RAD transaction.

The benefit of this is -- there's a few things. First, by taking the -- going through the RAD conversion, we can receive funds from HUD into our project-based Section 8 contract.

HUD approves annual inflation increases through this contract. So, over time, over 15, 20 years, we'll be able to benefit from higher annual subsidy to the properties than we would under continuing to operate the properties under the Public Housing Program.

The other benefit is we can access private financing for the properties. We're anticipating we can access about \$8 million in

private debt, another \$12 million or so in private low-income housing tax credit equity.

Using this money, we can complete renovations to the properties. We're looking at completing about \$13 million in renovations to the property.

So, we're looking to get these properties into like 20-year viability, so we don't have to come back every year and continue to do patchwork repairs to the property.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What are some of the improvements that you'll be doing?

MR. SMITH: Sure. So there are some kind of minor improvements, some things we had scheduled, such as roof repairs. We're also of quality-of-life looking to do kind improvements, upgrade the kitchens, the bathrooms, upgrade the HVAC systems, new flooring. You know, really give residents a high-quality and new unit, improvements to the community spaces and the properties, as well.

With this authorization, we would

proceed to submit financing applications to the DC Housing & Finance Agency. This will allow us to access four percent low-income housing tax credit equity. We would move forward to secure debt and equity commitments from private financiers, and we would proceed to HUD to submit a financing plan so that we can continue on the path towards a RAD conversion.

We would come back to the Board of Commissioners in order to obtain final approval, before entering into any financing commitments once we have the final development program and financing plan in place.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, what would be the impact on residents in these various buildings?

MR. SMITH: So, from a physical standpoint during the renovation process, we'll try to minimize any inconveniences to the residents. Residents will remain in place during the renovation through the RAD conversion process.

There'll be another resolution later, but we're seeking to maintain all of the same rights

that the residents have under the Public Housing regime. We're just looking to change the operating subsidy.

The DC Housing Authority will continue to manage these properties. We would also continue through this model to have effective ownership of the property.

So, it is a conversion, but the Housing Authority would continue to have the same effective relationship with the residents as your owner and as your property manager.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And as you renovate units within particular buildings, would you have to move residents from one unit to another? What kind of assistance would you be providing if you need to do so?

MR. SMITH: Sure. So we are finalizing the scope of work for each property. We'll see exactly what the budget is and what the scale of the renovation will be for each property.

We want to do as much as we can possibly afford to get the units in the best condition. We

do anticipate the residents during the time period may have to move out of the units, either during daytime hours for some limited period of time, or possibly move to a currently vacant unit within that property.

But we're not seeking for residents to actually have to move off the property. There will just be temporary moves within the building, or just having to vacate their unit for certain hours during the day.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Additional questions?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: How many public housing in the United States of America has applied for RAD, and what number is --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Could you speak into the mike? Or can you turn her mike on?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: My question to you, and I'm going to do them -- so you can do one quick brief one. One would be how many public housing in the United States of America have applied for RAD? Then, that we're the only

municipal corporation that is not a state applying for RAD, where will that leave us?

How was these units -- how were the communities that were selected, because they're all my constituents?

And the last question that I would ask you investing in that RAD is to put all records -- option of RAD? And I think it's very important to say that RAD is the only thing going now for all public housing in the United States of America. Am I correct?

MR. SMITH: You missed it. I can't say --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: In other words, what I'm telling you is this. The District of Columbia didn't know about RAD. Obviously, all other states in the United States have already applied for this RAD program.

So the District of Columbia is not the first. So if this resolution don't pass, do you get another chance? And how many other public housing -- I mean, how many other housing

authorities have applied for RAD? Or do you know?

And if you applied, can you go online and know what members we are, and how do you find out?

MR. SMITH: Sure. I don't know the exact number of housing authorities that have applied for RAD. I believe there's been about 50,000 units to date that have been converted.

I believe, as you alluded to, there's been housing authorities in each states across the country that have applied for the program. As the name says, it's the Rental Assistance Demonstration program. So this started off as a smaller-scale demonstration program.

HUD, every few years, has raised the cap with Congress's approval of the number of units allowed to be converted through the RAD program. They have recently raised the cap for the number of RAD units that are allowed to be converted again. So we received a couple of awards for RAD at different points.

We've converted two properties we own,

Colorado Apartments and Columbia Road Apartments.

That's a total of 44 units. For those, we did not seek outside financing. Those have been recently renovated. So we just changed the subsidy source for those properties.

There are two other properties,
Fairlawn and Marshall, and Matthews Memorial, that
were private mixed-finance developments. We're
just providing the operating subsidy. So, again,
those just changed the subsidy source.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Last question, real quick. \$25.6 billion backlog. Put that on the record and explain to us what do that mean --

MR. SMITH: So you're alluding, yes, to the backlog of work. So this tool for RAD works well for these properties. You asked for why we selected these?

They need some work, but they don't need to be torn down. They would be difficult to go through disposition process because they wouldn't meet the physical obsolescence test. So, we

recognize there's probably about between \$10 million and \$13 million of work that needs to be done for these properties.

Using RAD and low-income housing tax credit and debt, it works very well for this financing plan to get the renovation work done for these five properties.

So there may be other options, you know, RAD and other options that would work well at some of our properties, and other options that may work better at other properties.

For this specific authorization we're seeking, RAD is the best tool in looking at these properties that we've identified, to get the properties into a 20-year viability, and improve the quality of life for the residents with these sites.

MR. GARRETT: Alistair, could you just explain to the Board or discuss it real briefly, how the FMR increase will allow for additional operating subsidy to continue the viability of the project?

2.1

MR. SMITH: Sure. So --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And tell us what FMR is.

MR. SMITH: Yes, the Fair Market Rent. So HUD added a sweetener to the RAD program in the past year. So they said if you go up -- because folks were kind of doing a mix of disposition activities plus RAD, and doing some creative modeling for projects.

So they said let's make it simpler. If you go out and do substantial renovation to a property, so meaning you're doing renovation work in excess of about 60 percent of the replacement cost of the property, they'll give you a bonus.

You can increase the rents for 25 percent of the units. You can go from just the RAD rent, which is a formula just based on what we're currently receiving in public housing operation funds, to the Fair Market Rent.

So for these units, we can increase, for a quarter of the units, the rents we're receiving from HUD by about \$500 per unit. So that's extra

cash flow that will come to the agency for the next 20 years, at least. That means we can leverage extra funds through debt, through equity, to finance the renovations.

So that really gives us strong incentive that HUD is dangling out there right now with the RAD program, that didn't exist previously.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Why was there no high-rise public housing community selected for RAD, so that being that we already know that all high-rise since 1990 were the first to go down?

And in the District of Columbia, high-rise, traditional conventional public housing are in some of the most wealthiest landmarks in the District, but no high-rise family public housing was considered for RAD. Only the ones that the Board had come up with. Can you explain to us why, for the record?

MR. SMITH: So, we received in 2016 a portfolio award that did include a mix of different properties. Some of them were high-rises.

The challenge with some of the high-rises is they do require a higher level of renovation cost. You need to put in new elevators. There's a higher level of renovation cost which then leads to a financing gap in the pro forma.

So it could be done with RAD, but you may have to identify another, you know, \$10 million, \$15 million, \$20 million for property.

We decided to move forward, yeah, with the five that we have. You know, we've been working through the Board to get buy-in on proceeding with RAD. So, we liked these five properties as a manageable scale of a project.

It doesn't require outside financing going on in applying for additional money. So, we could move forward quickly with these with this authorization. So that's why we selected these.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Being that that is the case, then I want to know why did DCHA selected their team and put them together, and they did go around to some of the high-rise buildings,

attempting and trying very hard to inform residents about RAD? Because in Potomac Gardens Senior -- and put this for the record, please -- you had one resident who actually went to a RAD conference.

And with that RAD conference, she learned a lot about RAD, and she had an interest about RAD due to the fact that they were having RAD discussions in Potomac Gardens Senior Building.

But nor was that building selected for RAD, and I don't know what else happened. So, I'm going to get off by saying this. I really suggested in the District of Columbia, if we're going to do RAD projects, that even with the citywide advisory board — and once again, I caution that we definitely need a resident learning center before residents run for office, whether it's president or commissioner, they seriously understand the policy, because it creates a lot of conflict and division within a culture of a subculture, because public housing communities are a culture.

And then, there's a subculture in the culture, with some more subcultures.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner

Vann-Ghasri, we're going to move on. Commissioner

Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Thanks, I appreciate it. A couple of questions. It looks like that the renovation costs on a per-unit basis is about \$120,000?

MR. SMITH: We're projecting, yeah, a little over \$100,000. It depends on the property. But an average, we're looking at about \$95,000 in hard costs.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Well, that's not the total -- I mean, the total cost. I'm not asking about hard costs.

MR. SMITH: Oh, the total cost?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: Right. So, part of that includes the astral value of the properties.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I backed that out.

MR. SMITH: You backed that -- yeah, so the soft costs I guess would be -- yeah, would be about \$120,000 or so.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Is that a big number? A small number? A number you're going to expect in terms of when you get into our grander portfolio? Where does that fall in the numbers that you're seeing? Portfolio --

MR. SMITH: It's probably on the lower end. You know, these aren't gut renovations. I think for some of the properties, we expect to see numbers -- if we're going to keep the building, you would expect to see numbers on the higher end.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So \$120,000 per unit is a low number.

MR. SMITH: It's a moderate renovation number.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Okay.

MR. SMITH: It's not a gut renovation number. So it's probably on the lower end for a tax credit --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Is there a number where a RAD doesn't make any sense on a per-unit basis or an economic basis? The easiest way to do it is on a per-unit. So if it was \$250,000 per unit, could you make RAD work?

MR. GARRETT: No. No, Commissioner Slover, you could not.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So there's a point to which RAD is not something that can be considered on a condition basis.

MR. GARRETT: Correct. And especially if you have to put in -- this is unique also, Commissioner Slover, because we're not -- because of the permanent debt concept.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Right.

MR. GARRETT: A larger project that would require more renovation or more of a gut rehab probably would not qualify for RAD because if you needed permanent debt, it would go over what HUD perceives as the threshold per unit.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And do you know what that number is?

MR. GARRETT: It's roughly about \$40,000 per unit if you're --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: No, I'm talking about what's the point of no return number. If it's not 120 what is it?

MR. GARRETT: No, I don't have a point-of-no-return number.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: But I do know that you said 250, and I can definitely tell you 250 would be too much.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Right.

So -- because I know that a lot of our properties have existing debt. One of them is -- and these properties have existing debt. So, part of the sources and uses document you guys provided us didn't accommodate for the existing debt. So, how are you going to deal with that?

MR. GARRETT: The existing debt gets rolled into the overall pro forma, and it's covered by that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Explain more

about that. So, we have a portfolio-wide debt. Right?

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, you're just going to then reallocate it to existing properties? That's how you're going to clear the debt?

MR. GARRETT: It's actually -- depending up what the debt actually is. If it's CFFP, it's already been allocated to many of the properties already, based on what that was previously done years ago.

From that, if that debt is still remaining, we would roll that into the actual redevelopment pro forma, and cover it that way, pay it off, and then move forward.

Now, in some instances, the debt may be too large combined with rehabilitation work or scope of work for a particular property. That would limit exactly what we could possibly do in term of financing.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, in the future, it would be great if you guys could sort

of recognize that debt and how you present these to us, so that we know it's being dealt with.

MR. GARRETT: Understood.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: You talk about how DCHS is going to serve as the guarantor, a subsidiary of ours. What is that entity used to be able to provide the guarantee? I mean, what assets does it have and is there a cap to the amount of obligation that an entity can take on?

I'm trying to think about what we have in front of us. And how much debt and obligation can that entity take on?

MR. SMITH: So, the guarantor entity is Capitol Housing Partners. It is a separate subsidiary, so it has a balance sheet of roughly \$3 million in cash for liquid assets. Also, it holds square 737 over in the Arthur Capper development area. That property is valued somewhere between \$40 million and \$50 million. So, that's our kind of large net asset to give us the assets that we need to provide the guarantees.

Things have been very comfortable with

that balance sheet to-date. So, we have used that for the properties. We've been a co-developer over in Capper. We use that as a back staff for Highland and for Parkway Overlook.

