THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY

+ + + + +

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS EMERGENCY MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2019

+ + + + +

The Board of Commissioners met in the Executive Director's Conference Room, 1133 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 12:30 p.m., Neil Albert, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

NEIL ALBERT, Chairman
KENNETH D. COUNCIL, Commissioner
LEJUAN STRICKLAND, Commissioner
ANTONIO TALIAFERRO, Commissioner
FRANSELENE ST. JEAN, Commissioner
NAKEISHA NEAL JONES, Commissioner
AQUARIUS VANN-GHASRI, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

TYRONE GARRETT, Executive Director ALETHEA McNAIR, Manager of Board Relations

COMMISSIONER(S) ABSENT:

BRIAN KENNER, Commissioner KEN GROSSINGER, Commissioner WILLIAM SLOVER, Vice Chairman

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

AGENDA

<u>Item</u>	Page
Call to Order and Quorum	3
Resolution 19-01: To Adopt a Framework for the Stabilization and Repositioning of DCHA's Portfolio of Properties	
Public Comment	5
Commissioner Questions	. 88
Board Action on Resolution	109
Adjournment	111

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 12:39 p.m. 2 Good afternoon, everyone. 3 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: My name is Neil Albert. And I chair the Board 4 of Commissioners of the D.C. Housing Authority. 5 And this is an emergency Board meeting being held 6 7 today, January 17, 2019 at our headquarters. If you've been to our Board meetings 8 before, this is a reminder. If this is your first 9 10 time, we're asking you to silence your devices. And we generally observe a particular 11 decorum during our meetings. You guys are all 12 13 adults. And so you'll know how to behave. we're going to have an opportunity for people to 14 speak here today. And so we ask that you give them 15 a listening ear and don't interrupt as they speak. 16 17 At this time, I'm going to actually turn it over to our secretary to establish a quorum. 18 Thank you. Commissioner 19 MS. McNAIR: Neal Jones? 20 COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: 21 Present. 22 MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gaud?

1	Commissioner Slover? Commissioner St. Jean?
2	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Present.
3	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?
4	COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Present.
5	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?
6	COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Present.
7	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner
8	Vann-Ghasri?
9	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Present.
10	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Council?
11	COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Present.
12	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Grossinger?
13	Commissioner Kenner? Chairman Albert?
14	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Present.
15	MS. McNAIR: You have seven
16	Commissioners present. You have a quorum.
17	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you very much.
18	Today we actually just have one resolution that
19	we're going to ponder. But before we do that, I
20	want to take this opportunity to welcome our newest
21	Commissioner, Commissioner Lejuan Strickland, who
22	was just appointed by the mayor to our Board. So

please join me in giving him a round of applause 1 as we welcome him. 2 3 (Applause.) It is our custom to, 4 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: before the resolutions are presented to allow 5 members of the public to comment on the resolution. 6 The resolution today is Resolution 19-01, which 7 would adopt a framework for the stabilization and 8 repositioning of DCHA's portfolio of properties. 9 10 We've got a number of people that have signed up to speak about the resolution. 11 It is 12 our custom to, since I see a number of non-residents 13 signed up, to give our residents the opportunity five minutes, speak first for 14 to and non-residents, three minutes to speak. 15 16 So I'm going to call on Linda Brown, 17 not ready, to come forward. who Linda, 18 welcome. 19 MS. Thank Good BROWN: you. 20 afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Linda Brown. I live in Greenleaf Senior in Ward 6. I'm here 21 22 today about the resolution.

I have concerns about the vouchers that will be given to the residents to reposition them in other places. I have a daughter who is disabled. She's a disabled adult.

And so, when you are issuing these vouchers, I'm wondering if you have considered that there is a waiting list for these vouchers. And how are you going to prioritize the vouchers that you are going to give out to the residents? And how are you going to ensure the residents that these vouchers would be accepted in other places?

With these developers, a lot of that is not considered. So it's like if you are going to, if you want to live somewhere else and those vouchers are not acceptable, then you can't move in there. So that's like being uprooted and not being able to live a place where you want to live in the community that you want to live in those vouchers aren't accepted.

So how are you going to ensure your relationship with these developers that the public or the residents will have some kind of safety

measures that they will be able to move in where 1 they choose to move with those vouchers? 2 Thank you, Ms. 3 MR. GARRETT: Okay. 4 First, I want to say I truly appreciate your question and your concerns that you've 5 actually raised. 6 7 But I just need to take us back just one step for not only the Board, but also the public 8 itself, is that the Housing Authority across the 9 10 board, DCHA, right now what we're talking about with 19-01 is to adopt a framework and merely a 11 12 framework to look at our portfolio based on what 13 we're facing in terms of environmental and lead concerns throughout the entire 8,000 units that 14 we actually have. 15 16 What we're trying to do is ask the Board 17 for support to create a framework that we will then 18 bring back to them on a case-by-case basis to make 19 determinations about how we handle each property. 20 So use of vouchers may be one particular vehicle 21 or it may not be.

And we haven't gotten there for every

single site. And this is the idea of this particular resolution is to take us there to create a guideline that we can utilize, so when we talk to the public, when we talk to our residents, we can give them all those explanations of what we're trying to do.

When you're dealing with a relocation voucher, if that was the case, and we're not saying that it is, but hypothetically, if we were to use a relocation voucher, there would be a process in which we would adopt a clear relocation plan that has input from the residents and also gives clear guidelines of how we would proceed to identify opportunities for residents, if that's what they chose to utilize.

MS. BROWN: Okay. A lot of these properties are, as you said, are in bad shape. So, when you're talking about relocating the residents, where are you going to relocate them to, because they're, the properties or the structures that you're talking about, a lot of them are in bad shape, worse than the place that you're

moving from?

MR. GARRETT: I don't disagree with you. And that's what we're trying to do. We're taking this and embracing it in a manner that takes that into consideration.

But I have to tell you, some of our options don't always include actually relocating residents from the current unit that they're in. Some processes could be something different, which could allow for rehabilitation with residents remaining on site. So not everyone has to be relocated.

It all, it's based on a case-by-case basis and an analysis of what type of redevelopment or rehabilitation we want to do to that particular site, it at all. I mean, in some cases, we might not have to do anything. It may be a stable complex. That will not be on any recommendation to move forward with any repositioning.

MS. BROWN: Okay. So, and the other question is how are you going to get this information to the residents. How are you going

to rehabilitate them and understanding what you're trying to do?

MR. GARRETT: That's of the, that's the top of the list. The top of the list is to educate not only our Board of Commissioners about our processes and things that we're going to do, but also to deal directly with the residents. Again, residents will have input and knowledge of every step that we're trying to take.

One thing that I did hear about this particular resolution was that how transparent it actually was. And that's something that under my administration that we've tried to instill over the last 18 months, which is a level of integrity, responsibility, and accountability so that everyone knows exactly what we're trying to do. There are no smoke and mirrors games to my administration.

There is change, yes. And change can be difficult for many individuals and especially when we're dealing with lives.

But we have to recognize we have a legal

1	and a moral obligation to do something. Based on
2	our portfolio, based on its current state, we have
3	to take some steps forward. And this is just our
4	first step in that direction to change the portfolio
5	of the Housing Authority. Thank you.
6	MS. BROWN: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much.
8	Next we're going to call Lori Leibowitz. Lori,
9	you have three minutes. And welcome.
10	MS. LEIBOWITZ: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: How are you?
12	MS. LEIBOWITZ: Okay, thanks. How are
13	you?
14	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Good.
15	MS. LEIBOWITZ: Good afternoon.
16	Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.
17	My name is Lori Leibowitz. And I am an attorney
18	at Neighborhood Legal Services Program, a local
19	organization that represents thousands of D.C.
20	residents for free in a variety of cases, including
21	housing cases.
22	Before I start with my points that I

1	was going to make, I just want to flag that I
2	realized while Ms. Brown was speaking that the
3	version of the, of Exhibit A attached to the
4	resolution that was given out when we walked in
5	is different from what I printed off the website
6	yesterday. There are more numbers in it, in
7	Exhibit A. So I don't know which I didn't have
8	a chance to see which, what's different or what's
9	changed. But it is different. So
10	MR. GARRETT: We can get you a hard copy
11	
12	MS. LEIBOWITZ: Well, I have the new
13	version.
14	MR. GARRETT: You have it? Okay.
15	MS. LEIBOWITZ: But I haven't had a
16	chance I just noticed it now. So I haven't had
17	a chance to look that over. And I suspect some
18	other folks haven't as well.
19	But what I was going to say is we at
20	Neighborhood Legal Services and as a D.C. resident
21	have long known that there are serious conditions
22	problems in public housing in D.C. I spend a lot

of time going out and visiting tenants.

And I'm really glad that DCHA went through and did this full assessment and is talking about making plans and actually making a plan to make plans to really address these major issues. I think that's huge. I think that's great. Thank you. Now, here's the but. The but always comes with us.

What I'm concerned about is my reading of the resolution is the only solutions that appear to be under considerations are solutions that take public housing out of the public housing portfolio and move it to Section 8 or to other portfolios which necessitate private ownership. Even if that private ownership is a wholly owned subsidiary, it's not quite public housing anymore.

And there doesn't seem to be any kind of exploration of can we get the D.C. government to pay for some or all of these repairs in order to keep this into public housing.

And I think it's important that we consider that option in addition to other options

especially, and I think it's very important that the options include really thinking about preventing displacement and keeping people in their communities.

I was at Park Morton earlier this week talking to folks who have really serious conditions issues in their units. And I asked every single one of them like what do you want. Do you want -- no, no, I don't want to move. I want to stay here. Even as they're telling me about what's wrong with their unit, I want to stay here, I want to stay in my community.

