DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

HOUSING AUTHORITY

+ + + + +

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
DECEMBER 5, 2017

+ + + + +

The Housing Authority Board of Commissioners met in Hearing Room 220 South at 1133 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 11:00 a.m., Neil Albert, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT

NEIL ALBERT, Chairperson
TYRONE GARRETT, Executive Director
BRIAN KENNER, Commissioner
AQUARIUS VANN-GHASRI, Commissioner
FRANK LANCASTER, Commissioner
KENNETH D. COUNCIL, Commissioner
SHELORE FISHER, Commissioner
WILLIAM SLOVER, Commissioner
NAKEISHA NEAL JONES, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT

ALETHEA MCNAIR, Acting Board Liaison KEN SLAUGHTER, General Counsel ED KANE, Deputy General Counsel KIMBERLY KING, Staff

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

Call to Order
Resolution
Public Comment
Announcements
Adjournment 108

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

2	11:05 a.m.
3	CHAIR ALBERT: Good afternoon,
4	everyone, my name is Neal Albert, and I am the Chair
5	of the Board of Commissioners of the DC Housing
6	Authority. I call this meeting to order. This is
7	a special meeting of the Housing Authority Board
8	being held today, December 5th, 2017, and DCHA's
9	headquarters, 1133 North Capitol Street,
10	Northeast. And the time is if I could if I
11	had a watch that worked, is 11:05 a.m.
12	So, I'm just going to remind us that
13	this is a public meeting. I'm going to ask that
14	you silence your phones and observe the decorum
15	that we've come to appreciate in our Board in
16	our Board meeting. As you know, we always welcome
17	public comments on items that we're going to
18	discuss, but, again, I'm going to ask folks to mind
19	decorum that we've become accustomed to.

Alethea.

determination of a quorum.

At this time, I'm going to ask for a

20

21

22

1	MS. MCNAIR: Thank you, Chairman.
2	Commissioner Slover?
3	MEMBER SLOVER: Present.
4	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council?
5	MEMBER COUNCIL: Present.
6	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Fisher?
7	MEMBER FISHER: Present.
8	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Grossinger?
9	(No audible response.)
10	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Kenner?
11	MEMBER KENNER: Here.
12	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Lancaster?
13	(No audible response.)
14	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Neal Jones?
15	MEMBER NEAL JONES: Present.
16	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Ortiz Gard?
17	(No audible response.)
18	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Vann Ghasri?
19	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Present.
20	MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert.
21	CHAIR ALBERT: Present.
22	MS. MCNAIR: Currently, you have seven

CHAIR ALBERT: Great. So, Ι 2 as 3 mentioned earlier today, the special agenda -- a We will allow the public to special meeting. 4 comment on the resolution before us today. 5 is -- it is our custom to allow residents --6 public-housing residents, five minutes, and allow 7 non-residents three minutes to speak. We don't 8 9 have any public-housing residents signed up, but we do have some non-residents signed up to speak. 10 11 So, at this time, I am going to call our 12 folks who have signed up to testify. You have three minutes. We have a little bit of latitude. 13 So, 14 we may be able to go over. So, let's first of all start with 15 Jennifer Berger. 16 17 MEMBER SLOVER: Can -- before we get there -- I'm sorry. Can I ask couple questions? 18 19 CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah. Sure. 20 MEMBER SLOVER: Ts t.here an expectation that there is going to be a vote of the 21 22 board today?

commissioners present. You have a quorum.

1	CHAIR ALBERT: There is an
2	expectation. There's a resolution before us.
3	Right?
4	MEMBER SLOVER: And, can you tell us
5	why we're having this special meeting? It seems
6	I didn't really understand it from the
7	literature that I got. Is there some time
8	constraint? Because we do have a
9	normally-scheduled Board meeting in what, five
10	days, ten days, something like that?
11	CHAIR ALBERT: Yes. There is a time
12	constraint, and our Executive Director will
13	explain the need to for this resolution today.
14	MEMBER GARRETT: Yes, Commissioners.
15	Two of our conflicts actually fall under this
16	request for a revision to the to our final
17	regulations. And in fact, what this would do would
18	be allowing us the opportunity to close before the
19	end of the year on the on the transaction for
20	Columbia and Colorado.
21	Lost my train of thought sorry.
22	Losing if we lost a week, we would

not be able to close on this half of the year.

MEMBER SLOVER: So, I just want to go into the record again and say that this is what I really dislike about this board is just this, you know, these time constraints that we get put up against. And I just don't understand why we get caught in these situations repeatedly. And, so I just -- I mean, this is maybe the first time that I can remember where we've had to have a special meeting. And I'm not even sure most of the people up here may even know we were going to vote today, in talking to some of the members.

And, so, it just feels hurried and rushed and sort of discombobulated. And the conversations I've had with the advocates and everybody -- they were fundamentally unaware that there was going to be a vote today. I have actually circled back with the people I was talking to, and explained to them after I learned that there was a vote, after having read all these documents, I never fundamentally thought that there was going to be a vote today.

CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER SLOVER: And talking to some other board members, I don't think they knew. And, so, I just -- I hope that in the future we cannot operate this way.

So, Mr. Slover -- Mr. CHAIR ALBERT: Slover, I've got to say, I've sat through the votes at least a dozen resolutions in the three months that I've been here. Every time we've had a board meeting, it's to -- it's a vote on resolutions. So, the fact that we're having a special board meeting implies, and it was clear in the notification that was sent out by DCHA that we were going to be taking an action today on a resolution.

So, I apologize if you missed the obvious in the correspondence that was sent out, but that's the purpose here today, is to actually take action on the resolution before us. So, Commissioners, if we weren't clear in the instructions sent out, my apologies. But when I read the instructions that came out, it was clear we were going to have a vote.