So, Highland has completed construction. Parkway Overlook will be complete of construction this summer. So, the significant obligations are on the construction end, where we have to guarantee that. So, by the time we get to closing on this project, we won't have any construction guarantees outstanding.

We will have operating guarantee obligations, but those are much smaller and they do burn off after three or four years, depending on the project.

So, we're okay for now. I think it is a concern as we continue to do more self-development projects, to really take a hard look at that, and banks and equity investors will be taking a hard look at that, as well.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, what I would love to see is some sort of long-range plan

as we -- and I think we should -- continue to try and self-develop and do as much of this stuff as we can.

I would hate to do something unknowingly or unwittingly that prevented us from doing something better and grander in the future. So, I just want to make sure we're keeping our eye on the ball in terms of the obligations and guarantees that we're taking on through these entities, and making sure that we can chop some of the wood that's coming up that's going to be pretty significant.

So, in this resolution you refer to equity financing. I assume you mean tax equity, not traditional equity.

MR. SMITH: Yes. It would be provided through the low-income housing tax credit program.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, in the future when we write these resolutions, could we refer to it as tax equity? Because in the traditional sense, equity means an outside investment. And so, that would be great if we

could do that.

Another question would be, what happens at the end of the RAD obligation, which is either 15 or 20 years, I understand? So, what happens the day after that expiration? And what is it we're doing to make sure that that doesn't affect our residents?

MR. GARRETT: Actually, right now, Commissioner, remember, we'll be entering into a HAP contract, a Housing Assistance Payment contract, on the units, based on the PBB. What happens in today's date and age right now, it's renewed.

At the end of that -- at that time we just go ahead and renew those HAP contracts with the ownership entity. In this particular case, it would be ourselves.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, the RAD contract doesn't expire.

MR. GARRETT: We would come to an end of the HAP period, and the HAP period would be renewed.

MR. SMITH: Right.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: The project-based voucher period would be renewed.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Who's the DC Housing Solution Board, and when will they be presented with this deal?

MR. GARRETT: I'm trying to think of who's on that board.

MR. SMITH: It's all of the Board members.

MR. GARRETT: Yes. It's -- this entity is all of us -- all of the Board members.

MR. KANE: Afternoon, Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What's your name?

MR. KANE: Ed Kane, Deputy General Counsel. The answer to the last question is that the entire Board of Commissioners also serves as the Board of DC Housing Solutions.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And according to the resolution, this will be brought before that entity in some capacity?

MR. SMITH: Yes. So, most likely, it would come forward both to the DC Housing Solutions Board, as well as the DC Housing Authority Board on the way to move forward towards closing for the project. So, we would require authorizations from the DC Housing Solutions Board on behalf of Capitol Housing Partners to provide the guarantees and to enter into the financing contracts.

We would most likely seek authorization from the DC Housing Authority Board, as well, to bless the project and go forward to closing for the RAD conversion.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: On page 6 -- or on the second page of the resolution, bullet number 4, you refer to development or owner entity as required to facilitate the financing of the project. Isn't that us?

MR. SMITH: So, we are acting as the developer. So, we will require, as part of the RAD conversion process, to actually convey the property for fee simple or ground lease to a different entity.

That entity will be created as a subsidiary of Capitol Housing Partners. So we will -- that will be one of the authorizations we seek closer to closing so you could actually create that entity, and then to approve a conveyance, convey those five properties to the new owner entity. And we will be -- our subsidiary will be the managing general partner of that entity.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So I would like to clarify that, because one of the biggest concerns people have about RAD is this notion that it's privatization, and that somehow some other entity private owner is going to own these buildings, and when you leave hanging things like, such development or owner entity as required, you open that door.

And so, for me, if we can make this very crystal clear that this process is not that, it would be really helpful in terms of how we present these things and how people look at them. Does that make sense?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, that makes sense.

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

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: One last question.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner, can you hold on a second?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: There are others that would like to ask questions.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I thought he was finished.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: How does this action -- so, we've all read about our big issues and our repositioning, and also -- talk about how this fits in to the overall repositioning plan. I think you may have hit on it a little bit earlier, but -- because this is -- can you just talk about that for a second?

This is not part of the distressed units. This is not part of -- where does this fall in the category of unit condition?

MR. SMITH: Why don't you take that?

MR. GARRETT: Commissioners, this is -- and Commissioner Slover, as Alistair pointed

out, this would be on the low end, in terms of rehabilitation of our actual units based on what we've seen in our portfolio.

So, these wouldn't be considered extremely urgent units. As we've been talking about and discussing over the last three to four months, this is another set of units that we were previously looking at a conversion.

So, when you talk about the overall repositioning of the Authority, this falls outside of that. In terms of our overall number of units in our portfolio, yes, it's very important that these units reach 20-year viability.

But they're not the extreme units that we've been talking about within repositioning, and we'll continue to talk about as we move forward.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And so, I just hope that whatever actions we take do not preclude us from managing and dealing with the ones that really need assistance, which is why I'm so focused on the guarantor.

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And I'm going to make one attempt to try to clean up something that's always bothered me on this board. It's this be-it-further-resolved section of these resolutions.

Can we strike such-action and put above-action there, and strike all-such and just put required? Because it might seem nit-picky, but these resolutions tend to provide a wide opportunity to not come back to the Board for things. And so, I'm going to make that request.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Consider it done.

Commissioner St. Jean?

we going to educate and train our residents to make sure the properties stay upkeep with all the renovations that you're doing? So, how are we going to train or educate our residents to make sure that they upkeep?

MR. GARRETT: We're going to be doing the human capital piece, Commissioner St. Jean.

And that human capital piece also does engage the

residents as to what their needs might be, how to encourage them to perform, and by various policies that we may have.

But it also includes having the Housing Authority itself, because we are going to be managing the property directly, that we're ready and prepared to do the same. Resident can't receive guidance from a team that isn't ready.

So, over the next 12 months we're going to be gearing up and ready and prepared to go out and change our protocols in dealing with residents in how our properties are actually managed on a day-to-day basis.

So, an example might be our managers -- as I've said, our managers going out and inspecting properties twice a year, versus just coming out once. It could be just that simple.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, any other questions from any other Commissioners before we go back to Aquarius for a last question?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Last question. Most important question for the units.

Okay, being that there are all --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Could you speak into the mike?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. Being that this impacts my constituents, number one, how many of Ward 5, 8, 7, 5, and 2, because that's all the wards that -- what the communities are, employment, I am highly recommending and demanding that in each one of these wards, that the residents that live in public housing will be the first one hired to work on the renovations.

Being that we now have a Southwest Family Enhancement Center with an apprenticeship program, I don't want to just hear about the apprenticeship program because they may not live -- they may not live in this ward.

I can already tell you that the Villager does have a DCHA employee living there, which is good. And she came out of that apprentice program.

But when you come to the rest of my constituents, I'm highly demanding, with respect, that my constituents are given the first right of

employment in each one of these wards.

Now, if -- here is a hypothetical. You're doing Lincoln Heights up the street. Lincoln Heights may not have a carpenter, etc. at all, but you have a lot of unemployed seniors who some of them do have updated certification.

And this is a way for us to have pride. So I'm telling you, make sure DCHE is involved, and that we also have residents on the lease working, employed, making \$15 an hour, and that they cannot give any Davis-Bacon Act -- they'll receive something, medical or something, an extra what we would call the incentive.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you, Commissioner. So at this time I will entertain a motion to approve resolution 19-10. Is there a motion?

PARTICIPANT: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: It's motioned. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Second. Can I have

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

a roll call vote?

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you.

Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: No.

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: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: We have eight yes, one no,

NEAL R. GROSS

the resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great, thank you. You guys may want to stay there. We have tons of questions for you on the next resolution.

So, Resolution 19-11, this is a resolution that we talked about last Board meeting. It's there again on the agenda, this time with an amendment to approve the removing of mixed finance amendment to the annual allocation contract and authorize the execution of other related documents for Capper Square 769N, also known as the Harlow. Welcome, Carrie.

MS. SMYZER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, what are you doing today that's different from what you did last month? And what's the -- I got a witness over there.

Before we break out into church, if you can just answer that portion, and then, I have additional questions.

MS. SMYZER: Okay. Good afternoon, Commissioners. So, what we are proposing to do,

what's different from what I suggested last month, is to remove the ACC, or the Annual Contributions Contract, which is the document or vehicle that provides the public housing subsidy.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, remind people what it is that we were trying to do last month.

MS. SMYZER: So, last time, what we were doing was, we were going to remove the ACC, and then we were going to add five project-based vouchers.

So, we're not asking for vouchers this time. We're just asking to remove the ACC. And then, we'll just accept the tenant rent and the units will still be operated like public housing, but we won't accept any subsidy.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, is there a financial gap that the Housing Authority will have to close now and/or in the future?

MS. SMYZER: No.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: How could you be that confident?

MS. SMYZER: Because it's in

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

documents. We've negotiated that point and we have the same terms in the Bixby, which was developed prior to Harlow, which says that the market component will subsidize any deficiencies in the affordable component.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, how do we hold our partners -- and our partners being you and your co-development partners -- to that?

MS. SMYZER: So, the Housing Authority, one, through asset management, reviewing the budget, and being very involved in the overall management of the building.

At the Bixby, we've been very involved in making sure that everything is run properly. We review the budget, we review who's living in the units, and, in fact, we even had to replace the manager.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Thank you.

Questions from Commissioners? Commissioner

Slover, let's start with you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So how long is the affordability required for the 36 units?

MS. SMYZER: So it'll still be required for the 55-plus years. And then the affordability covenant that's placed on the units because of the Housing Production Trust Fund is for 40 years. That's the local money.

And then the low-income housing tax credits is anywhere from 15 to 30 years.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, the enforcement mechanism, lack of a subsidy, is through the other source of revenue.

MS. SMYZER: You have that and you also have the regulatory and operating agreement, which that's the 55 years. And that's a recorded document. That's the HUD document.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, getting to one of the questions that Chairman Albert asked, should there be a shortfall out of cash flow from the market side, how will that be borne by the partnership?

MS. SMYZER: Then, we'd have a capital call from the partnership.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And it would

be --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What proportion?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: -- how would it

be shared?

MS. SMYZER: Fifty percent from both sides.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, that's somewhere in writing, 50-50?

MS. SMYZER: Yes it is.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Now, these are replacement units for Arthur Capper residents.

MS. SMYZER: That's correct.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: How -- under this new structure, how do we -- is it the same in terms of how we ensure that the units are occupied --

MS. SMYZER: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: -- by former Arthur Capper residents?

MS. SMYZER: Yes, we're still using the reentry criteria that was negotiated back in 2003 with the residents.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, these questions might seem simple to you, but to me, you know, when the subsidy goes away, I want to make sure that none of the other things go away. And so, I just -- I apologize if you find these questions simple, but I think I need to know, making sure that nothing else changed.

MS. SMYZER: Well, actually, we've been going through the process. We've been working with our residents for over six months now, almost eight months now, to prepare them to go into the Harlow. So we've been working with the Capper residents, the former Capper residents.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I get that.

But what I'm saying is --

MS. SMYZER: So what I'm saying to you is there is a priority in the reentry criteria. And the first priority is for the heads of household.

And then, there's -- and it goes through like four or five preferences, and it's mainly the residents of Capper/Carrollsburg. So

those are the residents that we reach out to first and those are the residents that we have been working with for some time.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So none of that is dependent upon the subsidy. That's --

MS. SMYZER: No.

 $\label{thman} \mbox{ VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: } \mbox{ That's a simple } \\ \mbox{ question I'm asking.}$

MS. SMYZER: No, none of that is dependent on the subsidy.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: When you changed that there's no subsidy, I'm making sure that there's some enforcement mechanism to fulfill our obligations to the tenants of Arthur Capper.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Ed, do you want to answer?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, the answer is no.

MS. SMYZER: No. No, that's not the answer. The answer is that we still are -- so, the enforcement mechanism is in the Regulatory and Operating Agreement that I mentioned to you

earlier.

So, we have two documents that talk about how we bring residents back to the site. The reentry criteria is a document that gets negotiated with the residents prior to people moving off the site.

Then, at the time of the closing or prior to the closing, we negotiate a document with a developer in HUD called a regulatory and operating agreement.