So I hope that as this, as DCHA moves forward making plans that you will work with the advocates, that you will work with the residents, that you will work with the D.C. council and the mayor to develop options that, a, keep our public housing public and, b, really prevent displacement and really help people stay in the communities that they have developed over time, because it is important for people to get to stay in their communities. Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much,
2	Lori.
3	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I have a
4	question. I'm going to give you a hypothetical.
5	MS. LEIBOWITZ: Sure.
6	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I live in
7	Park Morton. I just came to the Board with ten
8	residents, not the Board of Commissioners, the
9	resident have identified an adjective and when we
10	place those adjectives into a formula of words,
11	you are now living in a condemned unit.
12	If your unit is, have lead, asbestos,
13	you're complaining about your balcony that's
14	deteriorating, now the Board didn't identify it.
15	You did.
16	Now, once you made all those
17	identification, and I'm a family Commissioner.
18	Now, once you made all those now, I've heard
19	this over and over. Now, when I look at what you
20	are saying, and I'm applying it with 24 CFR, and
21	24 CFR is not just about organizing.
22	Whether you like it or not, the District

of Columbia is a municipal corporation. It is not a state nor it's a county. We only have policies, guidelines, municipal regulations in Housing and Urban Development. Now, we all know that.

Now, once I do that and you come along and somebody else next door to me, the majority of them, they want to stay there. Now, one of my fiduciary responsibility is to money. I'm a resident first. I'm looking at your life. So I didn't identify where you live at. I live in Potomac Gardens. I don't identify where you live at. You do.

So, once you make that identification, you have an 11-member Board. I'm going to be outvoted, because whoever was your organizer or whoever -- and when I say organizer, I'm not talking about Empower DC, et cetera. It could be your executive board or it could be a resident advocating for residents.

Now, the next thing I know you'll be sitting in front of us telling us who you're suing because we have allowed them, the person that

identified their own. And so we're going to go 1 along with the masses. So we're going to let you 2 3 stay in Park Morton, et cetera. So now when the ceiling fall down on your head, how much is the 4 Who will be sued? And who's going to 5 lawsuit? represent those tenants? 6 7 So, when there's a Commissioner in my position when it comes to a resolution, I'm only 8 speaking for Aquarius Vann-Ghasri, the elect family 9 Commissioners. 10 There's only three Commissioners up here that's elected. 11 Okay? 12 So, now, even though my peers have gone 13 that far with me, you share with me what should I do when I know it wasn't the Board that identified 14 your community as being condemned. You did. 15 Now, you already know about how the 16 17 voucher goes because there's too -- first of all, 18 if I come to your legal aid, you're the first one 19 will give me my first lesson if DCHA don't. So, if I already know that I live in 20 Park Morton, this is a process that's been going 21

on since the Honorable Marie Wittfield, who signed

off on Park Morton to have a new community. And it's not my fault, because even the Housing Authority or maybe it's you, you know, your organization.

All I know as the Commissioner, nobody like hearing my mouth, because I talk too long, because I want to give you the history of your community. I want you to know what the leader did before you. I want you to understand what role you have played in it.

And now, you're going to place a position for three elected Commissioners that's on this Board to make a decision. Do we save lives? Do we make sure that the Housing Authority gets sued, because you're the one who identified your community? And in doing that, whomever is the director of the Housing Authority is going to send inspectors out there. Now, they find that's right. So, now, you got -- I'm looking at that area.

Now, we're talking about gentrification. And we are talking about public housing. Now, you have two types of public

housing. You have traditional, conventional public housing. And I don't live in conventional public housing in Potomac Gardens. But Park Morton does.

Now, what's the difference? In Potomac Gardens, in order for it to have a life cycle that was more than 30 years old, we had to have assets management to come in. That was a change, because without it, we would have never lived on that hill this long for anything else to happen.

Now, let's flip it. Now, let's look at other public housing communities around here. Right up the street from you, whether you know it or not, there's Julius Hobson Plaza. The residents that live there never said tore them down. What they did was they had a class first. They understood real estate. And I'm not talking about Sursum Corda. I'm talking about 80 New York Avenue.

Now, right today, you see the average person that lives there have no education, came

under the Barry administration, had civil service exams, had a job. And to date, they own their condos. Bates Street, they own their houses. That's under Jasper Burnett and the honorable late Bob Moore.

I have a problem as a Commissioner when we all are so intelligent. You have resident council presidents that sit before me just like you who have been there for 20 years. Now, you want to flip. And you have new residents coming every day.

The question is not how residents get informed. The question is how will they continuously to get informed without a cell phone, without coming down here. Okay. I don't know how to read. So, when you mail something to me, that don't mean nothing either.

So now, I'm caught, I'm really caught, because I don't come down here and say what I need to say because just because your apartment is condemned -- and I'm going to say it like it is.

See, the man that lives with me in my

But what I do is get his friends. They're going to come in and plaster. They're going to make sure that I live in -- somehow mentally, here's what I need you to do is to tell this Housing Authority that when we're living like that and if a family decides to paint their unit and keep the receipt and they deduct that from our rent, because many of us, we live in homes.

Barry Farm was somebody's home. Every house in Berry Farm didn't look like somebody's house. I know of residents that live in Barry Farm that they did their own painting. They did their own plastering. They didn't use public housing refrigerators. They had their own. And if necessary, they may have brought their own stove.

Now they're in trouble. They're in trouble because they didn't go through the right proper procedures, and I'm about to end it, to hook up the stove.

So now, when you look at that whole big scenario, and this has happened nationally, the

1	question is what do we do. How do you pass a
2	resolution? Who do you listen to, your
3	constituents, or do you listen to the facts?
4	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,
5	Commissioner.
6	MS. LEIBOWITZ: Thank you. I mean, I
7	think
8	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Lori, and if you want
9	to respond quickly.
10	MS. LEIBOWITZ: Very quickly, I think
11	in answer to your question, I 100 percent advocate
12	that things need to be fixed, no argument from me
13	there, and that people should not be stuck living
14	in places where I would not want to live with my
15	children.
16	What I'm asking is that we explore all
17	the available options, including potentially
18	advocating with the D.C. government to put money
19	into the repairs, and that we engage advocates and
20	residents in the conversation about, you know, here
21	are the options that we've developed.
22	Here are all the numbers. Here's where

1	the problems are Here are the bodroom sizes of
Τ	the problems are. Here are the bedroom sizes of
2	where the problems are, and then how do we solve
3	this problem that we explore all the options, not
4	just some of the options, and that we really engage
5	the community in the solution.
6	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: All right. Thanks
7	so much.
8	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you
9	so much.
10	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Amanda Korber?
11	Welcome.
12	MS. KORBER: Thank you. Thank you for
13	the opportunity to speak today. My name is Amanda
14	Korber. I am a staff attorney at the Legal Aid
15	Society of the District of Columbia. I'm here to
16	share Legal Aid's concerns about this resolution
17	specifically and also about the direction DCHA
18	appears to be going with its public housing stock
19	generally.
20	We have never, the advocacy community
21	has never rejected the notion that the District's
22	public housing is in need of serious repair. What

we do reject is a resolution, this resolution that only requires DCHA to explore one way out of this problem, especially when that one way out of the problem is privatization.

Privatizing public housing is not new in D.C. And we have seen firsthand that privatization, what privatization has done to public housing tenants and their homes.

Prior recent private developments are already falling apart and in disrepair and have management companies that don't know or don't care to follow critical public housing rules, which puts all public housing tenants at risk.

It seems like you understand these concerns. In your resolution, you note that privatizing public housing can lead to the loss of tenants' rights, to DCHA's loss of control over the economic value of its properties, and just loss of control over the properties generally, the loss of long-term affordability, and the degradation in tenants' quality of life.

These concerns that you accurately lay

out in your resolution are precisely why DCHA should be required to explore alternatives, such as working with the local District government to preserve our public housing stock before rushing to privatize to dig ourselves out of this problem.

Therefore, Legal Aid requests the Board require DCHA to do the following.

Share with tenants and advocates all reports in its possession regarding the condition of its public housing properties and the projected costs of needed repairs so that we can adequately assess any plan the Agency puts forth to resolve these problems.

Prepare multiple plans for the preservation of public housing, including at least one that does not involve privatizing and selling off people's homes, and working with tenants and advocates to develop these plans before presenting them to the Board.

It's alarming to Legal Aid that a resolution as important as this is being considered before DCHA has talked to tenants and advocates

to get input about what its priorities should be while developing its redevelopment framework.

We would urge the Board to delay voting on this resolution. But if you are going to pass it, we urge you to require DCHA to, at a minimum, consult with its residents and incorporate their input before making plans that can change the course of their lives.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I'd like to say something on that, too. As I stated, Potomac Gardens is private. The only problem I have with privatization is the unions, because the maintenance and those who staff it, they are not in the union.

And what I see there is this. I see that living in Potomac Gardens, when my manager has three and four and five complaints because the person that came in your unit did not prepare it properly, they fire him. They don't have to go through no grievance. You maybe can get your unemployment.

If you are managed by DCHA, you're in the union and you have the right to grieve. So the only thing I see with, when you privatize a public housing, you're cutting out the right of a person with the union. So that's something that you have to think about with that.

Now, let's look at the trends. Sursum Corda was privatized. And the District of Columbia Housing Authority owned those 29 units, townhouses that's called a turnkey. With Sursum Corda being private, it outlasted the life circle. When gentrification came through, every tenant in there received a check in their name with dollars, along with a federal voucher.

And I want to know why Legal Aid is not looking to make sure that the rest of the communities that may be at threat will educate our resident councils how to make that happen in their communities. You already have a model. So why are you keep on trying to keep the wheel going?

We cannot keep looking at what has already been done. Now, the only thing we need

now in the District of Columbia, we need your organization to get out there and write the perfect community benefit program for economically challenged individuals.

Now, we had under the Marion Barry administration, like let me give you example like James Creek. Can James Creek be something that the city would allow only public housing residents to purchase their home in James Creek for one dollar?