Well, I hope they would 1 MEMBER SLOVER: have talked to you before that. So, maybe that's 2 3 why it was clear to you. They didn't talk 4 CHAIR ALBERT: No. to me before that. 5 You get the -- you got the same 6 notification that I got on this issue. 7 MEMBER GARRETT: And one thing I would like to add, Commissioners, is that, if you recall, 8 we did do a presentation to the body in reference 9 10 to RAD and the regulations that we were looking to If you recall, it was that PowerPoint 11 change. 12 presentation where we highlighted the bubbles for And we talked about time line during that 13 you. discussion also. 14 Right, and, again, I 15 CHAIR ALBERT: don't want to belabor this point. But, again, in 16 the three months that I've been on the board, most 17 things have come to us timely. There are going to 18 be instances when we have to move outside of the 19 sequence of board meetings. And I'm hoping that 20 as a body that we can do that from time to time. 21

And other comments from the Commissioners before

we call our witnesses up?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Yeah. I have a comment too.

CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah.

MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Now, and I'm serious about this. This is one of the reasons why we wanted to go into a new direction. One of the problems this board -- well, let me speak for me. One of the problems I've had on this board as well, is even though when we have our discussion, all questions are not fully answered -- and this is probably to you, Mr. Chair, to you coming. therefore, I'm going to always be leery. I need -- when I have to make a decision and vote on behalf of my constituents, I do poll my constituents, contrary to what people believe. I also read, and I also like to look at documents from other sources, so I can objectivity mind.

Now, I'm going to go on record, and I'm not a secret up here. Maryanne Luby trained me very well, and I sit here today blessed with that training that Maryanne gave me. The advocates --

you all are here today, because when we had Mr. Kelly, I saw that a lot of things I couldn't accomplish as being a paralegal from Antioch School of Law and being trained personally by Edgar and Jean Cahn.

So, I would do anybody from that community a discredit sitting here, because that's a part of my veins. Maryanne used to sit in the back of that room. And Maryanne used to study. And I'll never forget that. So, I know that when -- for me to make decisions, I'm not going to always with all of my colleagues, but I'm going to make decisions based on not only being a public-housing resident first, because I live among the people I serve -- I'm not appointed by the mayor. I'm elected by a bunch of constituents. So, I want to make sure that's on record.

And I don't -- I do know that we're going to have special meetings. But this is vital important, when you want a resolution to pass, is to make sure that each and every one of your board members do have a clarification of what they're

passing. Each of us have a different constituent group that we represent on this board. And I don't think none of us want to do anyone a discredit.

CHAIR ALBERT: So, Commission, before

I go turn to Commissioner Kenner, I just want to remind you that we sat through a session with housing authority staff on RAD, I think, less than a month ago. I think we -- you guys asked some really great questions at that time, which I hope the staff was able to answer. And in between that time, I would hope that if you needed additional clarification, that you would have reached out to the staff for that clarification. And, so, I'm hoping that you've been sufficiently briefed, that we can have the conversation -- we can have the vote today, after hearing from our public witnesses.

Commissioner Kenner.

MEMBER KENNER: Can you just explain a little bit -- so, the consequences if we don't take action today? Tell us a little bit more about the consequences of what happens.

CHAIR ALBERT: Okay. Director.

MEMBER GARRETT: Okay. And,
Commissioners, I actually misspoke with the
complexes. It was -- thank you for correcting me,
Eric and Chelsea. It was actually Fairlawn and
Matthews. Those are actually closing -- or
attempting to close before the end of the year.

CHAIR ALBERT: Right.

MEMBER GARRETT: If we are able to do that, the you go over into, you know, 2018, where the equity market may change.

is it KENNER: And true? MEMBER Because I know that on a city side, we are experiencing this. We are experiencing projects that are -- especially affordable housing projects that are rushing to close because of the potential for the tax change that is currently happening between the House and the Senate. The Mayor, many advocates, and affordable housing people had a rally yesterday where the housing finance agencies actually, before the end of the calendar year, doing a forward issuance of its convertible bond of about half a billion dollars, because no one is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	exactly sure what's going to happen with the tax
2	change.
3	MEMBER GARRETT: Okay. Okay.
4	MEMBER KENNER: So, is that one of the
5	is that also one of the reasons why we're
6	(Simultaneous speaking.)
7	CHAIR ALBERT: Yes. That's one of the
8	reasons.
9	MEMBER KENNER: why many of these
10	affordable housing projects are rushing to close?
11	MEMBER GARRETT: My team is telling me
12	no. I disagree. But Kim, do you want to just
13	clarify for everyone?
14	MS. KING: Sure.
15	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: But you need to be
16	on record. But we don't need to keep saying that.
17	MS. KING: Hello Commissioners. So,
18	while that is definitely a significant issue for
19	many of our projects, there's no refinancing for
20	Fairline and Matthews. So, that's not one of the
21	issues here. This is purely time line and HUD's
22	quidelines.

So, with 1 CHAIR ALBERT: Thank you. 2 that, let me invite Jennifer Berger to come up and 3 bring testimony. Welcome, Jennifer. Thank you, Chairman 4 MS. BERGER: 5 Albert. My name is Jennifer Berger, 6 supervise the eviction prevention team at ARP legal counsel for the elderly. Our office has been a 7 community partner of DC Housing Authority, well, 8 since 1999. And I have been supervising the unit 9 10 since -- the past 11 years. And DCHA has always 11 been for us an open community partner. 12 We are disappointed that the same openness did not occur with these regulations. 13 We moved mountains to review 119 pages of regulations 14 during a time where we had other city council 15 testimony, other client work -- and we did submit 16 those comments early, purposefully, to be able to 17 sit down with DC Housing Authority to talk about 18 We submitted our comments November 19 that process. 17th. 20 There is a chart I received yesterday 21 by grace of one of the commissioners that responds 22

to some of our comments. And we appreciate that time that went into that. I don't know when that was prepared, but it would have been helpful if we were able to go through those comments, just at the housing authority. All we're asking is -- and this can be before the end of the year. I'm willing to make myself available, and I think other advocates would too, to have a meeting with DC Housing Authority to discuss these comments to try to talk with you about some of the legal implications of the comments.

I will move on to the concerns that we have with the comments. There are constitutional issues, fair-housing law issues, local-law issues, relating to the Rental Housing Late Fee Fairness Act, some of which was addressed here, and the Residential Lease Clarification Amendment Act, and the Tenant Right to Organize Act. I will not be able to review all the accounts. We submitted 32 pages of comments. We looked through all of the 119 pages and made line edits. And we think we should have the respect of having our comments

heard, sitting down, and talking about these concerns in more depth.