And that talks about how the property gets operated. And it also speaks to how residents come back. That document gets recorded, and it also is signed by HUD. So, that's a regulatory document that has HUD and it encumbers the land.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, these are deed restrictions that HUD put on and cannot be taken off by the Board.

MS. SMYZER: That's right.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, they're different than that 30 -- the other unit in this footprint where we removed the 30 in the

covenant --

MS. SMYZER: Yes, that's different.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: -- This is a different mechanism.

MS. SMYZER: That's different, because Square 737 was not owned by the Housing Authority. That was a square that was owned by William C. Smith --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Well, it was once owned by the Housing Authority. We contributed \$17,000 --

MS. SMYZER: A portion. We were contributing a portion --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Yeah.

MS. SMYZER: -- of the land. But that was a building that they were going to own and operate. And then, we were going to provide subsidies so that they could --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: But when we transferred --

MS. SMYZER: -- have 30 units.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: When we

NEAL R. GROSS

transferred the land, we didn't have a covenant on it?

MS. SMYZER: No.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I know

Commissioner St. Jean and Mr. Strickland --

MS. MCNAIR: Strickland was in first.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Strickland first?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: I just have one question. How come this course of action wasn't presented to us simultaneously as a previous course of action?

Because you kind of made us decide to give vouchers or not give vouchers. But it seemed like this is to be a better option going down this path. How come both paths were not presented simultaneously?

MS. SMYZER: Yeah. At the time when we presented the previous course of action, mainly because we had worked with our lawyers, one being HUD lawyers, it had suggested the previous action. And so, that was the course that we were following.

And then, when we went back and thought

about it a little bit more, we thought, we'll just -- we'll take this course of action.

add, Commissioner, I think the Commissioners should be commended for pushing the staff to go back to look at alternatives in actually making the deal work better for public housing residents. Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes. As a housing choice voucher commissioner, I did say no last month to this resolution because we were using the PPV voucher for operation budget.

So, that being said, the vouchers will be getting received. So like, if my participant has a voucher, they will be -- they could go there?

MS. SMYZER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Okay. And then, the other question, do you have residents and participants ready to be moved there?

MS. SMYZER: We do have some residents, yes, that have been approved to move into the building.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Thank you.

Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: My question with -- I know that there was a targeted group of people who had received letters and they have already gone to Harlow.

How was that targeted group selected, and then whether or not they already have a resident council in place, whether or not my constituents will lose all of their public housing and Indian rights, or -- they're already going to lose some if you already have an association in place.

In that case, how are we going to tweak out different from what we hear from the big suite, so we won't have those same issues at the Harlow?

MS. SMYZER: So, they're not going to lose their rights. So, remember we said we're going to operate --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So, they're going to have the right for CSC?

MS. SMYZER: Let me finish. Let me finish. So, remember, this is Hope 6 and it's

mixed income. Okay. So, we don't have the traditional resident council.

The residents do have a right to start their own association if they would like to. They have not started one yet, but that was something that we had started talking with residents about.

We need to probably pick up that conversation again.

Now, if you pick up this conversation, whether or not residents will be informed that they have the right road -- public housing residents, if they form this group, whether or not they would have the right to be the agent, the president, the agent of the CSC dollars. Whether or not they would have the right to apply for a resident participation grant based on the poor units of where they're residing at? Yes or no?

MS. SMYZER: I can't answer the question regarding the grants.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Did you also look in place with children in their computer

room? As we've heard in the previous with Bixby, there's a lot of problems there. Did we tweak those problems?

MS. SMYZER: Mm-hmm. Yes. So that was part of the change in management. And so we have a different manager at Harlow. It's Vantage. They're the Bixby now. And so everyone, all 179 units, have access to all of the amenities in the building.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Last question. How many two-bedrooms, how many one-bedrooms, and are there any three-bedrooms?

Or is it just one- and two-bedrooms?

MS. SMYZER: They're all ones and twos. And in the 36 they're split. So, half are ones and half are twos.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So, now here's my question, because this is where I'm confused. If you're already doing relocation for a Hope VI that is over 15 years or more old, now half of those people that once in Capper, are already been relocated. And can you find all of

them, or whether or not their 18-year-old child -- who was not 18 years old at that time, however, they were legally on their public lease -- how are you tracking them? Because they too have the right to return, especially anybody that was on that lease that was 18 years and over. And I'm not talking about head of household. So, are you going to that length to relocate?

MS. SMYZER: So, what we're doing is, first we reach out to the head of household. And so, we had the Software Tracking at a Glance that we used for our Community in Support of Services program for Capper. And we also track them -- if they're in either public housing or in the voucher program, we track them through our software through the Housing Authority.

So, we do reach out to the head of household first because they have the first preference. If that head of household says, you know what, I'm good where I am, I don't want to move back to the site, then some of them will say, I'm going to give my right to my daughter or to my son.

That has happened. And so, we will allow that to happen.

But we also let that head of household know that when we have another property come up, that they won't have that right to come back again. So, we have to let them know that they won't have a right to come back.

So, we always let them know that if they give up that right to their family member, that that's how it goes.

Now, we do have some family members that we've had to go -- because they're a priority 2, we've had to go to priority 2 and go to them. And then, they -- some of them have come back. We had a great deal of family members that came back to the townhomes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you.

Commissioner Neal-Jones, did you have a question?

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: I just had a follow-up to Commissioner St. James's questions about the PPVs. Can you tell us a little bit about where that funding comes from and how it works out

that it can be a part of this project?

MS. SMYZER: I'm not using project-based vouchers.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Oh, I thought --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay, final question for Ms. Smyzer.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: I'm sorry, but can you answer that? Is that also a federal subsidy? So, what about --

MS. SMYZER: It is a federal subsidy. It comes through the housing choice voucher program. So, it's just -- I mean, it's the housing choice voucher -- I mean, it's a voucher that then has a housing assistance payment contract.

And the voucher is actually tied to the project or to the unit. It's not a voucher that a tenant has and can take to various properties.

COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: So, I thought that initially the challenge that we had was there were federal subsidies involved, and

because of the federal subsidies involved, that would activate some additional requirements and cost for us.

And so I'm just trying to understand, you know, initially we don't have that. But what Commissioner St. Jean asked was can someone with a voucher come into the building at a later date.

And what I'm trying to understand is how that's allowable. I don't follow that.

MS. SMYZER: If they have a -- I can't deny someone who has a tenant that -- if they have a tenant voucher, I can't deny them or turn them away because of that voucher. So, they can use that. That doesn't trigger Davis-Bacon.

MR. GARRETT: Commissioner Neal-Jones, what triggers Davis-Bacon in this particular case would be utilization of federal funding or a subsidy in the construction performer that actually creates or builds the project itself.

A resident having its project -- not project, but a tenant-based voucher moving in does not trigger. The building's already been

constructed, pro forma's already been settled, and the building's been closed on.

So that doesn't actually impact actual construction or trigger Davis-Bacon. So, the tenant-based voucher doesn't trigger Davis-Bacon. The subsidy going towards construction or operating would.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner Stover, you've got the final question.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Did we ever resolve the cash flow issue and how that was being booked pre-liquidity event over that seven-year period?

At one point it seemed like the partners were booking that money differently. And then, at the end when there was a proceeds over the land, that it was not going to be the full value of the land, that it was going to be less. So, did we resolve that?

MS. SMYZER: No, we did not. I mean, we still are booking it. So, we would get our full \$8 million at the end.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Well, last time we talked it was \$6 million. So --

MS. SMYZER: No, it's \$8 million. So, remember, we get the \$2 million through cash flow. And then, it's the \$6 million that we get in year 7.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Right. So, the project makes no money for the first six years.

MS. SMYZER: No, that's not --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: We're getting our land money.

MS. SMYZER: No, that's not true. We get -- our portion of the cash flow goes towards our land value.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And what is our partners' cash flow? What happens to that?

MS. SMYZER: It goes towards their -they get \$2 million of land value and it goes -- and
their portion of the cash flow goes towards land
value, as well.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, when we realize our \$6 million, they get zero. Right?

MS. SMYZER: That's right.

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Okay. Because that's not the way it was last time. The way it was --

MS. SMYZER: Well, I corrected it at the Board meeting.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: We can go back and look at the minutes. But I just want to get it affirmed that we are now on equal footing.

MS. SMYZER: Yes, we are.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And so, that we're both basically getting paid for our land -- well, it's our land -- along the way.

MS. SMYZER: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And at the end, that's going to be credited towards the land. So what happens to the other \$4 million?

MS. SMYZER: It's only \$10 million.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well, you just --

MS. SMYZER: So, we get eight -- yeah, see, we get --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Or you're going to get a -- you're going to get a credit at the

liquidity for \$10 million. Right? For the land.

 $\mbox{MS. SMYZER:} \quad \mbox{Remember, we get eight and} \\ \mbox{they get two.} \\$

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: We get six and they get zero. We got two along the way. We got paid out of proceeds --

MS. SMYZER: And then, we get six that we finance.

 $\label{eq:VICE-CHAIRMAN} \mbox{ SLOVER: } \mbox{ Well, what} \\ \mbox{ happens to the --}$

MS. SMYZER: They get two -- they're booking the \$2 million along the first six years when the --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Right. So, when there's this event, there's \$10 million attributed to the land. Right? So, when there's this capital event, right? There's \$10 million that says, well, you get this money and ten of it's for the land. And we got to pay off the land note. Right.

MS. SMYZER: There will be a balance of \$6 million that comes to the Authority.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You're getting the math confused.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: No, I'm not getting the math confused. There's -- we're not --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: We're making no money. We already had \$10 million when we started. There was \$10 million of land value day 1.

MS. SMYZER: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And on day 6, on year 6, we each got paid \$2 million along the way.

MS. SMYZER: Right.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: The land is still worth \$10 million.

MS. SMYZER: Yes --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Right. So --

MS. SMYZER: -- but \$4 million has been paid out over the --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And so the project didn't make any money.

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

MS. SMYZER: It -- okay. Whatever.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: It doesn't add up. If there was \$10 million of land value on day 1, and when I get paid for my land I only get -- there's only \$6 million, \$4 million's gone. Now, you understand, I got paid the \$4 million along the way, but that was out of profits from the project.

So the project made no money for the first six years. How is that not accurate?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So let me see if there's any other --

MS. SMYZER: This is not looking -CHAIRMAN ALBERT: -- any other
questions.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Neil, you do this all the time, Neil. You sort of like -- you cut me off, and I --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner, we've got six other resolutions.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I'll have to vote no because I can't get answers.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: She's answered the questions to the best of her ability. So any questions from any other Commissioners? I'd like to entertain a motion to approve Resolution 19-12. Is there a motion?

MR. GARRETT: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So moved. Is there

a second?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can I have a roll call?

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz-Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: No.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner

Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: No.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have seven yes, three no, the resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Let's move on to Resolution 19-12. Thank you, staff.

MS. MCNAIR: I'm sorry, one correction. That's six yes, three no; the resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay, great. Thank you, Carrie. Ed, you don't have to come back. Trust me on that one.

Resolution 19-12, which will adopt the final regulations to amend the ACVP limited local preferences for public housing tenants in units

with emergency conditions. Director?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, Commissioners. This is the final adoption of what we have previously published to the public to deal with our environmental issue that we brought to your attention a few months ago.

This was an effort for the Housing Authority to be able to relocate quickly residents who might be living in substandard conditions that had an environmental impact. So, Andrea will be able to discuss further.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Do you have anything else you want to add to this? I know you gave us a really great briefing. I'd prefer to have Commissioners ask questions on the record, if you prefer that.

MS. POWELL: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So let's start in a different order, not Slover, not Vann-Ghasri. Any other Commissioners have questions on this resolution? If not, then let's go to -- any Commissioners have any questions? Vann-Ghasri,

you can't make me a liar now. You got to have a question.

Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Does this have any impact on the housing choice voucher program writ large by basically creating a super preference?

MS. In POWELL: order to house -- Andrea Powell from the Office of General In order to house families that are in Counsel. public housing where there's a need for emergency, this does create a special preference so that the families that we need to move where there's no other public housing unit available, or a unit that's in a RAD unit, it does give the Housing Authority an option to provide these units to public housing, rather than going first to the waiting list.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, it puts them in -- it's a tough decision. I'm not -- MS. POWELL: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: -- suggesting

it's not. So, it basically will ultimately reduce the number of new people we can bring on into the system as we work through these issues.