You can only -- in order to do that, you have to live in public housing or you have to live in the housing choice voucher program. And those residents in James Creek that do not have that vision, then the Housing Authority moved them. And those of us who have that vision, we have the right to purchase them homes as is just like a lottery. That's thinking out of the box.

And we have residents in public housing that can do that. Public housing residents have degrees from PhDs to masters and AAs. They just never had the opportunity to be employed. So what

are we going to do about it? 1 I agree with everything 2 MS. KORBER: 3 you are saying, which is why I think it's so 4 important that the Housing Authority, and I know Mr. Garrett talked about getting community input, 5 why I think it's so important to get their input, 6 because I think the residents have the most valuable 7 ideas in --8 COMMISSIONER 9 VANN-GHASRI: Mr. 10 Garrett came to my property, Potomac Gardens. Не received the input. The input is I 11 support 12 privatization. My community don't. They want a 13 change. So I told Mr. Garrett the change is 14 we'll go back to DCHA and let DCHA manage it. 15 16 already have lived a 15-year life cycle with 17 privatization. It was a success. 18 That's why I'm not running for the 19 Commissioner either, because I want to go down with 20 assets management and I want people to see a trend. 21 And when Mr. Garrett says that we've done something

for 15 years and it needs now to be turned back

1	over to DCHA to see what, because DCHA should be
2	able to do that, let me go on record and say this.
3	As residents, if you're not educated
4	and you're listening to the wrong messenger and
5	you don't want to educate yourself, you're going
6	to get what you ask for. And when you get it and
7	living in a municipal corporation, please don't
8	come back up here and say you didn't know, because
9	your resident council president's been trying to
10	tell you. The advocacy group been trying to tell
11	you. The attorney's been trying to tell you.
12	But, guess what? If you're going to
13	have a democracy, the democracy is whatever the
14	majority want, I'm going to make sure you get it.
15	And when you live with it, remember this. You're
16	
	speak it into existence.
17	speak it into existence. CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,
17 18	
	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,
18	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you, Amanda.
18 19	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you, Amanda. MS. KORBER: Thank you.

I have a little frog in my throat. Good afternoon. 1 My name is Rebecca Lindhurst. I'm a managing 2 attorney at Bread for the City's legal clinic. 3 4 It's good to see you all. Thank you for the opportunity to speak 5 Admittedly, in the 16 years I've been doing today. 6 this work, this is the first time I've ever 7 testified before the Board of Commissioners. 8 Well, welcome again. 9 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: 10 MS. LINDHURST: The fear invoked by this resolution, however, left me no choice but 11 12 to come and speak today. Over the last two decades, advocates 13 have participated in countless robust discussions 14 with D.C. Housing Authority. We've discussed 15 16 everything from pet policies to how to deal with the unwieldy waiting list. The collaboration has 17 18 been fruitful and, in my opinion, led to better 19 programs and policies for the thousands who depend 20 on DCHA for affordable housing. 21 However, I've been disappointed in 22 DCHA's unwillingness with current to work

advocates. Bread for the City, Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless, and Legal Aid, and other organizations have long been partners with this agency in thinking through difficult policy initiatives and ensuring that our clients' interests are protected.

The exclusion of advocates in discussions about the direction of the agency over the past few months is deeply concerning. Our agencies have fought alongside DCHA for decades to provide housing for those most in need. We have the historical knowledge and institutional memory that can benefit its current leaders, yet we've been shut out.

Our ask today is that advocates get a seat at the table and that we get answers to the questions we've been posing for some time. We'd like to have a conversation about the problems presented by this resolution. We'd like to see the data that's available. While advocates have asked for data, we've been in the dark about the findings.

1	We'd like to discuss an analysis of the
2	cost of all the competing options, including an
3	option that doesn't result in the loss or
4	privatization of public housing.
5	We'd like to consider with you whether
6	renovation can be done without displacement. We'd
7	like to know what opportunities will exist for
8	resident input and community involvement.
9	Also, we'd like to consider what, if
10	any, conversations have happened with the city
11	council about funding all of the potential options.
12	The resolution appears to be a vaguely
13	worded blueprint to give DCHA the power to make
14	decisions about communities without any input, but
15	more likely appears to be a threat to public housing
16	as we know it.
17	And more concerning, it includes the
18	ability to get around the commitment to build first
19	at some properties, which should be a priority for
20	everyone involved.
21	Frankly, the possibilities for
22	residents of public housing presented by this

resolution are terrifying. While we clearly don't want residents to remain in housing that is unsafe or unhealthy, moving forward with an emergency resolution is not the answer.

historical As know from you а perspective, D.C. has a terrible track record of destroying communities of color through redevelopment. Beginning with the destruction of a predominantly African American community in Southwest in the '60s and more recently the demolition of Arthur Capper/Carrollsburg, redevelopment has displaced thousands of people of color.

One of my first cases was representing a woman who was one of the last residents living in the family section of Arthur Capper. She is still bouncing around with her voucher, still unstably housed.

Finally, I'll note that this resolution seems to make an end run around the commitment to build first at sites like Park Morton. That site provides a real opportunity to do redevelopment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	in a thoughtful way. Ensuring that no residents
2	are displaced from the community prevents tragedies
3	at Southwest and Capper/Carrollsburg.
4	While not immediate, it's the right
5	thing to do so that residents who have lived in
6	that neighborhood for decades can continue to live
7	in a prospering community and enjoy the amenities
8	that have built up around them in recent years.
9	Thank you.
LO	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much
L1	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I've got a
L2	question
L3	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Can you hold a
L 4	second?
L5	MR. GARRETT: Commissioner
L6	
L7	Vann-Ghasri, thank you. I just want to speak.
	I believe, Commissioners, you also know
L8	that in our process of bringing this resolution
L9	to you and earlier in our symposium, Mackenzie
20	worked with us. Mackenzie also did interviews with
21	stakeholders, understanding that we were going to
22	be bringing ideas and concepts like this to the

table.

And they actually spoke to Ms. Lindhurst I think directly about her position on our portfolio and some of our efforts that we were going to be taking. So there was a direct communication.

In addition, just in December I held a meeting with the advocates, as we do every three months. I come to the meetings. And we discussed the overall portfolio and the stabilization and the need to garner partners.

And there was the request for a subcommittee to be created with the Housing Authority and the actual advocates. And that occurred actually in December.

And I believe there was a representative from Bread for the City who asked for a link to our risk assessments, which identified all of our properties which we had done lead risk assessments. So that analysis was available, and it actually was offered and requested and offered at our last advocate meeting.

So there is dialogue between the Housing Authority and the advocates. Whether or not we agree on all terms, that remains to be seen.

And we're going to try our best to work through it.

We're not trying by any means to displace anyone. And I need to make that clear. We're looking for an opportunity to figure out a way to sustain and stabilize our portfolio as it currently exists, understanding our needs of \$1.3 billion over 10 years with 343 needed in the next year.

And when we talk about what are our options, yes, maintaining public housing in its current state is an option that we are going to explore. But it will take a strong commitment from various stakeholders. And if we don't have that commitment, then we're going to have to explore other options that may be outside of the conventional public housing approach.

But asking the District government for support is on our priority list. That's one thing

1	that we are doing and have done thus far. And
2	there's going to be ongoing communications about
3	that.
4	So I don't want anyone to think that
5	we're not exploring all the opportunities, the only
6	thing that we can do is to go outside of the Section
7	9 program. That's not the case. And in terms of
8	displacing residents or purposely displacing
9	residents, that's not something my administration
10	is going to do.
11	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you.
12	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Rebecca, I
13	just want to know this. In your role as Bread for
14	the City, and this deals with vouchers, have Bread
15	for the City yet did any type of trend on rental
16	discrimination among people of color using the
17	vouchers once they received the vouchers during
18	relocation?
19	MS. LINDHURST: I actually skipped
20	that paragraph of my testimony because I was out
21	of time. So I
22	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: You have

the right now to answer that question.

MS. LINDHURST: Thank you. We have serious concerns about relocating folks with vouchers. The market is saturated. We get calls, so many calls from residents who are trying to use a voucher and can't use it because landlords are discriminating against them, landlords don't want to take vouchers. There isn't enough enforcement of the non-discrimination against voucher holders in the District.

And frankly, most folks are using their vouchers in neighborhoods that are east of the river or in neighborhoods where there isn't access to public transportation, isn't access to grocery stores or doctors or other needs in the community.

So, when we look at folks who are living in properties that are in neighborhoods that are developing, we need to keep those residents in those neighborhoods, because giving folks a voucher really ends up with folks bouncing around, living in substandard properties.

I know you all inspect properties. But

1	there are so many voucher properties that are not
2	in compliance with the housing code. And folks
3	with poor credit or have a landlord-tenant eviction
4	case on their record, it's almost impossible for
5	them to use a voucher.
6	And to top it all off, DCHA has
7	instituted a new policy where they're snatching
8	people's vouchers back if they don't use them fast
9	enough. And so we've got people who finally get
10	a voucher and then lose it because the market can't
11	take vouchers.
12	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Redlining,
13	do you find with Bread for the City that residents
14	who are in a position to take their voucher to use
15	as a down payment for housing? Have Bread for the
16	City been keeping a trend on any redlining
17	practices? Is that existing in the District
18	MS. LINDHURST: Do you mean for home
19	purchase?
20	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes, as it
21	
22	MS. LINDHURST: We haven't really

worked with any home purchase. I did a few a decade 1 But I haven't helped any voucher holders 2 3 purchase --4 COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So your concentration really has been mostly with public 5 housing. You've been helping a lot with relocation 6 and some of our issues with using vouchers with 7 our slum landlords. 8 9 Now, let me ask you another question, 10 whether or not Bread for the City have a list of slum landlords. At one point in time, 11 12 Washington Post, if you recall, used to place and let us know all the slum landlords. That is no 13 longer a feature, whether, it's not even in social 14 media with them. 15 16 So my question would be whether or not Bread for the City is keeping a trend of slum 17 18 landlords in all eight wards of the District of 19 Columbia. 20 MS. LINDHURST: We certainly have 21 repeat landlords that we struggle with. I think 22 more importantly the attorney general has been

1	prosecuting landlords that are not doing the right
2	thing by their residents. And so I think the target
3	has been to sue landlords who aren't maintaining
4	their properties.
5	You know, the names I'm not going to
6	say here, but are certainly in the newspaper on
7	a regular basis. We know those names. We don't
8	maintain a particular list. I think it's just
9	familiarity with, oh that guy, he rents to voucher
10	holders because he can, you know, he seems like
11	he can get away with not taking care of their
12	properties.
13	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Rebecca, thank you
14	so much.
15	MS. LINDHURST: Thank you.
16	MR. GARRETT: Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Nathaniel Aquino?
18	Welcome.
19	MR. AQUINO: Thank you very much.
20	Good afternoon. My name is Nathaniel Aquino. And
21	I'm an attorney with AARP's Legal Counsel for the
22	Elderly. We are a non-profit organization whose

goals are to protect, defend, and empower low-income residents 60 years and older.