I think that DCHA did address the concerns we had with modernizing language regarding persons with disability -- persons with disabilities. We have not seen the regulations edited, though. So, these comments indicate that the regulations will be corrected, but the approval vote today seems to be on regulations that may not have incorporated these comments yet. We don't have the ability to do the line comparison. So, we can't say for sure.

So, that is an important question for Commissioners to ask before voting. What are you voting on? Are you voting on the old version, or are you voting on the version that incorporates these comments, which could be very different?

The concerns we have is that legal services providers and providing the opportunity for counsel is critical, regarding the constitutional right to due process. And we ask that not just in the termination phase, but in the

briefing, the re-certification, the notices of other changes, all of those phases, that the opportunity to consult with legal services providers be transparent and that we not hide that opportunities, ball, because there are instance, within the Housing Choice Voucher Program, where they refer cases over Property managers at DC Housing Authority refer We want that to happen more cases over to us. often.

I'm going to ask for more time.

CHAIR ALBERT: You may continue.

MS. BERGER: Thank you so much.

The Late Fee Fairness Act I believe was addressed in the comment, and we appreciate that. We want to make sure that the Late Fee Fairness comments, in compliance with the Late Fee Fairness Act are addressed in the final regulations. And it's not clear to me that that's the case. The Residential Lease Clarification Amendment Act provides very specific information about when a housing provider can access a unit. There are a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

number of different times during the repair procedure discussion, the services discussion, the right to enter the dwelling discussion in Section 57-61, and the annual inspection discussion in 57-63, where access is discussed, and there is an emphasis, a great emphasis on the responsibilities on the participant, but not a great emphasis on the responsibility of DC Housing Authority.

The clearer the regulations are, the less likely it is that property managers will unwittingly and innocently violate the Residential Lease Clarification Act, which does come with sanctions.

We also want to avoid unnecessary litigation. That is not our first place to go. We want to make sure everybody is educated to avoid unnecessary court proceedings.

In terms of the Fair Housing Act, it is not clear within the regulations, and I don't believe with in the corrections, that there is an understanding of the requirements under the DC Human Rights Act and the Fair Housing Act. There

are pieces that have been removed, whether unwittingly or intentionally. For instance, a reasonable accommodation is required, not just when someone demonstrates that they have a physical or mental impairment, including a record of an impairment, if they are regarded as having that impairment.

People do not need to provide medical documentation that is extensive regarding their impairment. And that is a very large error that occurs among the property management level in DC Housing Authority properties. And we want to make sure that that's corrected. So, even if the DC Housing Authority regulations have that, it doesn't mean it's correct.

And we shouldn't defer to the DC Housing
Authority regulations regarding the public housing
properties for RAD just because that's past is
prelude. Past is not prelude. We want to correct
both. And I really encourage that, because
otherwise DCHA is susceptible to violating the Fair
Housing law locally and federally. And the

HUD-DOJ joint statement is very clear t.hat. reasonable accommodation requests need not be written. So, while it is ideal and we would encourage to write their reasonable accommodation requests, there are many reasons someone cannot write. There are disabilities that relate to There are people who are blind and can't literacy. write out their reasonable accommodation requests.

Also, it's not just about community members -- DC Housing Authority property managers letting community members help the participant. The property manager should help the participant, if the participant is clearly trying to ask for an accommodation, then they -- verbatim, the property manager should write out what that is and not just say, well, you're going to have to go get help. That's not what a reasonable accommodation is.

So, we really want to talk with you all about that more, and also service animals. Service animals do not, under the Service Animal Amendment Act, need to be trained necessarily. There are service animals that help people with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mental-health issues, for instance, that do not need to be specially trained, but nonetheless calm an individual with mental-health issues.

So, there's so many different things we can talk about. We are experts in the community. ARP clearly is I've been practicing for 18 years. nationally-known in dealing expert with fair-housing issues and other issues involving We welcome the opportunity to sit with We are open to doing so before the end of the you. year, and see no reason why a vote has to take place today when we're explicitly offering to meet ahead of time to make sure this is done in 2017, as is your wish.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR ALBERT: Thank you.

MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: I have a question. Are you telling me that since having a new director, that the advocacy group have not received some type of documentation sharing with you all that the monthly meetings that you continuously had with the previous directors, our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

director haven't -- you haven't received anything
 of that nature?

MS. BERGER: We did have an opportunity to meet with Executive Director Garrett. And the issues with meeting about regulations is really my concern. And that is not owing to Executive Director Garrett. He walked into a situation where those meetings had ended for about a year and a half.

MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Correct.

MS. BERGER: I remember working on the pet policy and with Lori Paris. And they were back and forth. There were stakeholder meetings, but in terms of regulation meetings, we were able to have regulatory meetings with Lori Paris, Joanne Wallington. When it comes to the voucher program, we do have some transparency, and we are able to sit and talk with Mr. McCoy, but we're not seeing that in the public housing side. We have not been able to have meetings where we sit and talk about regulations. And that has been for at least a year and a half.

1	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Well, I'm
2	confused. So, the meetings that you were having
3	with Adrian, and the meetings that I have attended
4	with Adrian, what were those meetings about? Who
5	was setting the agenda? Because the whole legal
6	you know, the whole legal field I mean,
7	advocacies was sitting there, from bread from the
8	city to pro bono attorneys.
9	MS. BERGER: I'm glad you're asking
10	that, Commissioner Vann
11	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Vann-Ghasri.
12	MS. BERGER: Ghasri.
13	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Correct.
14	MS. BERGER: So, the stakeholder
15	meetings we view as distinct from the regulatory
16	meetings. The stakeholders meetings are an
17	opportunity to more globally or aerially discuss
18	what the issues are. And those meetings did happen
19	and have renewed with Executive Director Garrett.
20	But there were meeting we had with the
21	General Counsel's Office, where we would talk about
22	regulations like these RAD changes, as opposed to

1	we had this one meeting, and then we submitted
2	our comments. And then there was nothing after we
3	submitted out comments.
4	That is what's different. If we
5	submitted comments before, we would be able to sit
6	and talk with the prior staff in the General
7	Counsel's Office. And that has not happened
8	meaningfully for at least a year and a half. And
9	that is different, because that is litigation
10	avoidance for DC Housing Authority.
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Could somebody
13	tell us why?
14	CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah.
15	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: I mean, our
16	relationship was, apparently, appeared to be so
17	much I mean, because I'm not going to always
18	agree with you too. So, don't get me twisted.
19	(Laughter.)
20	MS. BERGER: I'm fine.
21	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: I mean, don't get
22	me twisted. I just like fairness, because I feel

like when you play fair, you win fair. Nobody never lose. You always -- you just learn.