MS. POWELL: Sure. And as of right now, what was approved for these environmental conditions was 272. So, there's a limit right now on how that can be used, that you all approved. So, that's in the resolution from September.

And so, until -- so, yes, there is an impact, but it's limited.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: It's limited to those 272?

MS. POWELL: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Why would we not -- since these folks are coming out of our traditional public housing, why would we not be applying for tenant protection vouchers?

MS. POWELL: So, we would like to do that. So, as we move forward with you all through the portfolio stabilization effort, we first have to do Section 18 demolition disposition applications.

So, to the extent that's the direction in which, from your, you know, the direction of the Board, and with the public engagement that we do, it's recommended and approved that we do dispositions. We will definitely apply for those tenant protection vouchers.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, without that, you can't --

MR. GARRETT: Correct.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: -- that's the mechanism to apply for tenant protection vouchers?

MS. POWELL: Yes.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, unless it's a disaster. A natural disaster, we give the authority to offer vouchers to us, but we don't quality for that. So, the only way for us to receive tenant protection vouchers would be a demolition disposition, a Section 18 conversion.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, in looking at the resolution, I did see the 272. I thought we had already approved that for this particular use. I thought that this resolution was to go

beyond the 272 and to --

MS. POWELL: It doesn't add any additional vouchers. What it does is it lets us continue to use that special preference that you described --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Right.

MS. POWELL: -- for the same 272. We haven't used all of them yet because we're using the sparingly for the environmental conditions. So it just puts in place -- the regs before were proposed in emergency. This just makes the regulation --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: -- making permanent that other action. Okay.

MS. POWELL: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner

Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: No.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Any questions on the reg? So, why don't we do --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes, I do.
I have a question.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So, how is this going to impact, or whether or not it will impact, my constituents who are already on an emergency transfer, and probably been on one for five or six years and haven't gotten transferred yet.

And some of those people had domestic violence, a lot of homicides, through all of our properties, including the senior properties, because they too have life-threatening situations.

So the question is if we pass this resolution, are you going to go back, or are you going to leave them back, and you're only going to go forward to, after this resolution is passed and we ever become -- have a transfer based on the subject matter, they will get the transfers and we'll never look back. How is it going to work with this selection pool?

MR. GARRETT: No, we're still going

back, Commissioners. We're not leaving anyone behind. realize is --We that this Commissioner Slover said, it's a tough decision that we have to make. So, we have -- we've been discussing actually it this week about exactly -- of how we're going to move forward with residents who are in other situations that need an emergency move of some type, whether it be a public safety transfer, or an environmental move.

think that's a great idea. And once we pass this resolution on a committee level, every three months there should be a report on how many -- and that goes for every property -- and there should be a report letting us know exclusively -- not the name of the individual, but we want to know the property they were on, where they go, and then the subject of the emergency. Because that will run a trend.

And that go for all of the properties, seniors and families. And even HCVP, because I don't know, you may be the -- whatever. But that should be something given to us at least every three

months. And maybe operations.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can I entertain a

motion to adopt Resolution 19-12? Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Second.

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, roll call.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Ortiz-Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: 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

NEAL R. GROSS

Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: We have nine yes, the resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Don't go anywhere. Resolution 19-13, which will adopt final regulations to amend the HCVP limited local preferences to provide project-based units as a housing option. Do you want to --

MS. POWELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah.

MS. POWELL: Similar to the previous resolution, we created another local preference to use vacancies in project-based units. So, the Housing Authority has project-based contracts with owners where, as we were describing earlier in RAD,

there'll be a contract for ten or 15 years with an owner.

When there's a vacancy in that unit, we've created a preference that would allow us to place as a housing option a public housing resident in a unit that's a project-based unit.

And so, it gives us more options when there's another need for an emergency. It gives us other options other than those 272, which are scarce, to place a person in a project-based unit.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. I don't know that there'll be any questions on this but I will entertain a motion to approve this resolution. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Roll call.

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Slover?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz-Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have nine yes. The resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. Are you going

to do this one too?

MS. MCNAIR: What's the next one?

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Resolution 19-14, which would adopt final regulations to amend -
MR. GARRETT: No, that's Kim Cole.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: -- regulations implementing HUD requirements regarding over-income households. Kim. So, just briefly, what would this resolution do? Let me ask Vann-Ghasri's question. How would it impact her residence?

(Laughter.)

MS. COLE: Brief description and I'll go straight into that.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah. I didn't mean to put you on blast, Aquarius. Sorry.

MS. COLE: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. My name is Kim Cole. I'm the
Director of Policy and Strategic Initiatives at the
Housing Authority.

So, the resolution that you have before you right now is a request to publish as final regulations governing a new HUD requirement that establishes an over-income limit for public

housing residents.

Just want to point out for the Commissioners and the public that this is the first time that HUD has passed something like that. It originally appeared as part of legislation called HOTMA, which stands for Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act. This is one of the requirements under that.

The specific requirement is that public housing households with adjusted income that exceeds 120 percent of the area median income, specifically, 120 percent of 50 percent of the area median income are considered over-income.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What's that raw number?

MS. COLE: I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What's that raw number? Rather than percentages, what's the dollar amount?

MS. COLE: Sure. So, the span for the income range is \$102,000 a year to \$307,000 a year. And that depends on the size of the householder.

And to go a little bit further with that in terms of the impact, currently the average household income of our public housing residents is \$14,000 a year.

We did an assessment most recently and identified only six households that would be impacted by this.

To add to this in terms of how we would implement it and how HUD's requiring it, households would have to be in an over-income status for two consecutive years before they would be asked to pay an increased rent. The initial look at the household --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You said only
14 households will be impacted by this?

MS. COLE: Six.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Six.

MS. COLE: Right now, six. Yes, sir. And for some detail on that, those adjusted incomes for those households range from \$118,000 a year to \$137,000 a year.

So, in terms of implementing it, the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

process would go, we would do an initial look at our entire portfolio to see if folks had been over-income for a year. We would notify them, let them know. We would continue to look at the following year.

If incomes stayed at over 120 percent for that household for that second year, there would be a six-month grace period for households to transition into a higher rent.

We, given the time frame that HUD has given, the two years, we plan on working with those households to provide them with resources in terms of moving them towards self-sufficiency of the rental options, if possible.

That includes connecting them with organizations affiliated with the DHCD for home ownership. We're also looking at expanding our family self-sufficiency program for public housing residents. And you may see that shortly, as we go through our NTW planning process.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, my question is, why would it take this resolution for the housing

authority to work with those six families towards home ownership or some other form of self-sufficiency?

MS. COLE: That's an excellent question. It should not take this resolution for that to happen. One thing that I know that our Office of Resident Services is looking at is do an annual look at income ranges for households, to make those kinds of decisions to make things open to folks who would fall in that range.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. I'm sure we have tons of questions on this. So let's go -- any questions, in addition to the questions that I've had?

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI:} \quad \mbox{I do have a} \\ \mbox{question.}$

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Vann-Ghasri asked you a question already, so you can't --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I just wanted to know -- you answer that one. I got -- you answered that one, but this one needs to be in the minutes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: First and foremost, although it impacts my constituents, and being that many of them fits in that category, whether or not they will be given the opportunity to be a first time home buyer on the DCHA plan, or be able to have a referral plan that they go to the mayor part, to -- and somehow or another, it's called passport. Due to the fact that they are the role models for many families in traditional, conventional public housing, I highly recommend that that is a component that will be worked on, because it's not like he got 50 families.

So those families that you have, they have to make the choice whether or not they want to be home buyers. And then our job is to find them the lender. They already have some money and just find -- and let them buy a house.

MS. COLE: So we would be working to assist families. These families.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And so we're going to encourage, educate, and inform --

MS. COLE: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: -- home purchasing in the District of Columbia, whether it's DCHA or under the Mayor. But we're going to look to find these families who want to -- and own a home, we're going to do that. Correct?

MS. COLE: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner

St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: So through the FSS, they have financial literacy, counseling with their credit scores and everything.

MS. COLE: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So what I'd love, and you don't have to do it today, but maybe by our next Board of Commissioners meeting, if you have a plan and strategy for really working with these six families with timelines and goals for getting folks into home ownership, the DC Government has tons of programs available.

The Mayor's going to increase, or has a production trust fund budget to \$130 million next year, with \$20 million of that carved out for work force housing, which is something we hear about views need for in the city all the time.

So, there should be no excuses. So, we'd love to see a plan to work on that.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: So, we do have a plan, Carolyn Hunter and I, for June 22nd. We are having home ownership symposium and we are inviting those families, because the Path to Home Ownership is just an education symposium.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I think you need to say that again. No, I'm serious, because they got to pick it up on the minutes.

Carolyn Hunter and I are organizing a home ownership symposium. Those six families are invited to the home ownership symposium. It's just an education symposium to talk about the other avenues and pathway to home ownership.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Can I ask a quick question on this?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Does this symposium on the 22nd, does it involve pathways that don't involve subsidies? Because if --

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes, sir.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: -- the people are out of a subsidy, then we need to find a different solution for them. So, what we don't want to have here is some perverse incentive to not make money, right?

So, it's a really delicate situation here that I think really needs some thoughtful attention and it sounds like we're doing that. And so, I'd love, as Neal said, to see some sort of plan that, hopefully this problem will continue, and that we can be really prepared to help counsel people into a different situation, because that also frees up space for us to house more people.

And so, that's a win-win. And so, maybe we can take this moment and build upon it and

create a program around this. That will be something great to see. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And then, before we call a motion, I just want to do a whole commercial. So, we as the Board have agreed that we will form a committee to just focus on the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

A number of residents participate in this program. We think it needs more attention and focus. I had a wonderful meeting with Deborah Frazier this week. Deborah, don't hide to the left.

But -- so truly, we just really educated us on some of the issues facing that community, although the voice doesn't get as heard as it should. And so, Commissioner St. Jean will be chairing that committee. We'll make announcements as to meetings, but we invite everyone who is a voucher recipient to participate. And with that, I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?

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

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Roll call?

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. 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: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz-Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. MCNAIR: The resolution has nine yes. It is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you.

Resolution 19-15, which would adopt final regulations to amend regulations for the Rental Assistance Demonstration program.

MR. KANE: It's Ed Kane.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Ed? Mr. Kane? So, Mr. Kane, can you give us the high-level?

MR. KANE: Good afternoon again, Commissioners. Resolution 19-15 is to publish as final amendments to the regulations supporting the Authority's Rental Assistance Demonstration Program.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can you put the mike closer.

MR. KANE: Sorry. These are amendments to the existing regulations which you all have adopted supporting the operation of the Authority's Rental Assistance Demonstration Program, RAD.

So, I think you probably covered as much

RAD detail as you need today in your discussions with Alistair Smith earlier on the project.

These regulations, I will just say, are continuing effort of the Authority to make the transition of life from traditional public housing into RAD properties as seamless as possible, to preserve as many of the protections and rights as exist under public housing in the converted properties as would be possible.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What kind of input did you get, and from where, on finalizing these regulations?

MR. KANE: So, when we published the initial publication of the regulations, and frankly, even before that, we had a couple of consultations with the legal service providers, advocates.

In addition, just as a part of the process of publishing the regs in the District, they are out for public comment for a period of 30 days. That happened with both the original set, as well as with these most recent.

But we have had a series of conversations, probably about a handful, with various advocates about the different iterations of these regulations, going back to 2016-17.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, if we adopt this resolution today, does this mean that you can go out and find a property to convert to RAD?

MR. KANE: It does not -- this is not an authorization to do anything other than to publish as final the last set of amendments. So, we're cleaning up things, addressing some open issues, in the resolutions that exist.

It's not an authorization with respect to any particular RAD project or property, all of which is covered in your other actions.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, what if the staff decides that there is a property that's eligible for RAD conversion? What steps would you have to take to get that approved?

MR. KANE: So, from a dead stop, to convert a RAD property, the process of the application to HUD is multi-stepped.

It would involve, among other things, environmental review of the property, consultation with the residents of the property, consultation with the District, typically in the form of the Office of the Mayor consultation.