First, I would like to thank the Board of Commissioners for the opportunity to testify today.

At the outset, what I would like to make clear, and I think a lot of the testimony that we've already heard today has touched on this, is that no tenant who has to live in substandard housing conditions wishes to do so for any longer than they have to.

For years, tenants and tenant advocates have raised issues that Resolution 19-01 seem to address, which is that DCHA's housing stock is falling apart. For years, Legal Counsel for the Elderly and other advocates have testified before the D.C. council about the worsening conditions in public housing units.

And for just as many years, DCHA has deferred making repairs, giving various reasons for its inability to do so. Again, public housing tenants want and deserve safe, sanitary, and

habitable housing just as this Board does.

But I'm testifying today to make two points. First, this resolution purports to drastically alter the very nature of the public housing program through the transfer of ownership and the subsidy conversion. Doing so would diminish vital tenant rights beyond repair.

Second, by hastily rushing through this process without providing any information to the public or seeking the input from tenants or their advocates, this proposal sends a chilling message, whether intended or not, that DCHA is making decisions without key stakeholders' input, or excuse me, key stakeholder input from tenants most affected by these changes.

This is particularly disappointing given a long-term spirit of collaboration between the Housing Authority and organizations such as Legal Counsel for the Elderly.

Now, we did note that there is a vague reference in one of the exhibits to making every attempt allowable under the law to not diminish

tenants' rights. However, by its very nature, the inclusion of such a caveat acknowledges the fact that invaluable rights may be lost.

For instance, what transfer rights will tenants have in these new units? As we know, relocation of 160-plus Arthur Capper residents took over 3 months to accomplish and that cooperation, and it took the cooperation of numerous agencies and organizations.

Additionally, due process rights will be impacted, due process rights such as the right to review one's file, the requirements that all public housing leases require good cause standard for eviction, the right to a written notice of termination stating with specificity any reason for termination so as to allow the tenant an opportunity to prepare her defense, the right to informal conference public with housing an officials in most cases, and the right to a formal grievance hearing before an impartial decision maker in most instances.

This is just a quick sampling, but it's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

clear that transferring ownership to private entities or subsidy, or changing a subsidy type irreparably strips public housing tenants of their essential rights.

In light of what is at stake, it is critical that DCHA not forge ahead with this proposal without first providing information to the public and seeking input from those most directly impacted. It is essential that DCHA provide data and comparative analyses as to other competing options.

We, therefore, implore this Board to table this proposal that strips public housing tenants of their most essential rights, instead, give DCHA staff, stakeholders, city council, tenants, tenant advocates time to sit down and truly analyze what is best for the future of public housing in the District of Columbia.

My colleagues and I at Legal Counsel for the Elderly will be happy to answer any questions either myself today or by follow-up email that you might have going forward. And I

1	appreciate your time. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much.
3	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Question.
4	MR. AQUINO: Yes, ma'am.
5	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: My
6	question is you read the resolution, correct?
7	MR. AQUINO: Did my best,
8	Commissioner, but I echo what Ms. Lori Leibowitz
9	said earlier, which was it changed a little bit
10	this morning. And we also didn't get a copy of
11	it until just a couple of days ago. So we're doing
12	our best to scramble to be able to address what
13	was in there.
13 14	was in there. COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So have you
14	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So have you
14 15	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So have you ever been to an advocate meeting with the director?
14 15 16	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So have you ever been to an advocate meeting with the director? MR. AQUINO: I go to every single one.
14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So have you ever been to an advocate meeting with the director? MR. AQUINO: I go to every single one. COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So, when
14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So have you ever been to an advocate meeting with the director? MR. AQUINO: I go to every single one. COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So, when you met with the director, did he or did he not
14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So have you ever been to an advocate meeting with the director? MR. AQUINO: I go to every single one. COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So, when you met with the director, did he or did he not say that he now, I'm going to be honest with

I know is residents.

So, when it comes to your organization, do you have a class for the elderly who attends your meetings and you share with them if you know that they live in public housing or let's say you know they live in a housing choice voucher program?

So do you have workshops with them so that they can comprehend and understand with clarification and understanding and transparency what is going on in their particular housing market and you assign them a AARP lawyer to talk to them separately if there's a misunderstanding, because if you're not doing it, I challenge you to do it? And you will become a partner of the District of Columbia Housing Authority by helping us educate.

Everybody come in front of us and always telling us how we're supposed to educate. Now, we already got you on -- first, we weren't even computer literate here. So now it took a Board of Commissioners, some of the Commissioners to fight so you could be on Facebook, so you could be on Twitter, so you can be on social media, so

that you can hear what we are hearing. Okay? So that ain't working.

Okay. So now you mailed everybody letters in the mail. That ain't working because the mail don't always work either. Okay.

Could you give me -- seriously, do you think that AARP could start a TV show? And on that TV show it only going to talk about how you read a resolution, tools, how to read a resolution, how you read it when it impacts you, because I'm going to be honest, first, it got to impact my community first before I could deal with yours. If I haven't cleaned up my community and advocate for it, how can I advocate for yours?

So I'm saying that girl with the Legal Aid, if all of you all could find a way to join partnership with us with communication so when your clients come to you, because you have that one-on-one time with them, maybe you could extend a more 10, 15 more minutes. And then you have them sign a note or something, because, see, we don't do that.

See, if a resident, if they have a meeting here, you have the right to sign in or sign-in sheets are voluntary. It's not a mandatory situation. So, if this room was filled up with 15 residents and they decide not to sign that sign-in sheet, you would never know 15 people was here unless they do a release with a press release.

So, if you all can all get together in the next two years before the two years is over with, figure out a way how you can help us to communicate and get our message across so that all the stakeholders, that's first the residents and then you all, because all of you all already know, because most of you all are lawyers, developers, et cetera, whatever.

So, when you all get together, you all don't do a lot of venting. You all come to the table with a course of action and an agenda. You know the purpose and the mission. There's no screaming and hollering, because you already done — see, you respect each other enough to learn the history of the community. And then you, okay,

1	teach us those same skills as residents so we can
2	be as successful as you. Thank you so much.
3	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,
4	Commissioner.
5	MR. AQUINO: Madam Commissioner, I
6	appreciate the question and the comments. I think
7	one thing my colleagues and I are always trying
8	to do is to try to figure out different ways to
9	touch different people.
10	I do my best to try to talk to as many
11	resident councils and tenant associations that I
12	can, because you're absolutely right. These are
13	rights. And it's an education that needs to
14	happen. And it starts sometimes from the ground
15	up and to be proactive about it rather than being
16	reactionary, which is often what we're, what we
17	end up doing.
18	And I think we'd welcome the
19	opportunity to get into more of these buildings
20	and to talk to more tenant advocacy organizations,
21	but also tenants themselves face to face.

I can't, I just want to say I can't speak

1	for the AARP itself, because we are a subsidiary
2	thereof under the larger umbrella. But I can speak
3	for Legal Counsel for the Elderly in that we echo
4	your sentiments and that education is absolutely
5	essential for all tenants and all public housing
6	residents.
7	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much.
8	MR. AQUINO: Thank you all for your
9	time.
10	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Courtney Alexander?
11	Welcome, Courtney.
12	MS. ALEXANDER: Hi. Thank you for the
13	opportunity. I'm Courtney Alexander. I'm with
14	the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
15	and Urban Affairs. The committee was founded in
16	1968 for the purposes of addressing civil rights
17	violations, racial injustice, and poverty related
18	issues in Washington D.C., including racial
19	inequity and other barriers to fair housing.
20	I will say that I echo the sentiments
21	of my colleagues who have testified today. The
22	committee is deeply concerned about the approach

to redevelopment outlined in the resolution. And we are concerned that it will not accomplish the stated goal of this Commission or of this Board, which is to maximize the availability of safe and affordable housing units in the District of Columbia.

The plan as currently outlined in the version of the resolution that we actually received yesterday will result in the loss of deeply affordable housing units in the District. And this will be especially catastrophic for families in need of larger units such as four and five-bedroom units.

Additionally, perhaps what's most disturbing about the version of the resolution that we received is what's missing from this document.

And in the spirit of transparency that Director Garrett mentioned, what we ask today is that pertinent information actually be released to the public, first and foremost the residents, but also the stakeholders and the legal services community that is represented here today.

And that information we're asking for is all of the data, the reports, and other documents that were used to reach the decisions and the conclusions included in this resolution.

Additionally, the location of the units at issue was not in the version that we received, a detailed analysis of the cost to repair the units instead of potentially demolishing those units in relation to the disposition that is contemplated in the resolution.