MS. BERGER: Right.

MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: So, to me, more comfortable when I know how you all are thinking and how they're thinking, and then I put in my own legal equation, because you all have a And your self-interest is not self-interest. always my constituents' either. Just don't get it twisted. And, of course, sometimes they don't have my constituents' interest at stake either, because of based on laws. So, neither one of y'all are really my friends. But what you are, what both of you are to me, as an elected official sitting up here, is understanding that both of y'all have a role in law. Your role more so than their role is to seriously protect our rights.

And to look into matters that my constituents bring to you as your clients and to hold the confidentiality so that they won't be intimidated by some of the situations. So, I understand your role very clearly. So, now I want

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 to understand this before you leave. So, now you and Director Garrett, you now understand that after 2 3 today that what you was doing with Lori Paris, that's back on track. 4 That's a yes or no answer. 5 MS. BERGER: I can't answer that 6 question. 7 MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Okay. MS. BERGER: The stakeholder meetings 8 are back. 9 10 CHAIR ALBERT: Right. Sorry. MS. BERGER: I don't know what the 11 12 status of the General Counsel meetings are with our To their credit, we did have a meeting 13 office. with several staff members of DC Housing Authority 14 to discuss RAD. 15 There were 119 pages or regulations. 16 I've been doing policy work for 18 years, and that 17 is a lot of work. We had to scramble to get this 18 And that kind of scrambling, when we're 19 done. talking about our clients' rights -- and we are 20 aligned in advocating for the rights of 21 the

residents of DC Housing Authority buildings.

22

And

that is -- there can't be an ambush when it comes 1 to-legislative work. It's a thoughtful process. 2 3 It's an interactive process. We want to be able to take this to our clients, and we didn't even get 4 to do that. 5 6 CHAIR ALBERT: So, Jennifer, let me So, I listened to 7 just ask a couple questions. your concerns, and it seems as though you have quite 8 Of the concerns you talked about, how many 9 a few. 10 of those, what percentage of those are -- pertain specifically to these RAD regulations that we're 11 trying to publish? Or how many of them are sort 12 of broader concerns that can be addressed if you 13 had sort of ongoing dialogue with the legal team, 14 the Executive Director, and his team? 15 16 MS. BERGER: To be honest with you, I need to have more time with the comments that were 17 made to the advocates' comments to answer that more 18 19 fairly. CHAIR ALBERT: Right, because I looked 20 21 at the advocates' comments, and it -- you guys know

I'm as friend of the advocate as you can get in this

position. But they were sort of broad and general
and required, in my mind, sort of a a whole lot
of time. Some of them were not specific to RAD.
That I think should be put in a bucket for your
ongoing conversations with the Executive Director
and his team. And the others I think we should try
and figure out a way to work through. So, just in
following up the Commission's rates, really great
suggestion is getting the dialogue going so that
it doesn't take the publication of new RAD
regulations to get the voices and concerns of the
advocacy community heard. So, I just wanted to get
a sense from you, and you answered already as to
sort of, how many of these issues are specific RAD
issues, and sort of how many are sort of general
concerns, as I see them.

MS. BERGER: If I can clarify --

CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah.

MS. BERGER: What happened is, there was a tremendous amount of City Counsel advocacy on the local level in matters that affect tenants.

Late Fee Fairness Act and Residential Lease

Amendment Clarification Act are two examples. I was at the table for both of those.

So, when I was reading the regulations, it may be that the RAD regulations had some violations of those acts that also are in the public housing regulations. But that doesn't mean we should publish knowing that there are violations -- these regulations in the form they were in. it sounds like some changes were made for that very And it also sounds like public-housing reason. regulations need to be changed to conform also. Ι think justifying the concerns, the violations of the law that we're seeing in the regulations that are serious by having them -- saying that they were in the public-housing regs, that isn't -- it's not going to be helpful to the delegates. I do not think we should publish these regulations if they don't fix the problems we're raising. Because, we're not trying to raise wish list items, other than, I will say, the legal service provider list is a wish list item. It's not -- technically it's required to be in the spirit of due process --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR ALBERT: Right. 1 MS. BERGER: But that is an example of 2 3 something we can talk about more. Can I make a comment 4 MEMBER SLOVER: here, Neil? 5 6 CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah. You can. 7 MEMBER SLOVER: I spoke at length with the advocates on this, and I think, in listening 8 to you, and in listening to her, and listening to 9 everybody else, I think the issue is that there's 10 11 trying to be this distinction between a RAD 12 regulation versus public-housing regulation. But in talking to the advocates, it sounds like the 13 concern is just taking flawed and bad policy and 14 putting it out into the world as RAD policy. 15 therefore, we don't actually have control anymore, 16 17 because we're going to lose ownership interest in these assets. 18 19 And, so, we're basically exposing ourselves to regulations that have flaws. 20 what they're saying is let's fix these flaws before 21

we publish them as the RAD regulations, because

1	then, if there's a different owner of the building,
2	we don't have the ability to gear it the way we do
3	now.
4	And, so, I think it makes perfect sense
5	to clean up all the regulations. And, so, I hear
6	you saying, these aren't RAD specific, but that
7	part breaks down for me, because I think it's all
8	about how the properties run. And we're basically
9	taking public-housing regulations and
10	transferring them to RAD, because we don't want
11	there to be any disruption to the tenant via RAD.
12	So, we're basically taking public
13	housing regulation and making it RAD regulation,
14	but it's got flaws that we can no longer fix,
15	because it's no longer in our control any more.
16	And that's, I think, the concern.
17	MS. BERGER: And my colleague, Ms.
18	Amanda Korber, is going to be talking about that
19	in more detail as well. So
20	CHAIR ALBERT: So, it's a good time to
21	bring Amanda up.
22	MS. BERGER: I think that's right.