And, in addition to that, that whole process would have to come back to this Board. So, the --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Where is resident and community engagement in that process?

MR. KANE: So, there's at least one, and probably two or three, meetings that are mandatory under the application process with the residents of the affected properties.

So, typically, what that has meant is that everybody who's in the amp of a property where we are attempting to do a RAD application, has been consulted on at least one, probably two or three, occasions, both before conversion, and then -- both before the application, and then, as we get closer to conversion.

And, just as a note, there are two

properties that are converted already.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. And then, what do you envision the role of the Board moving forward?

MR. KANE: Well, in terms of rolling out more RAD program, the Board is the policymaking body of the Authority, and setting the vision for whether it's repositioning properties, or other conversions of properties, would be something that, certainly at the top line the expectation would be the Board would be the body to make those determinations.

Then, with respect to specific applications to do RAD, that would come to the Board. Certain financing decisions would also come back to the Board.

So it really is a sort of moving, iterative process where Board oversight and leadership plays a part at various points.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great.

MR. GARRETT: Can I have something clarified? Ed, just for the clarification for the

Board, would we be applying these regulations to the Montana Five RAD transaction that we just --

MR. KANE: So there are -- yes. I mean, there are existing regs that are already applicable to anything we do in RAD. These amendment would apply to those regs, and yes, they would apply to that, as well.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Thank you.

I'm going to open up for questions. Commissioner

Slover.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I think we covered most of that resolution. Thank you for the presentation. Also, I just wanted to put on the record and say thank you for engaging the advocate community on this. I know they appreciate it.

I'm sure not everybody's happy with where we are at the moment, but it's I'm sure an improvement in their mind from where we were. So, thank you for engaging.

And I hope you'll be open as this process evolves, to further conversations with them. I think it would go a long way towards, you

know, bridging what we'll call the trust gap, and
so, I appreciate the effort.

MR. KANE: For the record, it is an ongoing conversation. We're planning our next meeting probably before the end of May. And I think we recognize the importance of this conversation in light of the decision making that you all have to do with respect to the portfolio.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And I just want to echo Commissioner Slover in relation to engagement with advocacy and resident community, not only the RAD, but as we consider our options for repositioning for renovating our properties. This Board is going to look to the community for guidance on how to act.

And so, you are our representatives in the community. And so, we expect that you'd have robust conversations with folks who are going to be impacted, before we make any decisions. So, additional questions for Ed. Commissioner Vann-Ghasri.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I just want

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

this question for the minutes, because this is something we have not discussed. With RAD, the residents do have the right to sue in court the landlord for whatever reasons, housing code violations. Correct? Whether the landlord is DCHA or -- well, DCHA going to be landlord for RADs.

MR. KANE: RAD will not have any impact on any legal rights of any resident in a RAD property, just like they were when they were in public housing, or whether --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No, no, no.

You can't use public housing for an example,
because public housing enforcement is not
educating the public housing resident with housing
code violations, to go to court and pay their money
into the escrow.

So now, I want to make sure that with RAD, that is very clear that residents there will have -- understand their rights, that they do have the right not only to agree with the housing authority, but they have the right to DC Superior Court to pay to their landlord the rent in escrow.

Yes or no?

MR. KANE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner

St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: How does RAD impact a person with a voucher?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Good question.

MR. KANE: So, the initial conversion of a property is an operation fully within the public housing program. As a matter of fact, to be eligible for a RAD conversion, it has to be a public housing property.

The operation of the program is to convert that property to a voucher or platform property. So, at initial conversion, and what would be essentially a re-lease-up, those people who were now agreeing to become residents of what is now going to be essentially a project-based voucher or property, if the anticipation is that they will continue to be in place.

They'll have the ability to come back

if they've had to be moved. And so, that will essentially take care of initial lease-up. I mean, as time goes on re-leasing a property where folks move out of will be subject to same sort of availability and rules for people who'll use a voucher to move in, just like any other property with it.

But initially, what's anticipated is that you have people who are public housing residents who are going to be the first set of leased-up residents once the property is converted.

So, it's not going to be like building a new project and you're going to lease it up from either a site-based list or a bigger waiting list, or from folks walking off the street. You're really talking about the same set of residents.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Any other questions on this resolution? Hearing none, I would entertain a motion to approve the resolution.

PARTICIPANT: Motion.

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

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER KENNER: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Roll call?

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner

Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz-Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have nine yes. The resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you.

MR. KANE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you, Ed.

MR. KANE: Andre Gould.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Andre, could you come up? So Resolution 19-17, which will approve an allocation of local subsidies to support the creation of affordable housing in the District of Columbia for this brand new Communities Initiative project.

For many of you who don't know, this Strand project has been around for at least a decade. I want to thank the Office of the Deputy particularly the Communities Mayor, new Initiative, for funding a portion of this project, and also the Housing Authority --Housing -- DCHE, I think, for their new market tax credit allocation of about \$6 million to this project. So, I'll turn it over to Andre.

MR. GOULD: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. My name is Andre Gould,
Development Project Manager in the Office of
Capital Programs.

The Strand residences is 86 units. Seventy-one of those will be one-bedrooms and the balance will be two bedrooms. Twenty-eight of those units will be set aside for residents at Lincoln Heights and Richardson Dwellings.

Through the New Communities Initiative this is a build-first project for those two properties. And we're asking today for a subsidy for this project. Project-based subsidy for those replacement units through the local rent supplement program.

If the Board Commissioners approve this today, it will move forward to DC Council for their final approval in June.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And what's the amount of subsidy you're asking for?

MR. GOULD: It's approximately about \$456,000 a year.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. So can you give us an overall sense of the sources of funding for this project?

MR. GOULD: It varies from different levels. About \$15.6 million of gap funding was provided by the Deputy Mayor's office that was used for acquisition of nearby properties, as well as going to new construction for the residences.

And this will be a rehabilitation of the Strand Theater, which is a historic landmark. And the residences will be sitting right directly next to it at Nannie Helen and Division Avenue.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And you may not know the answer to this question, but do we know how many replacement units have been built for Lincoln Heights, Richardson Dwellings, new communities?

MR. GOULD: Currently, we're carrying about 72 replacement units for Lincoln Height and Richardson Dwellings residents, built today, that are serving our residents.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And this would add how many again?

MR. GOULD: This will add 28 units.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Do you have -- and you may not know this, but how many total replacement are we trying to provide for Lincoln Heights, Richardson Dwelling? If you don't know the answer, that's fine, too.

MR. GOULD: I don't know the total currently right now. But right now, Providence Place is planning to close. It has an additional 35. So, between the 35 and 28, those will be new units coming online within the next 18 months to two years.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Thank you.

Questions. Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Sorry. So, as stated, these are intended to be replacement units for the New Communities project, Lincoln Heights?

MR. GOULD: That's correct. Lincoln Heights and Richardson Dwellings.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: When is the Lincoln Heights project supposed to get started?

MR. GOULD: We're continuing to plan

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

that out.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, it has no start date?

MR. GOULD: Correct. There's no --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: All right.

What is going to -- so, you're going to throw these
28 units with the residents from that property.

What are you going to do with the 28 units that they
move out of?

MR. GOULD: It's not our intent, Commissioner, to backfill those units based on what we're encountering. In the past we have. But we also need to do one other thing with Lincoln, is actually go ahead and submit -- we only submitted for a partial demolition application for Lincoln. We need to submit for the remaining property.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, we're going to empty the units out and not use them.

MR. GOULD: We have been utilizing some of the units based on our environmental issue. We have been backfilling some of the units.

But at the end of the day, that's not

most beneficial to the Authority if our intention is to redevelop that property through the New Communities project.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Because one of my concerns in the previous resolution we passed was that we were going to get into a situation like we have at Park Morton, where we built offsite housing, we filled it up with people, we backfilled Park Morton, and we're at the starting point with Park Morton again. We accomplished nothing.

So, this \$15.6 million loan you reference in the resolution, what is that? Is that a loan? Is it a grant? What is it?

MR. GOULD: That's a loan from DMPED to the development team.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, that has to be paid back?

MR. GOULD: Correct.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: That's about \$181,000 a unit. And then, there's a subsidy -- so, you're looking to us to approve their subsidy. I mean, it's a local run subsidy.

Correct?

MR. GOULD: That's correct. DCHA administered the District subsidy.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, you know, I get we have to make progress here, but I just look at these types of dollars being spent, and I guess the city can do whatever they want with their money, but we have serious financial problems within the Authority, and we're trying to house and re-house people, and they're going to spend \$181,000 a unit to house 28 families.

So, I -- I know the New Communities

Projects fall outside of our scope, but at some

point we have to have a master plan here, and I just

don't know how this fits in, to be building

properties with no start date for the main

property, doesn't seem to be a good sequence of

events and I don't understand it. So -- I know

it's not your fault. I'm just putting it on the

record.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,

Commissioner Commissioner Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: My question is a two-fold. One, and this is a yes or no, with the Strand project, as you know that I am an advocate for residents in Section 3 to always be employed.

Question. On the project, how many Ward 7 residents from Lincoln Heights, Richardson Dwellings, Fort Dupont, Kenilworth, Parkside, Stoddert Terrace was employed to work on this project, if any? Or do you know?

MR. GOULD: The project hasn't started yet.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Now, being that it hasn't started, very good. So in the negotiation of the contract, did you or did you not negotiate a Section 3? Yes or no?

MR. GOULD: Yes. There's a Section 3, as well as first source.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.

Now, I am the only Commissioner that sits up here that's been on the DCHE Board for at least 12 years.

And as you know, being on the DCHE Board, I am an

advocate for a new program. And as you well know,

I will not be running any more to be the

commissioner by choice.

After 15 years, someone else need to be groomed. With that said with one of my goals, since you haven't completed everything, there's something that I'm going to create called Popup.

And any time that the District of Columbia Housing Authority partnership with the Mayor or anybody else in retail is a part of that deal.

It is essentially important that the District of Columbia residents of the Housing Choice Voucher Program and the public housing, have what is called the Retail Popup.

What do that mean? That all this retail space built on our land that we did not negotiate for, however we go along with the program, we got to have some dividends come in for those who suffer from the disease of poverty. And it's called residents-have-license.

So you do a popup. You'll do a Ward 7

popup if it's in Ward 7, or Ward 6. And then, if you don't have enough residents to qualify to be licensed and do the popup, then you'll move to the next ward. If you're doing 7, then you'll do 5, 6.

So what you'll see that we're going back and forth. It's called tutorialism. And it's also called being collective when we have to come to that calming bond.

As a Commissioner, I'm first for that Ward. That Ward is to get paid by employment, trying to make \$15 an hour at their retail space. Begin to do that as a part of the community agreement benefit.

And, Daniel, please start having organizers to get that information out and start organizing residents throughout the District of Columbia to deal with the popup retail space for public housing and housing choice voucher residents after it's built with DCHA money.

That go for tax money, a bond money, any money. If it's coming out of this house, then we

are to share in the dividends.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner, that's a good idea.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Andre, can you talk
a little bit about the retail that would be at the

MR. GOULD: This resolution is specifically for the residences. But there is a restaurant component, which would be the Ivy City Smokehouse. If you need more details, I can ask somebody that deal with the New Markets transaction.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. We can hear about that later. Great. So, I would -- are there any other questions? Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: I just wanted to know how the conditions of the units are being taken into account as we think about which residents from Lincoln Heights and Richardson Dwellings would move into the units?

Strand?

MR. GOULD: We haven't exactly decided that yet. We will be working directly with the development team, as well as DMPED, to work with the residents in a public fashion to determine entry into the new units.

MR. GARRETT: And, Commissioner Neal-Jones, it's open. More than likely, it will be handled in the same manner that 5201 Hayes was handled, where it's open for the residents to show their interest. And from that, they will be leased up. So --

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Yeah. I do think that since we're having this conversation about the portfolio stabilization, that perhaps there should be some kind of targeting to -- and work with residents that may be in units that are not in livable condition.

MR. GOULD: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. So, I would entertain a motion to approve Resolution 19-17. Is there a motion?

PARTICIPANT: Motion.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER KENNER: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Roll call?

MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner

Taliaferro?

COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner

Vann-Ghasri?