We also ask that the Board assemble a working group that includes a cross section of stakeholders, including but not limited to legal services organizations, many of which are represented here today, more importantly the residents, as well as other fair housing advocates.

We also ask that this Board postpone the vote on the resolution until such time that that working group has had an opportunity to review the information that we're asking to be released today.

We also ask that you consider during

that interim period reviewing the full written 1 testimony of the Washington Lawyers' Committee. 2 3 And finally, we will say that many 4 public housing units, yes, they are in need of extensive repairs. But this is not a new or an 5 unexpected issue. In fact, many of the residents 6 that have come to this Board and the advocates in 7 the room have pleaded with DCHA to fix those issues 8 for decades. And residents have lived with those 9 10 issues for decades. The Commission, the Commissioners, the 11 12 District of Columbia, DCHA, the advocates all owe 13 it to those residents to stop and take time to fully and thoughtfully come up with a solution for these 14 problems that doesn't inflict further harm on those 15 residents. Thank you. 16 17 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much. Can I ask a question? Go ahead, Commissioner. 18 19 UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: No, I --20 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So you talk a little 21 bit about assembling a working group. Could you 22 sort of give, no pun intended, a framework of what

MS. ALEXANDER: I think the primary goal of that working group would be to analyze that data that I mentioned to see fully what DCHA has been able to see. I think there was some talk about seeing some of the lead report or some of these other reports. But it is important to make decisions with all available information.

So the first thing would be to have that

So the first thing would be to have that working group see what DCHA has been able to see, and more importantly, to have all of these people who are going to be affected, so residents, but also the people with that legal knowledge of what their rights are, what the law mandates and allows, to have all of those people at the same table looking at the same information and maybe coming up with creative alternatives.

I agree. This is a massive problem, and it's been going on for decades. No one disagrees with that. And no one envies being kind of the face of that problem.

But I think that with those people, the

right people at that table we can come up with 1 creative solutions that both target the issue, fix 2 the issue, but also don't inflict additional harm. 3 4 So, as far as what people would be in or what organizations would be in that working 5 I think it has to include residents, 6 7 obviously, because these are the people who have to live in these communities. 8 But it should also include some of the 9 10 people that you heard from today who work with them day in and day out, who get the phone calls about 11 12 the landlords who don't take vouchers when we all 13 know that's illegal. So I think those people also have to be a part of that conversation. 14 have to have all of the available information. 15 16 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Appreciate it --17 COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I'm going to go a little further. I agree with you. 18 19 that working group, I'm going to craft it. 20 As a public housing resident, what I find is when you put -- okay, let's say hypothetical 21

that you just want to -- it's Park Morton.

22

But

1	when you have Lincoln Heights, Richardson
2	Dwellings, and Park Morton together it's going to
3	be chaos, because we all see, everybody look
4	at us as a group. We're not a group.
5	MS. ALEXANDER: Absolutely.
6	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: We're
7	territorial, whether we want to admit it or not.
8	And we come together on common grounds. We are
9	public and Indian housing.
10	So, therefore, I think the group is more
11	effective, if it's Park Morton you're dealing with,
12	the only people that need to be there are Park Morton
13	residents and Park Morton executive board. And
14	you don't need no outsiders.
15	And each community that you travel
16	through you need to talk to us, because this is
17	what happens. If you find somebody who have a mouth
18	like mine and they're from another community,
19	they're going to outtalk the person that's from
20	Park Morton. They've done used up all the time.
21	You see what I'm saying?
22	And I find that and here's a term

that I have created. In the fabric is the land. So urban is the District of Columbia, because we are urban municipal corporation. So, when you look at the urban design of the fabric, the fabric is us. We're the biggest thing going.

And the residents in the District of Columbia have not been taught, not been educated.

Now, I'm only talking about a targeted group.

So, when they come to the table, instead of us speaking with a calm voice, we are so angry because we have never, ever, ever had the opportunity to vent.

And then when you're going to put us in working groups, you put us in working round tables where you have everyone who's a facilitator that's on the same page.

First, in order to have a conversation with us, there need to be a one-on-one called vocabulary and terminology course. If you can't take that course, you can't be a part of the group no more, because what you find is you have one group of people in there. They understand the

1	terminology. They understand the vocabulary.
2	And they did these case studies, so whatever you
3	told me to do.
4	Now, you put somebody else in there.
5	I don't want to hear about something 50 years ago.
6	We're talking about right now and right then.
7	And if you can't and that will go for me, too.
8	And this will be hard for me to obey the ground
9	rules.
10	But the ground rules, that is the only
11	way that we will work ourselves out of what we're
12	doing in the District of Columbia, because, number
13	one, we have to organize residents first by
14	terminology. Can you help me with that?
15	MS. ALEXANDER: Actually, that's the
16	whole reason I'm at the Washington Lawyers'
17	Committee is to get closer to the community to
18	actually have those one-on-one conversations with
19	residents, tenant councils, all of those people.
20	I
21	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.
22	Take down my number and text me.

MS. ALEXANDER: Yes, ma'am. 1 COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: 2 3 202-627-9160. We have the target date. 4 January. We're going to meet in February. we're going to do it. We'll have -- February is 5 a short month. So, with your brains and my brains, 6 7 this should work real quick. And in March, you should be ready to 8 do what you need to do with your first group, because 9 10 if we don't target people right, DCHA will give you the language. They will use their own papers, 11 12 because they already know the HUD vocabulary, our 13 vocabulary, because that's one of the problems we have. 14 Residents sit there. We're talking 15 16 about something federal, and you give them a local 17 dialogue. Now, you're upset because the Board of Commissioners vote yes, because we understood it 18 19 was federal. And now, you didn't understand that. 20 And so, as we go in finishing out 2019, by 2020 21 we should be there. Okay?

CHAIRMAN ALBERT:

22

Courtney, I think

our executive director has some questions for you.

MR. GARRETT: I truly appreciate your comments, Ms. Alexander. One thing I do want to point out is that everyone who has spoken, and we've discussed this many times, has talked about decades of the same systemic problems happening within the Authority and across our portfolio.

I've been here 15 months and over that 15-month period directed the staff and the team to create an environmental task force to go into every single unit throughout our portfolio to identify exactly what our actual problems are so we would know how to address them. And that was the purpose of what we're trying to do.

Our risk assessment that we have performed, getting through that was important, because we want the health and safety of our families at the forefront of what we're trying to do, in addition to our legal obligation.

We have no intention of displacing again or treading on anyone's legal rights or opportunities within our portfolio. Our

residents, they're our stakeholders. Those are the people that we're serving, and that's part of our mission.

What I also want to say is that what we're trying to do now, this aggressive approach is based on a few things. It's based on the fact that we do have an infrastructure that has a timeframe on it where we have to make some improvements within the next 12 months, in some cases, in the shorter period, shorter timeframe than 12 months based on the time we began our lead risk assessments.

And those are things that we have been discussing throughout our conversations with not only the Board, but with the residents themselves at each community that we have gone out to for those risk assessments that we perform where there have been other conversations and dialogue between the administration and the residents. So our residents directly know what we're doing and know what we're facing.

In addition, this resolution is a

format, is a process in which we would undertake. 1 We have not identified any units for repositioning 2 3 or redevelopment from this resolution. We have created a framework and a 4 process for which we will bring it back to the Board 5 with all that information. And in doing so, we 6 would have engaged the residents directly so that 7 they have a clear understanding of what's going 8 9 on. 10 And in closing, we've known, and I've looked at documents, and I've looked at transcripts 11 12 where \$1.3 billion in needs, it's grown to that over the course of time. So this isn't something 13 new that has just sprung up. I think what it is 14 for many people is the first time that we're 15 16 aggressively saying we need to stop and make a 17 change. 18 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Thank 19 you, Courtney. Thanks for your time. Daniel, 20 you're up. Welcome. 21 MR. DEL PIELAGO: Good afternoon, 22 Commissioners.

1	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Good afternoon.
2	MR. DEL PIELAGO: Quick question
3	before I start, what's up with Commissioner Kenner?
4	He hasn't been here in a minute. We haven't seen
5	him in a while. Is he still part of the Board?
6	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: He is still part of
7	the Board, yes.
8	MR. DEL PIELAGO: Oh, okay. Are there
9	any regulations as to how many meetings they can
10	miss?
11	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: You can talk with the
12	Office of General Counsel
13	MR. DEL PIELAGO: I just haven't seen
14	him in a good while. So, and I know he's very
15	involved in all of this, so just asking.
16	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. Thank you.
17	MR. DEL PIELAGO: Okay. I'm Daniel
18	del Pielago with Empower DC. I just want to echo
19	the sentiments of my colleagues in the legal
20	community.
21	This is, to me, this is validation that
22	we've been doing some good work, because we have

been urging the Housing Authority to ask for local money. And I think that's a very good thing. We need local investment from our government, our local government, to save and improve public housing as we know it. We do not want to see continued loss of public housing.

While Director Garrett says that we're not trying to displace anyone, we have displaced a lot of people. That has been the, what's resulted from all of these developments we've seen, Cappers, Barry Farm. We'll most likely see that with Park Morton.

So, while there is some new energy in getting a baseline of what the problems are, the solutions that we see laid out here are old, demolition, partnering with private developers. They've all resulted in public housing residents being spread around the city and historic communities being lost.

So I just want to urge you all to consider that, Board, that we really do need something new. I do appreciate the director saying

that we're going to look at different things. But that's not -- you know, we've been talking about this. This came up on the advocate community, the legal community, the organizing community really fast. So we've been talking about this. And maybe we need to look at it a little bit more. But we're not seeing any new solutions to it.

You know, people at Barry Farm are in the wind. They're not in their community anymore.

They're in another ward. They're in other communities.

So, while we do agree -- I agree. I don't want anybody to be living in bad conditions. I don't want anybody -- you know, we've been to the properties where people who have literally fallen in through the ground of their home. We don't want to see that. We want to see improvement.