Not to get out of the hot seat, but really, I want to fix the problem with you. We're community partners. Let's meet. If you want to get this published before the end of December, in good faith we're offering to make that happen. We'll sit at the table with you, and we'll help you move regulations along. But a vote today is -- would be ignoring a lot of serious issues.

CHAIR ALBERT: Thank you so much, Jennifer.

MS. BERGER: Thank you for your time, everybody.

MEMBER LANCASTER: Mr. Chair, if I may, before you leave the table, ma'am. Being with the ARP and the seniors, which is my constituents. I represent seniors and people who have disability, which I know there's mixed-income housing. And I heard you about the ADA part, because I was just asked yesterday before I came that certain dogs, that they have as service dogs, are not being recognized because they don't have what they call documentations. And this individual told me they

went and checked the ADA and said there's no license and no regulations controlling service dogs. An individual can have a service dog because it is a companion or otherwise, as long as he registers the dog with the housing authority or with the vets.

And there's legal documents. And I was going to go into that a little further to find if there was a fact in that. And from what you said about this visit that you have there -- I think you're highly concerned about those changes you say you have, that you want to go into it further before this pass.

And I'm very, very curious about what those changes are. I mean, you weren't specific in what they were. And I suppose you got my curiosity. What changes are there that's sort of problematic to you? And I'm quite sure being in the position you are, representing the people that you represent, is going to be problematic to me also. And I would like to know what they are.

MS. BERGER: I think that Commissioner Slover captured it well, when he said that it's

importing -- the problem is importing regulations from the public-housing realm into RAD, when there's a mix of public-housing regs that are not compliant with the law. And then RAD is importing them. And then, when we look at some of the responses, in the interest of -- a lot of the responses were in the interest of continuity.

We're going to keep the regulations similar to public housing. We're saying that's a problem. And if it has to be fixed in both, it has to be fixed in both. But it's exactly the kind of issue you were raising with service animals. local law is very law. And the federal law, it does not require the restrictions either that somebody just has to register the animal. It doesn't have to be specially trained. And the pet has to be cared for. Someone doesn't have -- the whole issue providing written proof of disability. of Somebody can ask for accommodation, and someone can get SSI, and that alone is proof of disability. And a property manager should get a hint.

Or somebody is a hoarder. And hoarding

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is a disability. It's a disorder. It's obsessive compulsive disorder that happens -- that's rampant in public housing. And property managers who are really good will refer the cases to us ahead of time, where we're happy to help early.

MEMBER LANCASTER: And the other part about tenants being able to form an organization to represent themselves when they get into this. I think you were sort of -- allude to that just a little bit, as far as they had the right for the return, under the no restrictions when they come back in. They shouldn't be re-certified under the first state of going in from whatever year they were into housing, and in being relocated and come back in, they shouldn't have to go through the same process again.

MS. BERGER: Yeah. I think there was some discussion in the comments, and it does bear conversation between the advocates and DC Housing Authority to talk about that further. I think that partially was addressed in the comments. But in terms of the right to organize, charging a fee for

1	the use of common areas, for instance, that should
2	not happen, because that violated the Tenant Right
3	to Organize Act, which is local law.
4	MEMBER LANCASTER: Thank you, ma'am.
5	MS. BERGER: Thank you, sir.
6	CHAIR ALBERT: Thank you, Jennifer.
7	Thank you. Amanda.
8	MEMBER GARRETT: I just have I'm
9	sorry. I just have. I apologize. I just have
10	one question. The overall policy, public housing
11	policy that you're referring to, is there a time
12	limit in which that has to be changed or can be
13	changed? Meaning that, could we look and discuss
14	that in the overall policy in 2018?
15	MS. BERGER: I think that would be
16	great if we can do that. I think that RAD should.
17	MEMBER GARRETT: I'm separate but,
18	remember what I'm doing. I'm separating the two.
19	I'm separating the overall public-housing policy
20	versus what we're just distinguishing today,
21	versus we've been dealing with RAD itself.
22	MS. BERGER: That's a good question.

1	I think that RAD should fix the problems, and then
2	public housing can emulate RAD, which is nicer
3	position to be in, because then RAD can be a model,
4	as opposed to the opposite, which is then going
5	you having to go back and fix RAD again after public
6	housing's fixed.
7	So, I think it would be great to work
8	on these issues as a prelude with RAD regulations
9	as a prelude to working on the regulations with
10	public housing. And we and there are models for
11	that. We've done that before. We're happy to
12	have ongoing meetings to address the larger issues,
13	but
14	MEMBER GARRETT: But it doesn't
15	necessarily happen in that order. Correct?
16	MS. BERGER: That is correct.
17	MEMBER GARRETT: Okay.
18	MS. BERGER: I don't see that I
19	should say this. I don't see an issue with that.
20	Admittedly, that is a new issue that I'm thinking
21	of it, but I don't see a logistical issue. I think
22	it's more of an issue with publishing RAD

regulations that are violative of the law.

MEMBER GARRETT: Okay. That's the distinction. I see what you're trying to do, but the RAD law -- the RAD regulations according to these folks, are flawed. So, then we'd have to go fix them after passing them, which wouldn't fundamentally make sense.

MS. BERGER: Because I'd rather pass correct RAD regs and then fix public housing than pass incorrect RAD regs just to be consistent with some inconsistencies with the law that are in public housing, if that makes any sense.

you CHAIR ALBERT: But Jen, are specific -- you're using a specific term here. You're saying incorrect RAD regs. I'm not sure that the General Counsel for Housing Authority would characterize it that way. So, different of opinion here. So, I think for us to get on the same page, it's a much longer So, what the Executive Director was conversation. suggesting, I think can get us -- can get us there, but it won't get us there before the end of the year.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, my question to you and Amanda and Ashley, when they come up here is, is there a way to continue -- and, actually, our General Counsel is here, is to continue that conversation, to try and get to the right place where RAD becomes a model that you talked about. But models don't evolve overnight.