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?

COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal-Jones?

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz-Gaud?

COMMISSIONER ORTIZ-GAUD: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: No.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?

COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert?

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. MCNAIR: You have eight yes, one no. The resolution is approved.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Thank you, staff, for your presentations today. We really appreciate it.

So, this is the time I our agenda where we hear from our public witnesses, our residents, unknown residents who have issues and concerns that they'd like to share with the Board of Commissioners.

Residents have five minutes. We're going to hold you to a strict timeline today. I got into trouble last time for allowing folks to go over, and then some people didn't get an opportunity.

So, my apologies if I'm strict today.

Maybe next week I wouldn't make some of them be this strict. So, let's call up Judith Carmichael. As you come up, please state your name and where you're from.

MS. CARMICHAEL: My name is Judith

Carmichael. Good afternoon to you all.

I reside at 5336 Colorado Avenue, NW, Apartment 306. We're under the RAD program. The first time we ever heard about it, a gentleman comes in and tells us we're going to be under RAD. And we asked him, what is RAD?

And he says, well really, we haven't gotten all the details together, but we will come back and tell you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can you bring the microphone a little closer to you?

MS. CARMICHAEL: Oh, am I speaking -- oh.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I can hear you now. Yeah.

MS. CARMICHAEL: All right. We asked him about the RAD program and he really didn't have that much information. He said that we have just started it and we don't know really a lot of the ins and outs.

So, we said okay. The next time the man comes in, he said we're going to sign leases under

RAD May 1st. Well, we knew nothing about RAD. So, we're going to sign a lease and not know what's going on?

So anyway, we signed the lease on May 1st because we got notices that if you don't sign the lease, whatever. So, we did sign the lease. And when we got our rent receipt in January, it stated that I owed them \$778 in rent. This was past-due rent.

I don't understand it because I pay my rent every single month. So, I could not understand how come I had an outstanding balance of \$778.

They always say we have to pay by the first of the month. We received our first dollar May rental payment on the 3rd of May. So, how could we pay on the first when we didn't even get the rental payment?

Also, they told us when we signed it, they gave us the information about the lead, etc. We got somebody in August to come in and check on the lead. On August 23rd, we got the results that

there is lead in our apartment building.

I found it very strange, because at this time and age, one should know that they shouldn't use lead to paint apartment buildings. But therefore, they did. So two of the apartments had to be repainted.

We had a letter from the people that they were going to come in, got it in May -- gonna come in and have every repair done by December.

I still have places where the water has fallen down, and there you can see the brown. I also have by my light in the kitchen the same thing. They came in and plastered it. It's coming back.

I had -- in the air conditioning system, we could hear birds upstairs in the -- I live on the third floor, first of all. So we can hear the birds. We called about it, we called about it, we called about it, we called about it. Finally, they came and took care of the problem.

Next, I have on my other vent, drips coming in. Constantly. I told them about that, they did not come and do anything about it. So,

the drips are still there. It's like being in a prison camp where you constantly hear this drip, drip, drip.

All right. Also, I have cracks in the ceiling, on the part of the wall. And I've only lived in the apartment for six years. And when I moved in, I was the fifth person that moved into that apartment building. So therefore, I don't understand how we have cracks already.

Also, we have a little balcony outside.

And --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Go ahead.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Are you finished?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah, yeah.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Oh, okay. We have this balcony outside, which is done in steel and repainted. The only thing is there's -- out there is rust coming through. So, I don't know who did this building, but I don't think they did a very good job.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well, I don't know who did it either, but we can certainly find out.

Director, who can help Ms. Carmichael?

MR. GARRETT: The Deputy Director PMO, Brandy Lynch, who's sitting right in the back there. She'll contact you. She'll walk up and discuss this with you.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Free books donated by, is that what you're talking about?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am. She's right there. She'll stand up. Right there. Okay? She'll find you and she'll discuss this with you. Okay? Directly.

MS. CARMICHAEL: You speak a little too fast.

MR. GARRETT: I'm sorry.

MS. CARMICHAEL: That's all right.

MR. GARRETT: The young lady in the back.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Oh, she's standing up and come to her?

MR. GARRETT: Brandy Lynch just --

MS. CARMICHAEL: I saw her already.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. She's going to

NEAL R. GROSS

help you, ma'am.

MS. CARMICHAEL: She's going to help me with what?

MR. GARRETT: With your issues. She's going to talk to you and discuss everything that's going on, talk about the rent notice that you received, to ensure that everything has been rectified.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Ma'am, here to Brandy right here.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Okay. I see her. And also another thing is we need security in our building.

MR. GARRETT: Okay.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Because there has been people having money stolen, people having packages in front of their door stolen. So, this is a problem that we need to deal with.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Because it's not fair to the seniors that we have to go through this problem.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CARMICHAEL: All right?

MR. GARRETT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, I'm going to ask you to discuss it with Brandy.

MS. CARMICHAEL: I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I'm going to ask you if you can have the conversation with Brandy so we can allow the audience --

MS. CARMICHAEL: Oh, but of course.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Yes. You carry on.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Ma'am, but

before you leave -- excuse me. Ma'am?

Me. I'm talking to you.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: My name is Aquarius Vann-Ghasri. I've tried to get to your building. You have a very good locked building. It's hard to come there because residents do not let you in unless you really know how to key in.

But let me say this. Director Garrett,

just like he was doing the RAD roundtable and we

did it at Ontario Road, I really believe that we

need to put together a team that really understand

RAD, and we need a RAD conference, free conference

line.

Because I don't always deal with just

the resident council presidents and executive

board because there can be problems. So, we do RAD

with a free conference call line, and we can

pick -- find out -- survey the apartments.

Some people work in the day, some people

work in evenings, so we could do two different RADs,

and what they can learn is to educate them through

this conference with RAD.

And we would start out doing each

property individual, and maybe the third of the

month we could do it like an open group or

something. Because it's very difficult going from

one property to another, teaching every household

about RAD, unless we do it on video.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we can have a telephone number. That's something we can look into. A telephone number that you dial and you listen to a voice who would give, you know, the pertinent questions you need to know about RAD. And they can call in.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you, Commissioner.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Commissioner.

MS. CARMICHAEL: I would just like to say that you don't need a combination to get into our --

PARTICIPANT: It's a code. You have to push a button?

PARTICIPANT: A code on the door.

MS. CARMICHAEL: No. You just have to push the button of the apartment number.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes, ma'am. That's what I'm calling the code on the -- I'm calling that the code on the door. I apologize for the lack of terminology.

MS. CARMICHAEL: No problem. No problem.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes. Thank you so much. Because clarification with terminology is very important. And it's important for me to use the same term that you use, because that way we have a conversation. So, thank you for correcting me. And I will write that down to use that term. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you, Ms. Carmichael.

MS. CARMICHAEL: No, I have a problem moving out of my apartment. When I called up to --

COMMISSIONER NEAL-JONES: You

finished?

MS. CARMICHAEL: When I called up to move out, they said I was under RAD and I couldn't move out. They said I would have to be there a year before I would able to move. I did not know that. I did not know that was a qualification. Nobody told us.

And also, we have people coming in the building that are homeless, bring their stuff in and sleep inside our community room. So, I mean,

they don't have a way to get in, well how do they get in? That's a problem.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah. Well, I want to encourage you to share your issues with Brandy. We're going to track them through Brandy. And you know how to reach -- to get in touch with our director?

MS. CARMICHAEL: No, I don't.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Brandy will give you that information. If there's not a timely follow-up, she'll make sure that he reaches back out to you.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, thank you so much.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Thank you so much for your time and for listening.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You're welcome.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Chairman Albert, can I ask a quick question? Who owns the Colorado Apartments? I remember this was the first RAD we did. Who owns the building?

MR. GARRETT: That's under our control.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, we own and operate it.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Correct.

MR. GARRETT: Commissioner, the complete answer is it is owned by --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can you put the mike closer to you?

MR. GARRETT: The complete answer is it's owned by an LLC that is 100 percent controlled by the Housing Authority. It is managed by the Housing Authority via a contract with that LLC. So that LLC is the owner.

There's no additional financing, so there's not even a tax equity partner or anything in that one. And that LLC has no other members other than DCHA.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, in essence, DCHA owns and operates the building.

MR. GARRETT: It does.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. Thank you.

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

Esther Hardesty (phonetic)?

Good afternoon.

MS. HARDESTY: Good afternoon. Good day, everyone, Mr. Garrett, the Commissioners.

My name is Esther Hardesty, President of Langston

Resident Council and Ward 5, northeast quadrant of

Washington, DC.

Today, I'm coming here because of an issue that arose. I need some clarity on it. And now, I'm not expecting, nor do I want, any rhetoric, or anyone saying that, we don't know.

I need to know this. Because as being president of the resident council, and excuse me if I stumble, but I just had an issue -- personal issue -- so, I have to report back to my community.

My community is important to me. Now, it has been brought to my attention who I've been working with for a number of years, Mr. Michael Brown, has left the department. However, I just found this out on Monday. He's been gone since March.

Mr. Brown and I worked closely together

redeveloping Langston. Now, why wasn't we told -- why weren't we told about this and I had to find out for myself? I think this is unprofessional.

I should have been told that he was no longer with this company, with the Housing Authority. My concern is, Mr. Brown and I have been -- we worked on getting our laundry room. Now, the power plant is causing a problem.

Now, I was told that our air conditioning system was going to be put on hold for a while. So, I understood that.

But after that I knew nothing else because he's gone. Who's going to answer that question? What is going to happen to this power plant?

Now, I've heard that it's going to be sold and I've heard -- I talked to the 5-D Commissioners. They want to just take the property and make a recreation center and a library.

Now, I told them myself that that's not

happening, simply because they don't have any legality in that. Now -- and I'm expecting DC Housing to back me up on that. I'm not here to play games with anyone, and I'm not placing the blame on anyone.

I just need some answers as what's going to happen to this property. We had the meeting on Monday, and I understand that. But I am just talking about the power plant right now. What is going -- that's where our air conditioning unit is supposed to be coming from.

However, the residents are questioning us about what's going on with the air conditioning unit. These people cannot afford those air conditioning. Those air conditioners are no longer being made.

And our windows are -- when they put those windows in, I had no part of it. But what are we going to do about it? These people cannot afford to buy these air conditioners. When they were selling, they were like \$600. I had to buy one myself.

I am in need of an air conditioner now. But what are we going to do? What is Housing going to do to help these people with this air?

This property is 80 years old, and it is real brick. So it is hot in there. I can't stand the heat, so I know other residents can't the heat. Help us out. Don't just leave us hanging.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Mr. Director, you've heard Ms. Hardesty. What solutions do we have?

MR. GARRETT: I just have to say, Commissioners and Ms. Hardesty, one of the reasons, and one of the things that we were talking about, or I was attempting to talk about with the residents on Monday when we called you together, was about some of the decisions that we need to make and some of the thing that we're considering.

And the power plant is one of those pieces for that particular property. For your property at Langston, it involves our concept of repositioning also, whether or not we're in a position to spend that amount of money when we know

that we're going to possibly have to do something

different with many of our properties, including

Langston.

So that's where the decision-making

falls, us making a presentation to not only you,

as the residents, but also to the Board of

Commissioners, about what we believe the best use

of that particular property would be going forward.

And unfortunately, the power plant does

fall into that -- into -- I'm not going to say

limbo, but it falls into question only because we

need to know whether or not that expenditure is the

appropriate expenditure for Langston, and is that

the route that we want to take for that particular

property.

As far as Mr. Brown goes, Mr. Brown

decided -- he retired. He came back from an

extended absence just for some health concerns, and

when he came back he made the decision and

termination to actually retire.

MS. HARDESTY: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: So, we haven't -- we did

NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

not officially replace his particular position with anyone.

MS. HARDESTY: Okay. But who is the interim in his place, then?

MR. GARRETT: We didn't put anyone as an interim in his place.

MS. HARDESTY: No one is there.

MR. GARRETT: We do have Alex. Alex Morris is running that side of the OCP shop. Is Alex in the room? I think he left. But Alex Morris. And I can put you in touch with Alex Morris through Mr. Malone, Merrick Malone, the Director of the department.

MS. HARDESTY: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: Okay?