But the theory of change or the actual processes of change that we see and hear are nothing new. And they've all led to, as I will continue to say, to the loss of public housing, the loss of historic communities.

Barry Farm is trying to do something different. We're working on trying to -- you know, what do residents really want and how can we support residents in coming up with their own plan to do what they want so we can have ownership opportunities, as Commissioner Aquarius says.

So I would urge no votes on this until we have a real discussion on new ways of improving and saving public housing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you, Daniel.

MR. GARRETT: Commissioners, and thank you. I appreciate your comments. But we talk about new ways when we were, earlier this morning. The new ways are still very limited.

And what I mean by that, in terms of public dollars coming into the Housing Authority, I don't think there's any housing authority throughout the nation that could make that type of request of their city government, county government, or even state for that matter, to the magnitude that we need funding. We just don't have that capacity.

And I don't think the District -they've been very helpful, because we utilize the
repair and maintenance fund on an annual basis.
We apply for that. That money is given to us based
on the equation that the District uses. And we
utilize and put that money to good use. But it's
still not enough.

And even increasing that, as I said, our need for, within the next year is \$343 million to actually stabilize for just within the next fiscal year.

So what we're trying to do, we're trying to look at all of our options and put them together, whether it be money coming, more money coming from the District, if at all possible, and a combination of other resources that we might be able to put together, in addition to some of these other options that we're going to bring back to, not only to the public, but to the advocates, but also to the Board of Commissioners before any final decisions are made.

What we're talking about, again, from

this resolution is just the first stage to say this is the framework of how we're going to review and look at this.

We've already uncovered everything. We know what we're facing. Now, this is the process and how we're going to address the next decision that we have to make, whether or not we're going to put units into a rehabilitation status of some sort, whether it be public money being used or private equity coming in.

But this is just another step through that particular process. And I would hope that and encourage everyone to understand that this administration, that's what we're moving towards.

And we have to move at warp speed because there is some parameters by HUD that have incentives attached to it where we could obviously garner some more funding or additional funding to help that capital improvement or that capital need that we have for many of our units throughout our portfolio.

MR. DEL PIELAGO: I appreciate it.

-	
1	All I would respond is let's make sure we're not
2	losing more public housing and we're not displacing
3	residents out of their historic communities.
4	MR. GARRETT: I totally agree with you.
5	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much,
6	Daniel. Amber Harding? Welcome.
7	MS. HARDING: Thank you. Good
8	afternoon. I'm Amber Harding. I'm an attorney
9	at the Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless.
10	We agree that public housing is in a
11	serious state of disrepair. I don't need to tell
12	you how many public housing residents have
13	testified before this very commission and down at
14	the D.C. council about the terrible conditions that
15	they experience in public housing. This is not
16	a new problem.
17	In fact, we were the lawyers who brought
18	a class action against this agency in 1992 that
19	put it into receivership over its failure to
20	maintain its housing stock. That receivership
21	lasted until 2000.
22	We also agree the federal government

has failed to adequately invest in public housing infrastructure. We were there when that disinvestment began. And we partnered with this agency to fill the holes in its operating budget with local dollars for public safety at least a dozen years ago.

When community organizers like Empower DC began to raise the alarms about significant repairs needed in public housing, the Fair Budget Coalition advocated for local investments in repairs to public housing.

We might have been more successful in that advocacy if DCHA had been as transparent about the crisis as it is being today. Instead, DCHA leadership often claimed it could make do with much less. And even when it received local money, they had to be heavily pressured to use it for the health and safety risks that were there.

Now DCHA says it needs \$343 million this year to temporarily relocate residents and make needed repairs to 6,695 public housing units.

That's 84 percent of the public housing stock.

84 percent is in urgent need of repair. 1 That's not a problem that develops in 2 3 a month, a year, or even five years. That's gross negligence on a massive, unprecedented scale. 4 Nevertheless, here we are. After 5 decades of mismanagement, negligence, and ignoring 6 the pleas of public housing residents, the question 7 comes down to what can be done. 8 Unfortunately, we're at an emergency 9 10 meeting with very little opportunity to engage the And you, Commissioners, are being 11 community. 12 presented with a false choice between leaving 13 thousands of public housing residents in dangerously deplorable conditions and eradicating 14 a large portion of D.C.'s public housing stock and 15 16 displacing thousands of households. And to the director's point that this 17 is just the first stage, I want to point out that 18 19 this first stage very clearly forecloses the option we're asking you to consider. 20 21 If you look at paragraph 2 of your

resolution, it asks you to affirm that the most

effective available tools for addressing immediate conditions and ensuring long-term financial and physical viability would involve shifting properties from traditional public housing subsidy to a voucher system.

That's what you're being asked to decide. And that's why all of us are here asking you to consider a different option.

You've a better, more obvious choice.

Ask the mayor and the council for the funds you need to make these repairs. We'll support you in that ask.

While the amount seems large, it's not unprecedented for D.C. to invest that kind of money into infrastructure and capital improvements.

Just last year D.C. chose to increase the sales tax and raise \$178.5 million a year to improve Metro infrastructure. D.C. has also invested \$3 billion to modernize and renovate our schools. Public housing is just as critical of an infrastructure investment as schools and transportation.

1	D.C. has the money to do this. In 2017,
2	D.C. had a surplus of \$287 million. That's extra
3	money it dropped into the bank and didn't spend.
4	We don't yet know the numbers from 2018.
5	But D.C. is likely to have enough to get DCHA most
6	of what it needs towards the FY19 expenditures it's
7	asking for.
8	It's important that when developing its
9	options resolving this crisis the D.C. Housing
10	Authority consider the important and distinct role
11	that public housing plays in its housing ecosystem.
12	Many public housing households could
13	not secure units in the private market that meets
14	their needs, whether it's because there are too
15	few large family units, too few wheelchair
16	accessible units, or too few landlords that accept
17	applicants with poor credits.
18	If 2,500 public housing households are
19	forced to use a voucher instead, how many of those
20	households will have to leave D.C. to secure
21	housing?
22	We do not support leaving people in

1	uninhabitable apartments or homes where their
2	health is at risk. But we also do not support what
3	feels like the death knell for public housing,
4	converting thousands of units to vouchers or
5	redeveloping those properties into places our
6	clients will never be able to return to.
7	We urge you to require DCHA to develop
8	an option for fully funding the repairs and
9	renovations of all the units without losing any
10	public housing stock and to ensure that there is
11	a meaningful input process for public housing
12	residents about the futures of their homes.
13	We look forward to working with the
14	agency to develop such a plan and to advocate for
15	its funding. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Okay. Thank you so
17	much, Amber.
18	MR. GARRETT: Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Any questions for
20	Amber?
21	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: I have a
22	question. Give me that figure again, 6,690. What

1	did you say?
2	MS. HARDING: 6,695.
3	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Okay.
4	Now, let me ask you a question. So you feel that
5	the Board should vote no for this resolution.
6	MS. HARDING: I believe that the Board
7	should either vote no or modify the resolution to
8	include that the Housing Authority needs to come
9	up with an option for repairing those 6,695 units.
10	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So do you
11	see this resolution as a framework for
12	stabilization and repositioning?
13	MS. HARDING: I see it as a very limited
14	and narrow framework that excludes the most obvious
15	choice for how you would repair those units.
16	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And if you
17	was in our position, how would you prepare the units
18	that now now, we have to keep in mind that
19	Director Garrett has only been here for 15 months.
20	I've lived through the receivership as we know.
21	And I disagreed with the receivership,
22	because the District of Columbia vacancy rate was

made by Congress and DPAR from the beginning. And I always felt that the receivership was an attack on Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly, and at which time the District of Columbia didn't ask to be under receivership. And we did have a city. And if you know how our fundings are through Congress and then the other funding is through the mayor.

And I'm going to be quite frank with you. As a resident of the District of Columbia Housing Authority, I like the independency from, being an independent agency from the mayor. And I know what it was to live under a mayor. So I know the difference.

Now, I don't -- when we look at the District of Columbia government, and as we should know, when government plays a full part, because since I've been on this Board every time the city has helped us out, the city has control, the city calls the shot. I don't care. We put up the most money until the city had to use their new market tax credits. We do all that, but we're behind the ball.

So now, what should we really do? Now, you can't have it both ways, because life is not like that. And we're only talking about a municipal corporation, which is the District of Columbia.

We already know how many hosts that's already in Ward 6. We already know how many RAB, new preserved workable houses that we have and ever have, which is the only way that we're right now under Obama administration came up with RAB. Before there was RAB there was this, there was that, and that was the other.

So how do a housing advocacy group work out a formula or how do you save the rest of a housing stock that has all lived its life cycle? The only one who's free of the slave master is Langston, because it's historic preserve.

I don't understand why the legal community is not trying to get Kelly Miller to reserve, because Kelly Miller public housing have the same history, so that we can be moving that away one way with one group of housing while we're

dealing with what we have here, because now what I'm seeing is I'm still saying I don't see how we can have it both ways.

I can't have 50,000 residents coming in front of me like they did at 203 Greenleaf. Now, you're going to tell me -- and I'm having phone calls all night about you got rats, you want your building torn down, et cetera, et al. And I've gone through there and seen how many residents are still there in the rats.

supposed to let the So now do I residents stay in the rat-infested building while this Board figures out what to do or do I seize the opportunity under this Trump administration and work with whatever they have so I can get these residents out, because I'm tired of hearing residents telling me -- and some of them may be sitting in this room because they did the same thing in Barry Farms, because that's how it came down, by residents coming up here talking about your bad condition of your house.