MS. BERGER: Here's what I propose.

CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah.

I propose that we fix as MS. BERGER: much as we can. And there are efforts to do so in And I appreciate that. Last night the comments. was the first time I'm seeing these comments. for instance, Late Fee Fairness, there's explicit comment that given the concerns, they were to fix And therefore, going that. in public-housing regs they'll do the same in 2018, Executive Director Garrett, as, recommending, which I think is a great idea, to have RAD encompass as much of the law -- the local law and the federal law, as we can. And I think it's possible if we have -- maybe I'm idealistic. think we can get some core people at the table and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	try to move this along. There's nothing that some
2	edits in the word document can't fix if we want to
3	fix them. I'm optimistic.
4	MEMBER GARRETT: But there's also
5	but we also have when you put lawyers in a room,
6	there is a disagreement about, you know, what is
7	actually correct and what is incorrect.
8	MS. BERGER: We appreciate that. And
9	there may be you're absolutely correct that not
10	everything will be agreed upon. But let's try to,
11	for lack of a better phrase, knock out as much as
12	we can. Let's get as much done as we can before
13	the end of the year, and hopefully publish
14	something that is going to encompass as much of a
15	compliant set of regulations as possible.
16	MEMBER GARRETT: And just my last
17	question. I'm sorry.
18	CHAIR ALBERT: Oh no, we're taking as
19	many questions.
20	MEMBER GARRETT: Overall, the issues
21	that you've raised in reviewing the document are
22	issues that have been pre-existing. They have not

just occurred because we're looking to change the RAD reg.

MS. BERGER: I think because -- there's a combination. A third issue is that the law changed locally so much over the past year. For instance, Late Fee Fairness was only -- only passed, or was enacted December 7th, 2016. And the Residential Lease Amendment Act, I think was April 7th, 2017. So, in fairness, these are all new laws that are affecting the regulation.

MEMBER GARRETT: Okay.

MS. BERGER: that said, But the reasonable accommodation issues have been around. You have a great ADA coordinator and have had a really good one for a couple of years. And that has buffered the issues with the way that the writing is. And we have, again, referrals that we That has also buffered the issues that get early. the written regulations have with some of the requirements of the Fair Housing Act and Human That may take further discussion, but Rights Act. I think we can fix some of those before the year's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

end. 1 All right. Thank MEMBER GARRETT: 2 3 you. Thank you very much. 4 MS. BERGER: 5 MEMBER GARRETT: Thank you very much. 6 MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: I just wanted to say that when you all do this discussion, that some 7 of these questions need to be looked at -- and I 8 don't know what it'd been. 9 I never got the 10 opportunity to read your 145 document. 11 I never knew whether or not to address 12 some of the concerns my constituents had, which 13 were, how the assets rises, the significant capital of the housing assets -- local public housing. 14 does that impact with RAD? Whether or not there 15 is a standability revenue. If so, is it a 40-year 16 The bad history with tax credits and 17 quarantee? the debit and the equity. 18 I would like to have had a comparison 19 of other Housing Authority with 20 trend RAD conversion, if any. And what, if any, were the 21

advocates' position on jobs, mixed income,

1	mixed use? Whether or not the advocates found
2	mixed-use practice discriminatory to public
3	housing and housing choice residents or would like
4	to open business in public-housing mixed projects
5	with the partners?
6	MS. SIEGEL: To be abundantly clear, we
7	did not have input into
8	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: And, see, these
9	are the
10	MS. BERGER: this all. Until
11	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: these types
12	these type of elements are real big, for real. But
13	in a nutshell, they are RAD. They are the nuts and
14	bolts of RAD. And I came up with that conclusion
15	by looking at the El Paso El Paso Housing
16	Authority that did a 100 percent RAD. So, that was
17	the only Housing Authority that I could compare.
18	We're really trying to visualize RAD in
19	the District of Columbia with El Paso, being the
20	14th largest housing authority. And I'm always
21	comparing with us. And we need to really find out
22	whether or not we're still the ninth largest

housing authority in the District -- I mean, in the United States, because I'm tired of saying that if I'm incorrect. And we're not even a state.

MS. BERGER: I had the opportunity to attend a national-housing law training, where there was a RAD session, and people were talking from Philadelphia, from San Francisco, from Richmond about their experiences with RAD. And I think it would be helpful to have more conversation around that --

MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Well, I've had that conversation with a group that I belong with. And at that group, there were seven or eight public-housing individuals. And all of those resident counsel were RAD resident counsels. And all did have different experiences.

And that's why I don't want to rush into RAD, because, with the District of Columbia only -- and I'm going to still say this until I'm proven wrong, a ten-mile square. And when you look at where the District is and where public housing is, and when you look at what ward is in bodies of water

we are near, and the values of just the natural minerals within our community, the District of Columbia, the city and the housing authorities' both fighting over Indian Reservations, which are now called public housing in the District of Columbia.

And I wonder how many times or how often do the lawyers, even DCHA lawyers, actually look at how Indian and public and Indian rights are Indian rights, because the regulations came out of tribal rights. So, when you look at tribal rights in the Midwest, how many reservations are there? Where did all of these laws actually come from to incorporate to even come up with public housing? If you deal with HUD, HUD do not deal with public housing alone. It is called public and Indian housing.