MS. HARDESTY: Now, Mr. Garrett, I appreciate what you're doing. But we need to do the right thing. Don't tell me something that you're going to do something and it's not done, because I'm coming back.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

MR. GARRETT: I'm coming back.

Because I work for the residents. And like I said, my residents are important to me. And Langston is a historical property. And if you come for Langston, we're going to fight for it. We're going to lay down, we're going to fight. Because we don't want anything to happen to the residents there, the true residents, and we don't want anything to happen to the structure of Langston.

We want to be helped. We need the help there. We need the help.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much,
Ms. Hardesty. Valerie Flamer?

MR. GARRETT: Just one thing,
Ms. Hardesty, before you get up. I just want to
say, we clearly understand. I clearly understand
what the residents are looking for from the Housing
Authority, and from me as the executive director.

And I empathize and I know that we have to do certain things in a different manner moving forward. And information to the residents and conferring with you is most important.

And we're going to, as we said on Monday, there are going to be some times we're going to have some hard decisions and choices that we're going to have to make as a collective unit.

But we're there. I'm there. I'm on the side of the residents, and I'll continue to be.

MS. HARDESTY: May I make one more statement, please?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah.

MS. HARDESTY: They did redevelopment at Langston before in the terrace area.

PARTICIPANT: On the mike.

MS. HARDESTY: They did redevelopment before in the terrace area. However, they didn't do the whole property. We were told that they ran out of money. Please, we don't want to hear that again. We don't want to hear that anymore.

I understand that the money may be a little tight. But we don't want to hear that anymore. We have residents that are in dire need of having their units redone.

MS. CARMICHAEL: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Thank you so much. Ms. Flamer?

MS. FLAMER: Hello. I'm Valerie
Flamer. Now, I'm on the -- the last time I spoke,
you cut me off kind of fast. I noticed that. But
I'm going to -- that was kind of rude. I want to
talk about calculations. I agree with
Commissioner Slover about these calculations. I
believe you all giving away more than you all are
keeping.

That's not fair to residents that were born in DC. We getting pushed to the side. After a while, we're not going to have nowhere to live. I went to these apartments. They want \$2,500 for a one-bedroom. It's right next door to you all and housing over there.

So, what I was saying, what is my voucher for, or really worth? I got a voucher for a one-bedroom apartment where I can take it anywhere that I want to, and port it. So I wanted something nice.

The taxpayers are saying why are we getting these bad apartments that's run down and old, roaches, rats all outside, they got boxes outside.

Why aren't we getting -- if they're going to pay, they rather for us to have something nice, and I would love that. Because the senior citizens building got perks.

They got computer rooms, places where you can play bingo. I would love that, to be around people my own age that's got some sense.

And what I was saying about young people, I wasn't being prejudiced towards them. I was just saying we're getting blamed -- a lot of people from DC getting blamed for things that they be doing.

Like their pants hanging down. My mother -- our parents didn't raise us like that.

And they got this weave and the fingernail. And they be on there abusing their kids.

I be mad. I really want to fight one of them for that. Them little kids about one or

about. Something needs to be done about that.

And you all are giving away too much. Everybody's pockets getting fat and we ain't going to have nowhere to live.

I don't want to go and live with my kids.

You know, they grown, they don't want me there.

You see what I'm saying? They don't have no privacy. So I'd rather have my own place. And I want a nice one that's built and brand new.

So I had asked Mr. McCrory, before he left, about the 18 -- 1,000 -- \$1,800 apartment right up next to Harris Teeter. He said we ain't going to pay that much.

Well, I want to know what the voucher is worth. He told me straight up we're not going to pay that money. So I want to know. And when you all be giving away cash prizes to other employees, I'm quite sure everybody sitting up on this panel, and everybody that works for Housing, they're doing their best for us, the best they can possibly be.

So why are the rest of them so special? And where is that money coming from? Is that money coming out the budget for Housing that's helping us to remain in our places? If it is and it's fraud, when HUD get a whiff of that, he going to start firing people, do a clean sweep, and when he do that sweep, the only people going to suffer from that is the residents of DC, like myself.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Valerie, I actually want to hear the answer to that question. So I'm going to ask the director, where does the money come from?

MR. GARRETT: Are we talking about the federal money?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: No. People --

MS. FLAMER: Because I know some people --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: -- can get cash awards --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. FLAMER: Yeah. Why is they getting that money? A lot of people be bending

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

over backwards to help me. They ain't got no money yet.

MR. GARRETT: It's a small, nominal amount for the employees coming out of our operating budget.

MS. FLAMER: So you have your own separate budget for giving them that money. It's not coming out the housing budget.

MR. GARRETT: It's all the housing budget, ma'am. When you put all the numbers together, it is our budget. Yes. But each department also has an allocation.

MS. FLAMER: I found an apartment for \$1,400, senior citizen. Would you all pay that for me? You know, after my 30 percent would you pay that for me?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So obviously there's criteria. Have you talked to Ms. Punter about how to go about that?

MS. FLAMER: Oh, no. I just met her.

I don't want to burden her --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: No, but that's why we

hired her, so that you can actually work with her to achieve what you're trying to achieve.

MS. FLAMER: I already had got approved for one for \$1,200. But I turned it down. I wish I wouldn't have, though, but I turned it down.

And another thing like that lady spoke about, these real estates -- not the owners, but the people that they put in the rental office, they be asking us, why you all don't pay on the first. They ain't got no business asking me to do that.

Asking me about you all. I made a contract with William C. Smith through ya'll. I guess you all the third party or second party. They be asking me, you need to check on them and see when they going -- I said, no, I'm not going to ask them that. That's between you, them and the landlord.

And then, they be asking us -- they did me the same way, say I owe three months rent. I'm sitting over there breaking my neck paying my rent, and that lady wouldn't give me a receipt.

Do she know I know my rental rights?

So, I said, you not getting this money unless I get my receipt right now. So, I mean, I had a problem with her. She's a little off the wild side. So, I'm going to report her to William C. Smith. That's all.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, let's do this. Because we have a couple of other people waiting.

MS. FLAMER: Mm-hmm.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can I ask you to pull Ms. Punter, have the conversation about finding the right unit at the right subsidy for you, and if you still have problems, why don't you escalate that to our director.

MS. FLAMER: Well see, I can pick my own. That's about the voucher I got. I can go find my own --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Right, right.

MS. FLAMER: -- and it was getting ready to go through for \$1,200. I like it because it had a lot of things that I would like, like the fitness gym, and everything like that. So, what I was getting ready to say, I still want to know,

can HUD write us a letter, each one of us, so that we won't have to bring this subject up again?

I would like to know how the calculations are done for a utility allowance. I would like to know -- I'm going to educate myself on that. I want to find -- when I think somebody done hit me up for something they should have --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well, you don't have to get HUD to do that. Ms. Punter can actually help you with that.

MS. FLAMER: But can I bound -- I want the information in writing for myself.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: She'll give it to you in writing.

MS. FLAMER: She can give it to me where I can -- okay. She can download it for me?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: She can download it for you. I promise.

MS. FLAMER: All right. I want to know all of that.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: All right. And then, next month you'll tell me if you got your

answers.

MS. FLAMER: All right.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much. Kuweit Stout (phonetic)? I don't know how to follow that one.

MS. STOUT: Greetings, brothers and sisters.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Good afternoon.

MS. STOUT: How you doing? I'm going to make this brief. I've been coming to the Board meeting with a lot of emotion. Today I'm coming factual, cc'ing numbers. My lockup DC number, tag numbers, as well as names of the guy that pulled the gun on me but he didn't shoot me because it didn't -- the gun jammed.

I've been under -- I mean, I want to say thank you to Housing Authority. Thank you, from me and my children.

I've been living under Housing
Authority for 15 years at 3211 Henson Road. The
last six years the guy was selling PCP on the
property and I told. So now I've been the target.

Ever since I've been coming to the meeting, I've been a little emotional. So I've been getting past the fact that I been missing the message. So that's why no one really even took me serious because I didn't hit the targets as far as facts. Sorry.

Mr. Ty Garrett, you promised me in February that you was going to meet with me in regards to these safety issues. Since I've been calling the call center, Ms. Rodney, she promised to make -- she did make -- well, she tried to reach out to your secretary to make a date.

They gave me the wrong name to your email, because it kept coming back as non -- it's not your email. I've been assigned to Dietitian Myers. I would like to do job naming, but at this point I don't care.

Dietitian Myers, who is a specialist, supposed to been my case manager. Mr. Cedric Wormley -- Ron McCoy, Keith Moone.

I've been pushed around, brushed off, and I went online to find you myself to send you

an email. But in turn, I found something else, which I was very disgusted by, because I supposed to put my trust in Housing.

I just found -- I'm sorry, just bear with me for a second. I found a very disturbing City Paper of you about a -- that says DC Housing Authority Tyrone Garrett named in New Jersey sexual harassment lawsuit.

So I didn't know that that's why I been getting avoided. I don't know if you trying to cover up something, or you trying to avoid talking to me. If anybody want copies of this, you can have it, because I have plenty.

My real reason for coming, because if you're going to be the director and you said we're pushing for change, I need to change my address before I get put into a casket. I'm fighting every day, I keep my face on the floor, because I have the building shut up. That's what God told me to do, because you guys are not helping me.

I don't care about no elevator, three story house, I removed my kids. I got two letters

from my children, which I had to manipulate them -- forgive me, Lord -- and asking them, how do you feel not being with your mother.

My first son, his name is Jream, J-R-E-A-M, Martin. He's 15. April 18 he was born, 2004. He wrote me a letter. I have it and I'll make copies and share it with you, but I don't want to read it because then I'll get emotional. I just want to stay factually -- he has cerebral palsy. My kids' father's having a very hard time because they want to come home but they can't because of the issues I'm dealing with in the neighborhood.

I have pictures of vehicles that follow me every day. I was in the rental office on May the -- no, April 24th, when two young girls chased me with knives and mace because of Brandon Pope.

He now has a stay away order, which I thought it was in place. The judge wouldn't honor it because they thought I was the aggressor because I'm always emotional and I'm never factual.

But I'm here today because I'm tired of talking to the deaf hears, to the dead. You all done woke the dead.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So what would you -- ideally, what would you want to happen?

MS. STOUT: I want to move. I need to move.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So -- and so you've engaged with people from the Housing Authority about moving. And what --

MS. STOUT: Several times. Saying that to say, because I'm holding them accountable, they send me a 30-day notice of eviction. They're saying I didn't recertify. This was -- my recertification went out on January.

They let me live in my home five months prior to this. And then, they send this out on April 28th and I got 30 days to contest it via hearing.

Since I've been here, they've been running on the back of my Steve Maddens, which they cost too much, trying to talk to me. I wish they

would have came to me before trying to worry about my concerns.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay.

MS. STOUT: Ms. Yvette Ross have been on the property. She was worrying about Easter eggs and her new baby when I was in there talking to Caris (phonetic), the property manager.

Caris -- I asked Caris was she aware of this letter. She said yes. But she didn't care because I recertified with Henson Ridge. But this is not my concern. I should have -- could have coordinated with Housing.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, here's what I would like to do, since it seems as though you are not getting the progress that you would like to get. I want to enlist the help of our general counsel, Ken Slaughter. If you can just remain after this meeting, the two of us would love to have a quick conversation with you.

MS. STOUT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So we can friend forward.

MS. STOUT: Mr. Neal, I would have -- in all due respect, I don't just want just to talk.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I don't want to talk either.

MS. STOUT: I'm already packed and ready to go.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: All right. So, I'm trying to find solutions. But you --

MS. STOUT: Okay. But you don't live with me. When I leave here, I'm going back by myself, as well as God.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I understand.

So -- but if I had all the time in the world today,
we could bring some solutions. But that's why I'm
asking you to remain after, so at least we can start
our conversation.

MS. STOUT: But I just want the records to reflect that money is blasphemy. You can replace money. We can replace the papers, the drinks and the food. You cannot replace my life.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Absolutely.

MS. STOUT: I have two sons that count on me. I'm their guardian, protector, mother, and everything else, and advocate. I'm a very good -- I've been here 15 years. I don't have no roaches, bedbugs, holes. I have everything still in place when I moved there.