You already know the Housing Authority

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

don't have no money. And you, yourself, how old 1 If you have an antique car, you're 2 is your car? 3 going to keep that in the garage. And you're going 4 to only drive that at special times. Then you're 5 going to have to get a new car. So what do we supposed to do, patch up 6 7 the houses? And you all better make sure we don't get sued if we follow your instructions. Or what 8 are we going to do when the next time one of my 9 10 constituents tell me that a rat done bit their child, but I voted for them to stay there until 11 12 we work it out? What am I to do? 13 MS. HARDING: So I --VANN-GHASRI: COMMISSIONER 14 mean seriously tell me what to do. 15 16 MS. HARDING: I think these are really important considerations for the plan. 17 18 actually want to highlight one of the things you 19 said, which you should always be very conscious 20 of whether any local money is going to come with 21 strings attached, absolutely, 100 percent, right?

that

experience is

My

22

when

local

government has given the Housing Authority money for public housing like for public safety it didn't come with strings attached. It was a recognition that the federal government had underfunded public housing. And it was understood that D.C. had an interest in supplementing that so that operations could be maintained.

But it is something that in the plan that I'm just asking to, this agency to create, there might be tradeoffs to every choice. But I don't think this Board can make an informed decision about the best choice without actually looking at what those, what the tradeoffs are to moving to a voucher supported system, what the tradeoffs are to getting public funds and having plans.

And I've seen a little bit of a plan from the Housing Authority that has estimated costs and breaks it down and includes a plan for temporary relocation for the residents while the repairs are happening.

And I do think that is the type of plan that we're looking to have fleshed out a little

bit more and with some of those conversations with local decision makers about, you know, infusing some funds to improve the infrastructure.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Go ahead.

MR. GARRETT: Okay. So thank you. I truly appreciate the opportunity to hear your concerns. And, Commissioners, I know we have discussed it and some things I might be repeating myself.

But I just want to just go back to the public ask, realizing and recognizing that our overall ask and need for viability -- and there's a distinction between viability and just immediate need. Viability is \$1.3 billion to increase life cycle for the units. And if we continue to delay that, that number increases over time from 1.3 to roughly we have said within the next 5 to 10 years somewhere between 1.7, if not higher.

Now, for one year, immediate fiscal year '19, just for patch work, not viability, not anything that would take us long term with the units, that's \$343 million.

MS. HARDING: Right.

MR. GARRETT: If you are a good steward of funding and from our position as the administration, you have to look for other avenues so that we're not just doing patch work, but we're creating some type of sustainability within our portfolio for life expectancy for the next 15 to 20 years.

And that's one of the pieces to this puzzle that we're going to be bringing to the Board, because again, what we're presenting today is a format for our process so that we can once again bring it back to the Board and explain how we've made decisions.

Some decisions may be made based on local funding coming to us. And the statement will be we don't have to seek any outside equity or any other opportunities because local funding can help support this particular initiative, this particular complex.

But there may be other cases where we'll have to present to not only the Board but also to

the public and the residents themselves of reasons why a particular complex may be in need of something different.

So, again, all we're presenting at this point in time is just our format and process. final decision that has to be made on a complex or any units that go into a repositioning mode, that's going to be based on a clear dialogue and clear information given the to Board of Commissioners so that all their questions answered and they feel comfortable and confident that the administration that they've entrusted to do their job on behalf of the residents and on behalf of the mission of the Housing Authority is doing just that.

MS. HARDING: So first I want to say that's not what your resolution says. It's really good to hear that. That's not what your resolution says. That's not what you're actually asking them to vote on. You're asking them to make a determination that the most effective available tool for addressing this problem is converting to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	a voucher system.
2	MR. GARRETT: And I
3	MS. HARDING: Hold on.
4	MR. GARRETT: And I respectfully
5	disagree with you. And the reason I do
6	MS. HARDING: I mean, that's what the
7	words say.
8	MR. GARRETT: Let me finish,
9	Counselor. Your interpretation, that's your
10	interpretation. But also, every effective tool
11	doesn't necessarily apply to every single complex.
12	It will be different applications to each complex
13	as we move through our analysis. So that doesn't
14	mean one size fits all. That means we're going
15	to evaluate each complex, each issue individually
16	and make a determination.
17	For instance, we could bring back to
18	this body within the next few months five different
19	approaches to five different complexes, all
20	different, some including public dollars and some
21	maybe not including public dollars. That's how

we're going to make our assessment.

So each complex is going to be unique. 1 Each decision is going to be unique. 2 3 MS. HARDING: And that is not what your 4 resolution says. MR. GARRETT: Okav. 5 So, hearing that, I think MS. HARDING: 6 7 that it would be helpful to amend it to say one of the available tools, not the most effective tools 8 are converting to a voucher system, because you're 9 10 saying you're going to present something that has a variety of possibilities. 11 And I would also caution you again 12 13 saying that \$1.3 billion is not feasible when I've given you what is \$156 million a year for Metro 14 going to equal, when school modernization was \$3 15 16 billion. That's significantly less than school 17 18 And I'm sure there were people when modernization. 19 they were looking at the crumbling public schools who said what are we going to do about this. 20 are jurisdictions that turned to privatizing their 21

public school system.

1	I am saying that should not be the
2	District of Columbia's choice. I am saying we have
3	precedent for choosing to invest in our
4	infrastructure and that we should make the policy
5	statement and decision that public housing is one
6	of the most critical parts of our city's
7	infrastructure that we have.
8	MR. GARRETT: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you so much,
10	Amber. This is a good note to hear from you,
11	Director Garrett, about the resolution. And
12	you've heard the you can go.
13	MS. HARDING: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. I've
15	known Amber for a while. I don't want to put her
16	on the spot.
17	But you've heard the concerns. And I'm
18	not going to try and reframe them, but particularly,
19	the concern about seeking or the encouragement,
20	not a concern, about seeking public funding to help
21	solve the problem. Amber outlined some tax
22	solutions and used some good examples with Metro

funding and with funding for our public school system.

And so I just want to make sure that, and I think you've said that to us in private and I want to make sure you say it publicly that we are not foreclosing on looking at public funding, whether it's public funding at the federal level, which we know is limited and non-existent, but public funding at the local level.

MR. GARRETT: And that's one thing I was going to bring up. No, we're not closed-minded. And we're looking at all our options, including public money locally and public money from the federal government from HUD.

But one thing I also want to talk about and just bring out, once again, is that, yes, there is declining funding from across the board for the public housing program. And it's decreased over time. And it will probably, based on the trend, continue to decrease.

So, again, now we're talking about not only doing infrastructure or stabilizing the

portfolio through an influx of capital, but we're also having to figure out a way to offer actual daily operational subsidy to maintain those units even after any work was done.

If we were fortunate to have that type of capital come in, where is the additional operating subsidy going to come from?

What do have options are and we availability of tools that would increase our operating money, operating subsidy on an annual basis to a particular complex that would give us the opportunity to continue to operate it at its fullest capacity and give residents the quality of life, because if we do something similar to what we've done before, which is utilize public dollars, put it in, but don't have the operating subsidy to sustain it, we'll be back at square one within the next five years.

It's a cycle that we want to figure out a way to break. And the administration is working hard to do that.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So let me ask a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	couple questions. And we'll see if Commissioners
2	have questions. So let's just say, name a complex,
3	just a term that you use.
4	MR. GARRETT: Just say A. Don't, no,
5	just say A
6	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Complex A?
7	MR. GARRETT: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: What I'm going to
9	call Amber's favorite complex today. That you
10	recognize, based on your assessment, that there
11	is a need for tremendous rehabilitation. What's
12	your process for vetting it with, one, the community
13	and, two, with the Board of Commissioners?
14	MR. GARRETT: Okay. Depending upon
15	which approach we would actually take, all of them
16	would require public input, especially from the
17	residents first and foremost.
18	We would go to the residents. There
19	is a series of meetings that we would have to have
20	with them, whether it be, even if it was just a
21	rehabilitation application or if it was a

demolition application or something that's a little

more extreme such as a conversion, there is public input, resident input that has to be maintained.

Now, one thing that we would do which would probably be different is, and it will be different, is that we would have an enormous amount of meetings versus the requirement. HUD says you have to have two or three meetings. We would go well beyond that, because we want everyone to be on board. And we understand the significance of what we're trying to do. So there would be a lot of public input, also resident input primarily.

Then, moving to the Board of Commissioners, as we've outlined, this doesn't just happen in a vacuum. We have our development and mod meetings on a monthly basis. We might have to have special meetings in the process if we're trying to make some deadlines and timeline for updating our MTW plan or getting information back to HUD.

So there may be some requests from the administration that the Board meet somewhat more frequently so that we can get the proper information

to you so there is an opportunity for dialogue, 1 questions, and a lot of discussion. 2 3 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So let me ask a 4 follow-up question. So why vote on this resolution Why not talk to every affected property 5 over the next few months? What's the haste? 6 Well, we do have the 7 MR. GARRETT: obligation that if we're going to move forward with 8 any applications based on a process that we might 9 10 choose or a procedure or a program through HUD such RAD or Section 18, which is a demo/dispo 11 12 approach, we have to have that in by June, the end 13 of June, June 30th I believe. That's the date where we have to have those applications in. 14 So, if we were to choose a direction, 15 we need to have those engagement meetings with 16 residents. 17 We need to be able to bring it back to the Board to have it vetted and have it into 18 19 HUD no later than June 30th. That is the current 20 date that is on the table for these applications. 21 In addition, because we are an MTW

authority, we have the obligation to update our

MTW, our Moving to Work plan, no later than I believe 1 it is May 1st. So we would have to go through that 2 3 particular process, get that information into HUD 4 by May 1st stating that we were going to take some measure and take some approaches. 5 So time for us is really condensed. 6 7 The staff will be working double time, if not triple time, in order to try and get as much information, 8 fact finding, overlay, possible scenarios, whether 9 10 they be economic or from an operational standpoint, financial approach and/or stabilization. 11 12 When I talk about stabilization, I'm 13 talking about recapitalization, any capital programs that we'd have to implement, in addition 14 to what other opportunities for economic growth 15 16 would be there, opportunities on which we've talked 17 little bit. Does that give 18 opportunity to influx capital? 19 There's a lot of things that we're going to have to do in a short period of time based on 20

deadlines that are set up by HUD.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT:

21

22

So, Lori, Amanda,

Nathaniel, Courtney, Amber all said they represent a diverse constituency. They would love to have input in this process. What's the framework, since we're using that word often today, to facilitate that input while still moving quickly?