And I find that most of you lawyers do not know the Indian law perspective. And only lawyers I have encountered that know that part, unfortunately, they are now attending UDC or they were Antioch graduates, because of the impulsivity

in which the training of the legal field when it 1 comes to low and moderate income in the legal field. 2 CHAIR ALBERT: Jennifer, we really 3 appreciate your time. Look forward to continuing 4 5 the conversation with you. Amanda. And we can resume the timer. 6 7 But we won't kick you out, I promise you. I'd like to thank the MS. KORBER: 8 Board of Commissioners and Executive Garrett for 9 the opportunity to testify today. 10 My name is 11 Amanda Korber. I'm a staff attorney at the Legal Aid Society of the District of Columbia. 12 Legal Aid is the oldest and largest 13 civil legal services organization in the District. 14 I work in the housing unit, which specializes in 15 representing folks at or below 200 percent of the 16 poverty line in eviction defense, administrative 17 hearings before the Housing Authority, and, in 18 general, housing advocacy before the DC Counsel and 19 you all. 20 As you know, just over two weeks ago, 21 22 Legal Aid, along with Legal Counsel for the

Elderly, Neighborhood Legal Services Program, Bread for the City, and the Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless, submitted detailed comments on the complex and important rental administration Rental Assistance Demonstration relations. I was glad to learn last night that DCHA plans to make some changes in response to our comments. We have not seen what those changes will look like, which is important before there is any vote on those regulations.

But I would also like to address some of Legal Aid's gravest concerns that I understand are not going to be addressed. And one of those concerns that I'm going to talk about is actually not just an import from the housing regulations, but a very new and serious issue that is going to arise at properties that convert to RAD.

But before I get to that, I want to talk about that while considering these regulations, it's important to keep in mind what the purpose of RAD is, as well as the fact that there is going to be serious confusion among tenants about what is

happening.

While my understanding is that DCHA intends to remain the principal owner at RAD-converted properties, that is not guaranteed. It is possible that private owners are going to be coming in and taking over some of these properties. Therefore, it's important that the tenants are protected from possible abuses and know what their rights are and that their rights are in compliance with the law.

These regulations are the main guidelines that will ensure future private owners who take control of this city's vitally important public housing run these programs in compliance with the law, federal and local, and in a way that benefits the community and the tenants that live in them.

Though I encourage you to look at and read all of our comments, which cover nearly every section of the regulations, I'm going to focus my testimony on one section, which is DCHA's termination of assistance to tenants under the RAD

program. And this is, like I said, a section where this is not just an import of a problem from the public-housing regulations to RAD regulations, but a very new and serious problem that is going to arise under the RAD regulations.

changing public housing RAD is project-based vouchers. That means that there's now going to be two levels of termination that a tenant can face. There's termination from the subsidy program -- termination from the voucher and eviction from the unit itself. program, Currently, tenants in public housing, if there is an allegation that they have violated the rules of the program get a 30-day notice to correct or If there is an allegation that they vacate. haven't corrected, they are taken to DC Superior Court, Landlord and Tenant Court, where they can exercise their right to a trial by jury, get things like mandatory discovery, and defend themselves in front of a jury of their peers.

Under these current regulations, that process breaks down, and the DC Housing Authority

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

can now issue a recommendation for termination and insist that a tenant defend their right to a -- the subsidy -- the subsidy for their unit, the subsidy that allows them to live in their home, at an informal administrative hearing at the Housing Authority, thereby circumventing their right to a jury trial and an ability to defend themselves in DC Superior Court.

Tenants in the District of Columbia have a constitutional right to a jury trial before That is well established. eviction. And that right cannot be waived. And these regulations severely burden that right. And t.hat. is particularly problematic in properties that DCHA is going to continue owning post-conversion, because DCHA is saying, we're favoring substance -- I'm sorry, we're favoring form, which is just that we are now the principal owner in a private entity, over substance, which is that we're still a local Housing Authority.

And we are using that just change in form to circumvent your rights to a jury trial.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And that is very seriously problematic and very likely a violation of tenants in public housings' constitutional rights in the District of Columbia.

And I'm going to -- I don't want to talk too much about other issues, because I think that there's been a lot of talk of, you know, these are pre-existing problems, and, so, do we really need to fix them now given this time crunch we're under.

This is not a pre-existing problem, and it is a very serious problem that needs to be addressed. And my understanding from what I saw of what DCHA plans to change is that this problem -- they agree that there is a difference between that there is going to be the two layers and that terminated the subsidy can be through recommendation for termination process and that -they don't agree to that unduly burdens tenants' constitutional rights. And that I think is wrong and something that we need to sit down and discuss, because it is very, very serious.

MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Jennifer, are you telling me that as a tenant under RAD -- are you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

telling me -- now, I'm a public-housing resident. 1 I have a right to hear my choices. It's only my 2 3 strategy. Either, A, I can go to grievance first. I lose the grievance. Now I can go to DC Superior 4 But I can't go to DC Superior Court first, 5 lose my Court Case, and then think I'm going to a 6 7 grievance. Right. MS. KORBER: 8 9 MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: So, are you 10 saying that based on your research, what you was 11 seeing with RAD is that the resident no longer has 12 that right I just explained? So, if I'm a RAD resident, I don't have the -- I don't have the right 13 to go to the grievance with the DCHA first, then 14 Are you saying, that is cut out? 15 go to court. Because we have that right, and it is exercised --16 17 MS. KORBER: Yes. MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: in public 18 housing. 19 MS. KORBER: And it's an important 20 I think that it still exists for certain 21 riaht. 22 types of grievances. Grievances about what your

rent is. I think where it no longer exists is when DCHA is trying to evict people -- terminate people's subsidy from -- or evict people from their unit.

And, so, right now, if the Housing Authority is alleging that you or any other public-housing resident has violated the program rules in some way, you would get a 30-day notice to correct or vacate. And you could grieve that notice. And if you were to lose at the grievance hearing, you could -- they would still have to sue you in Court.

You could still challenge that same notice in Court. Right? That's what you were saying. But the way these current regulations are read, DCHA will issue before that a recommendation for termination from the voucher program -- because that's what's happening now. The public housing is converting to vouchers. And you will have to request an informal hearing to challenge that recommendation for termination.

And if you lose that informal hearing,

that decision -- there is no longer an ability to challenge that in D.C. Superior Court.

So, that impacts MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: my constituents terribly. Let me ask you one other With RAD, what's the difference in putting thing. that equation with a fight-back? As it is now in public housing for the fight-back, it depends on A -- I'm going to say this based on the trend I'm seeing, is that A is the property manager. they're handling the situation, it seems like it's a per-unit case. So, in all fairness to the fight-back and RAD, who would be converted to RAD -- A, would they still have that particular right? What would be the trend, or what is the projection trend of fight-backs?