But it seem hard when you're a very boisterous person and, you know, you guys sit up there with your \$3,000 suits on, but you don't really walk a mile in my shoes. You all don't know how a gun can be in your face and the trigger lock up.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

MS. STOUT: I'm definitely going to defend myself. It's not going to be a code case.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. So --

MS. STOUT: And I'm going to hold you guys accountable.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. And if you just don't mind staying back a little bit, I'd appreciate it.

MS. STOUT: I will.

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

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay.

MS. STOUT: I stood back last time and nothing still got done.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: All right. Well, let's see what happens this time.

MS. STOUT: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Neidra Mitchell? Daniel?

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Daniel Del Pielago. I'm with Empower DC. I've got a couple of questions for you on different matters. One is what type of security is there at Barry Farm currently?

I'm asking because recently we heard from a story of a resident being told -- who still lives on the property -- told that she does not live there. She was being barred from entering her home. And the security was just being adamant that she didn't live there, there was some back and forth.

Luckily, she was finally able to enter

her home. But I'm just wondering, since there's so few people left on the property, is security being told, hey, you know, 1200 Eaton Road is still occupied. And that's not the address, I'm just making that up. But I'm going to put that on your radar.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah. So, what kind of security is at Barry Farm?

MR. GARRETT: We're still -- the Housing Authority is still policing the property also. If there is a constructed fence, it's probably -- I have to check. And I need to step back before I give you a direct answer.

But a construction company in DC that's doing the demolition based on the fencing, may have a security company out there also. So, we'll just have to contact them and engage and find out exactly what the issue may be.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Thank you.

MR. GARRETT: It could be just a miscommunication and they don't realize that there's still individuals on the property.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Thank you. I mean, I just want to put it on the radar, because she lives there.

MR. GARRETT: This is the first time that I'm hearing of an issue. So, no one has brought it to my attention --

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Okay.

MR. GARRETT: -- prior to this.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Thank you. Thank you. The other question is I know you all had a meeting with residents recently around repositioning. How were they invited, who was invited?

MR. GARRETT: We took the opportunity to utilize the resident services and invite the resident council leadership from the various properties. That was the initial step. That was just step 1. That doesn't mean that we're not going to go out --

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Sure.

MR. GARRETT: -- we're not going to reengage the remaining population, or go through

the resident councils. It was just our initial opportunity to engage and let's start the actual discussion.

So, we got a lot of good feedback from the residents at that particular meeting about how we can do it better, and what they would actually be looking for from us when we come out to talk to them directly on the sites.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: And, Daniel, I had a meeting with members of the advocacy community a couple of weeks ago. I know someone from Empower DC was part of that group.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Yeah, yeah. I was on vacation so I missed it. But yes. And lastly, you actually called the person's name right before mine. She's also a Barry Farm resident. She was -- is being shown -- was shown, along with the remaining Barry Farm residents, units at the newly redeveloped, or almost redeveloped, Parkway Overlook.

She is being told that she's over-income to qualify for there. But she's also

being offered the same -- or she's being offered housing on a public housing property where she wouldn't be over-income. I understand it's a different kind of development, but, I mean --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I know where you're going.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: So, if -- I wonder if I could just drop her name after. I don't want to kind of put it out there.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: But if we could just -- I want to put that on your radar as, I think we need to maybe relax something and let her just move. I mean, I think it benefits everybody involved.

She was going to try to make it. She works during the day. She may be en route and maybe I can introduce you to her if she does come. But I also wanted to put that on you all's radar, because she's having a hard time finding a place given her situation.

And I understand it's a different

situation. It sounds like, Mr. Garrett, you've heard about it.

MR. GARRETT: No, I haven't.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Oh, okay.

MR. GARRETT: This is the first time. But I've heard about situations that are similar. And all I wanted to say was, we're going to find some of those, in instances where we might have a resident that is over-income, meaning that the property that we may be trying to relocate a person to, such as Parkway Overlook, is utilizing tax credits, or something like that, which have a strict income requirement.

Living in public housing, there isn't that. So, that means we can go -- there is no over-income, except for what we were talking about earlier with the previous resolution. That's the only time that we really rise to that level.

But we're not forcing residents out of public housing when they start to earn more. The issue -- the concern is that when we start to create development performance going forward, no matter

what it is, we need to take into consideration that we may have residents that are over-income, so that we need to plan accordingly for those individuals that might fall into a different category.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Sure. And I appreciate it because, given the magnitude of change that appears to be on the horizon, these issues are going to come up again. So, just right after the meeting, maybe I'll talk to you directly?

MR. GARRETT: That's fine.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: Okay. All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Daniel, were you actually referring to that meeting? Or were you referring to the meeting that Empower DC was at and we were talking about New Community?

MR. DEL PIELAGO: No, I'm referring to the meeting. I just recently saw something on Twitter about the engagement residence. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Chairman

Albert, can I get a quick question?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Follow-up as a result of Daniel's testimony. Could the executive director give us an update on Barry Farm? We haven't heard anything -- well, I personally haven't heard anything recently about the status of the deal and where we are in the process.

MR. GARRETT: We've been having meetings with our co-development team. Our co-developer, POA, and we have another meeting that's scheduled within the next week to discuss what the next step would be for -- and remember, with the litigation, exactly how we would approach it.

We will have -- there's still a couple of trains of thought, you know, from the DCHA side and from our development partners, to how we proceed. And we've also been talking about what the actual first phase would be.

So, we all understand and realize the need to get units up as quickly as possible and

start that particular process. So, we're talking and we're pushing POA, and POA's pushing us to come up with a clear idea and a definition of exactly what that first phase would look like.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So, could you give some sort of a comprehensive update at their next deadline meeting.

MR. GARRETT: Yes, I will. I can do that. Yes.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And when you give us that update, will you let us know how many residents are still residing in Barry Farm, and we want their address and streets.

MR. GARRETT: I can tell you the number of people that are still residing there. Giving their address, I don't --

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.

Well, what I don't understand is -- this is the question, whether or not the remaining residents that are in Barry Farm, whether or not they have a voucher.

MR. GARRETT: They have

been -- Commissioner Vann-Ghasri, they have been engaged, and we're identifying units for them. A few of the units, they either have -- I don't think they had vouchers. These particular individuals were going to be moving.

The bulk of them, the remaining number, we're going to try to be relocated over to Parkway Overlook. Now, it's been brought to my attention by Daniel that we might have had one that's over-income. So, we'll have to look for another unit and another mechanism for that particular family.

But they're having opportunities and we have mobility counseling working with them at the same time.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Bill?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I just wanted also a quick update on the Park Morton situation. We passed some resolutions a while ago. We had a situation there with an environmental issue. We had a timeline on that. Can you give me an update on where we are in that process?

MR. GARRETT: We've started interim controls, Commissioner. We've engaged, we have the contract that we've signed. Also, we signed our MOU with DMPED for the monies, to allow for the interim controls.

I also made the decision that we needed to go ahead and start if we were going to meet our annual -- our 12-month deadline.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, did DMPED sign the MOU?

MR. GARRETT: I don't know if the MOU came back yet. No, he signed our side.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So, we're at risk now? Is that what --

MR. GARRETT: I don't believe we're at risk. They've already agreed in principle. We've had correspondence between their attorney and our OGC counsel. So, there shouldn't be an issue in just getting a signature on the document from them.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: But we're at risk right now?

MR. GARRETT: If you want to say that, yes. We're at risk because we don't have a signed MOU at this point in time.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Right. That's at risk. So --

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well, we don't have any -- and we have no agreement with them. So I don't see what the risk is.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Because we're deploying capital, we've moving forward and spending dollars.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Well, I mean, we've been in that position for a while. So -- but at the risk of prolonging this meeting, I'm going to stipulate to what you just said. The last person on the list is Ms. Dwyer, M. Dwyer.

PARTICIPANT: Can I be added to the list?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I'm afraid not today. If you're going to be --

PARTICIPANT: Can I pass out what I want to say?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I'll add you if you'll be quick. How about that.

PARTICIPANT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. Have a seat.

PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Good afternoon. I'm Margaret Dwyer, here for SURJ DC, Showing Up for Racial Justice. And I don't have anything really new to say that hasn't been said. Everybody beat me to the punch.

But Surge did send me here to ask for four things. One is that we really care about the quality of the meetings that are going to be held with residents on repositioning.

And our experience at Barry Farm showed us that often those meetings tend to be one side telling the other what's going to happen, and what we're really hoping for is true collaboration, and really involving residents in imaging the redevelopment.

And the second thing is that we're calling for a baseline of the current inventory.

How many units over, what kinds of units are they?

Are they RAD units, traditional public housing units? Are the one-bedrooms, are they two-bedrooms? Are they slated for redevelopment?

If so, is that redevelopment in the pipeline?

We don't really know how to get our hands on monitoring progress if we don't know exactly where we're starting from. And I'm sure we have that information, and I'd love for it to be made public.

And we also want to echo Commissioner Slover's request for a long-range plan so that we're clear that we're not over-committing early when we have disasters on the horizon that we want to be prepared for.

And finally, we want to support Commissioner Vann-Ghasri's request for quarterly reports on the status of people who are being relocated. How many are successful that relocated? How many are still waiting to be relocated? How many are going into other public housing units, and how many are going for vouchers?

We really think that that kind of transparency, those four kinds of transparency, will make everything go better for residents and community members, and for the Housing Authority. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay, thanks for those very -- four great points.

 $\label{eq:ms.hart:} \text{MS. HART:} \quad \text{I can just pass out what I}$ want to say.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Sure. Why don't you say it in a minute or less? How about that?

MS. HART: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Why don't you come up and say it in a minute or less. And tell us your name.

MS. HART: Good afternoon, Chairman Albert and Commissioners. My name is Elinor Hart, and I'm on DC for Democracy's Affordable Housing Committee.

First, I want to thank you for serving on this very important Board. And I want to tell you that the prospect of the transformation of our

city's public housing makes some of us on our committee anxious and concerned. And I think that we're not the only people that feel that way.

We've done some research and discovered that in some cities, RAD conversions have negative consequences for tenants. As we learned this afternoon, RAD stands for Rental Assistance Demonstration.

However, we also discovered that because of exemplary practices in at least one other city, tenants have fared pretty well. The National Low-Income Housing Coalition reports that the conversion in San Francisco has probably had the best outcomes.

The National Housing Law Project partnered with the local aid organizations, enterprise, other tenant advocacy groups, and the City of San Francisco, to come up with rules and procedures to ensure that rights of tenants were prioritized. No tenants were displaced as a result.

The National Low-Income Housing

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

Coalition sent me some of these rules and procedures. I didn't bring them to pass out, but I have my email on this piece of paper. And if you'd like them, I'd be happy to -- if you send me your email, I'd be happy to send them to you.

The person from the National Law Housing Project told me with great pride, we didn't lose a single resident in San Francisco.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Really?

MS. HART: She also pointed out key elements of San Francisco's conversion, which we believe should be seriously considered with any conversion that takes place in DC.

The San Francisco Housing Authority owns all the land where public housing units are located.

The Authority has entered into ground leases with the private, non-profit developers who renovated and now operate the public housing complexes.

This arrangement preserves the long-term affordability. And I know that your

Resolution 19-01 talks about the importance of retaining ownership.

San Francisco, like a number of cities, -- sorry, I'm going to start this sentence over. San Francisco, unlike a number of cities, managed to avoid potential problems associated with low-income housing tax credits, which we call LIHTC.

Because LIHTC funding is typically for people whose incomes are considerably higher than public housing tenants, there is a danger that tenants returning to units renovated with LIHTC funding will not be able to afford to live in them. Protection against being priced out by LIHTC needs to be built into an RAD conversion.

Finally, one of the hallmarks of San Francisco's conversion was transparency and constant communication with all the stakeholders. It is our hope that this Board will make transparency and good communication the hallmark of whatever transformation is made in DC's public housing.

Thank you for fitting me in.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much. How do we stay in touch with you?

MS. HART: I'm going to pass these out with my contact information, if you don't mind.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. We don't mind at all. Thank you so much.

MS. HART: Thanks for everything.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So I want to thank everyone for participating in our Board of Commissioners meeting today. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 12, 2019 at 1 p.m. at our headquarters right across the street. And until then, we're adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:43 p.m.)