MR. GARRETT: Well, we talked about it in December when we had the advocates in the room, about some type of subcommittee or subgroup that would be able to meet and discuss some of the things that we're talking about.

I think it would be something similar to what we did when we first proposed RAD, when I first came on board and we were talking about about talked the different RAD. And we distinctions between the RAD program and the conventional public housing where we outlined and redlined documents to show the distinctions and It probably would be something along differences. but just meeting a little more those lines, frequently.

Now, again, Commissioners, I have to say, taking in information from individuals, we're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not always going to agree. What you have in the 1 house now with the agency are true, dedicated 2 3 professionals that are going to make, attempt to make the best decision on behalf of the residents 4 and on behalf of the agency overall. 5 So there probably would be times when 6 7 there would be disagreement. But what you would get from the Housing Authority is the opportunity 8 for us to listen, take in information, and use that 9 10 information to better scope what we would bring back to your attention. 11 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: 12 Great. Additional 13 questions from Commissioners? GARRETT: Oh, and OGC would head 14 I'm going to put it on Ken. OGC would head 15 16 up the discussions with any advocate organizations. 17 We would just increase our frequency of meetings 18 that we already have. 19 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great. 20 COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: How does, 21 how would this resolution have direct input on my 22 constituents?

1	MR. GARRETT: As of this time, we
2	haven't identified, Commissioner Vann-Ghasri, any
3	complexes or any units that we might want to
4	reposition.
5	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Well,
6	let's act like it's a hypothetical.
7	MR. GARRETT: Hypothetical in D.C.
8	becomes gospel. And I'm worried about doing that.
9	But the reality is if we thought that
10	it was a property that we wanted to go and look
11	at, we would start engaging the residents. So we
12	would know in short time, and you would hear
13	definitely. We would engage the leadership of that
14	complex, start discussing what the options are,
15	what we're looking at, and why with a full
16	explanation.
17	COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Director
18	Garrett, you mentioned incentives with this HUD
19	timeline. Can you talk more about those incentives
20	and the reason why that timeline with, the end of
21	June is so important?
22	MR. GARRETT: Well, one piece to the

puzzle is that they would do expedited reviews of applications that we submit, meaning that it usually takes anywhere from 6 to 12, if not 24 months sometimes, to do a review of a demolition application. What HUD is saying now is that if we get our applications in, if that was a route we were to take for a particular complex, HUD would expedite their review for us to get us all the necessary approvals so that we could move forward.

Also, in addition to that, with the subsidy moving a program if possible if we did that to the Section 9, to the Section 8 program from Section 9 to Section 8, which would allow for additional subsidy to the units, it would be a conversion of, from ACC subsidy to what we consider a HAP subsidy, housing assistance payment subsidy, which is actually more money based on what we're paying now for the housing choice voucher program directly.

So, in a nutshell, doing it now while the iron is hot would give us the opportunity to probably receive more funding for a conversion if

that's something that we chose to do. We would 1 have more capital money. 2 3 I think one analysis that 4 actually did was that for one of our complexes we looked at it and just doing a conversion, nothing 5 more than just a conversion into a new funding 6 subsidy program, would allow us to have a \$4 7 million, \$4.4 million surplus. 8 And in my mind, you could take \$4.4 9 10 million as a surplus on an annual basis and recapitalize that property without doing anything 11 12 substantial, just the conversion. 13 COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: One more question, do we really have a problem with -- I 14 recommend changing the language 15 as Ann 16 suggested to one of instead of the most effective. 17 Can that be --18 MR. GARRETT: That's fine. 19 COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Well, Ι think the record needs to reflect it and it needs 20 21 to be moved in the right format so that we can be 22 compliance how to change in that language,

1	Counselor.
2	UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Ms.
3	Vann-Ghasri, will you accept it as a technical
4	amendment that we will assert post the vote?
5	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yeah, but if you
6	could absolutely. But let's make sure we
7	MR. GARRETT: We're clear on that.
8	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: clear on the
9	language and I sign off on it.
10	UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Great.
12	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Thank you.
13	MR. GARRETT: Or to clearly say that
14	we will include options for public dollars if
15	feasible.
16	UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Yes, we'll
17	make both.
18	MR. GARRETT: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: And how will
20	this impact HCVP?
21	MR. GARRETT: It would not. It would
22	not.

CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Go ahead. 1 COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: 2 Let's put 3 -- can we put on the record where do DCHA get the, 4 where do DCHA get its vouchers from, and when we're dealing with RAD, where do those vouchers come from, 5 and how many different type of vouchers does the 6 of 7 District Columbia uses through DCHA administering? 8 I think we have the local 9 MR. GARRETT: 10

rent supplement program locally for local tenant vouchers. But D.C. gets the majority of its vouchers, DCHA gets, receives the majority of its vouchers from the federal system, the housing choice voucher program.

In this particular case with RAD, we would be talking about tenant protection vouchers that would be coming into us, or if we did a conversion, there would be project based vouchers.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: And would you give a definition for the record what is the difference between a tenant voucher and a project based voucher?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. GARRETT: Okay. So the tenant
2	based voucher and the project based voucher are
3	similar. If we're just talking about the local
4	rent supplement program, that's something
5	different. That's just, that's through, funded
6	by the District government.
7	A PBV would be funded by the federal
8	government and it would require a HAP contract,
9	the housing assistance payment contract attached
10	to that particular property. And that's how the
11	subsidy would flow into the project.
12	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Is there
13	anything else you would like any other questions
14	from any of the Commissioners?
15	COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: I do.
16	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: I just
18	wanted to know if you could paint some of the
19	national context for this issue. We have talked
20	a lot about D.C. and know our own jurisdiction most
21	intimately, but if you could talk a little bit about
22	how is this issue surfacing around the country.

MR. GARRETT: Many housing authorities across the country are starting to participate in RAD. Some got out of the gate pretty late. If you remember, they had to extend and increase the number of units that they were allowing in the program when it originally was formed by HUD because housing authorities saw it as an opportunity to recapitalize their properties.

I know that in San Diego years ago before this whole RAD program got started they did do a major conversion of all of their, of the majority of their portfolio to a PBV concept, housing choice voucher concept. I know San Francisco has just done and is in the process of doing a huge RAD conversion of a majority of their portfolio.

I also know that Philadelphia is doing a conversion of some type within -- the larger housing authorities are doing it. And those are the ones that you hear about more than anything else. But there are a lot of smaller agencies throughout the nation who have done RAD

conversions.

An example of one that I worked on was Freeport, Illinois where they did a RAD conversion of their, of a senior building. It was an in-house rehabilitation of units without having to displace residents at all. But that was a way to recapitalize that particular property because the dollars that were coming in from the federal government were not enough to sustain it.

So housing authorities throughout the country are doing something. I think this number, I want to say over 100,000 units are being asked to be reviewed by housing authorities to reposition themselves for whatever reason that HUD has identified.

We're one of the agencies that has been asked to look at our portfolio also, which we were going to do anyway. And I just have to make that clear also.

Remember, we started our own environmental effort and initiative over 12, almost 12 months ago. So this effort was going to come

about whether or not we received an opportunity
or incentives from HUD or not. We were going to
be having this same discussion because we were
proactive in our approach, trying to get out ahead
of what we see as a no-win situation if we don't
act.
CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you.
Commissioner, any questions from you, Commissioner
Council? Great. So we've heard the public
testimony and the questions that Commissioners have
asked. We've been briefed on the resolution. At
this time, I would entertain a motion to approve
Resolution 19-01. Is there a motion to approve?
COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Second the
motion.
COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No, you
have to go on record. I move that Resolution 19-01
to adopt a framework for the stabilization and
repositioning of DCHA portfolio of properties be
moved and voted into the record.
CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: As amended,

1	right?
2	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: As amended, right.
3	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: As
4	amended. Thank you, Commissioner.
5	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: So it's seconded.
6	Can we have a roll call?
7	MS. MCNAIR: Thank you. Commissioner
8	Neal Jones?
9	COMMISSIONER NEAL JONES: Yes.
10	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner St. Jean?
11	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.
12	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Strickland?
13	COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND: Yes.
14	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Taliaferro?
15	COMMISSIONER TALIAFERRO: Yes.
16	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner
17	Vann-Ghasri.
18	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Abstain.
19	MS. McNAIR: Commissioner Council?
20	COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.
21	MS. McNAIR: Chairman Albert?
22	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.

1	MS. McNAIR: You have six yes, one
2	abstention. The resolution is approved as
3	amended.
4	MR. GARRETT: Thank you,
5	Commissioners.
6	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you very much.
7	So I really want to thank the public, I thank
8	Commissioners also, for coming out today on short
9	notice and really just shedding light on the
10	important issues facing our residents in public
11	housing.
12	I was pleased to hear everyone
13	acknowledge that the conditions under which our
14	public residents or public housing residents are
15	living are just no longer acceptable. And that's
16	what we are trying to change here at D.C. Housing
17	Authority.
18	My commitment to you is to work with
19	you in not just the advocacy community but with
20	the residents to make sure as we look at property
21	by property that we don't foreclose on any options

for renovations.

And so we will ensure that this, this
Board will ensure that the staff at Housing
Authority is keeping the dialogue going not just
today but beyond today.

So thank you so much for coming to our meeting today. Our next Board meeting is on February 13th right here at the D.C. Housing Authority headquarters. And we are adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:16 p.m.)