Would that resident still have the right to remain in that unit, still pay their rent to the property manager while the court make a decision whether or not I'm guilty or not, or will the court make the decision under RAD that if I have a fight-back, I don't even have that opportunity, that opportunity that people in public housing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	have, that I immediately because the law does
2	say and can be that I immediately get a 30-day
3	notice to vacate? That's
4	CHAIR ALBERT: So, Amanda, why don't
5	you finish your testimony? And then I'm going to
6	ask the Office of General Counsel to comment on some
7	of the things you've said about our process,
8	because I'm not sure I'm in agreement with you, but
9	I'm not a lawyer, and I don't want to play one today.
LO	MS. KORBER: Okay. I'm ready to rest
L1	now on my testimony.
L2	CHAIR ALBERT: Oh, that's not a case.
L3	You don't have to rest.
L4	MS. KORBER: Yeah. No. That's fine.
L5	(Laughter.)
L6	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: And Jennifer.
L7	And Jennifer, I'm not a lawyer either, but I was
L8	trained by Ken Loewinger.
L9	CHAIR ALBERT: Okay. So, Ken, or Ed.
20	MEMBER SLOVER: Before we do that, can
21	I ask a question?
22	CHAIR ALBERT: Yes. You can cross

examine.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I haven't heard -- and MEMBER SLOVER: you just mentioned the right to return. And it's in here, and that's something that's, I think, a concern of all of ours. And so, from the overall summary you guys provided in your comments, you're referencing that one of the flaws is that 1606 sounds like it references just new communities in the DC-housing regs and that this doesn't currently it's not pushed out to all mixed-finance properties, which these would be. And, so, that right to return resolution, under what's being considered, wouldn't be enacted. Right? Is that what you're saying? Like, the way it's currently written --

MS. KORBER: Yes. That's right.

MEMBER SLOVER: -- there is an interpretation that could leave a private developer to say, I don't have to deal with that.

MS. KORBER: I think that's right. I will admit that our colleague at Bread for the City, who is the expert in, sort of, the right to return

1	area of the law, is not available today.
2	MEMBER SLOVER: Are you talking about
3	Taylor?
4	MS. KORBER: Taylor. That's right.
5	At Bread for the City.
6	(Simultaneous speaking.)
7	MEMBER SLOVER: Right. Now, we talked
8	about this. So, I'm pretty confident that that was
9	her interpretation.
10	MS. KORBER: Yeah.
11	MEMBER SLOVER: And, so, I mean, those
12	are the types of things, I guess, that we're talking
13	about, which is these sort of, what's going to get
14	lost as we transfer from this policy to that policy.
15	And that's why I don't think it's this is so
16	simple as, let's just do this and go back and fix
17	it. I think we need to fix it before we do it.
18	MS. KORBER: I think that's right. I
19	think that this is an important moment. This is
20	a moment where we're taking public-housing assets
21	and we're converting them to private ownership.
22	And, so, it is important to be incredibly careful

about what that transition means. It's not going 1 to be just -- there are going to be differences, 2 3 because there is a different owner now. pass these regulations hastily when there's so much 4 as stake, I think, is a mistake. 5 6 MEMBER SLOVER: And, another 7 clarifying question for -- not for you, but for the Executive Director is that, this vote is not to 8 This vote is to improve 9 approve RAD. Correct? 10 publishing regulations that may be used, should we 11 decide in the future to RAD properties, beyond what this board has already approved, which is just a 12 13 couple. 14 MEMBER GARRETT: Correct. 15 MEMBER SLOVER: I just want to make sure that's --16 MEMBER GARRETT: 17 You're --MEMBER SLOVER: -- clarified, because, 18 again, getting back to our previous conversations 19 about being given opportunities in the future, I 20 21 just want to put on the record that this vote, 22 should it take place, is not to approve RAD --

1	MEMBER GARRETT: Right.
2	MEMBER SLOVER: It's to approve
3	publishing regulations around, should we choose,
4	again, beyond what we've already approved, to RAD
5	in the future.
6	MEMBER GARRETT: Correct.
7	CHAIR ALBERT: And just to follow up on
8	Commissioner Slover's comments, what are the
9	opportunities after publication to further
10	amendments to the regulations.
11	MEMBER GARRETT: It could be ongoing,
12	Commissioner, Mr. Chair.
13	CHAIR ALBERT: Okay.
14	MEMBER GARRETT: Also, I just want to,
15	just make one comment, or it's just you're also
16	presupposing what our philosophy will be with
17	utilization of RAD. Correct?
18	MS. KORBER: No. I'm not.
19	MEMBER GARRETT: You're when I
20	when I say that, what I'm saying is you're
21	presupposing that we will, you know, sell property
22	to a private developer versus sell it to ourselves,

1 in most cases. I'm saying that it's --MS. KORBER: 2 3 you know, this program can be used for that purpose in the future. 4 5 MEMBER GARRETT: Okay. 6 MS. KORBER: That is precisely what the 7 -- how the program is used across the country. think DCHA is unique in its intention to remain the 8 But I actually think that the issue I was 9 raising about termination is bigger in -- is a big 10 11 issue because DCHA is saying it intends to be the 12 owner. 13 MEMBER GARRETT: Okay. I think -- I think that 14 MS. KORBER: changing the process and the way tenants are 15 terminated from the subsidy program when DCHA 16 remains the owner, is very problematic, because 17 it's saying that just because we're owning in a 18 different 19 form, your rights, in terms of challenging termination, are different. 20 think that is a very serious problem. 21

MEMBER GARRETT:

22

I guess the point I

1	was trying to draw out is that it doesn't
2	necessarily mean our philosophy will change,
3	meaning, in terms of our mission to provide
4	affordable housing. It's not our purpose to
5	evict.
6	MS. KORBER: Sure, but the Housing
7	Authority evicts people and terminates people from
8	subsidy programs every day. Those people are my
9	clients.
10	MEMBER GARRETT: Okay.
11	CHAIR ALBERT: Great.
12	MEMBER GARRETT: Did that help you?
13	CHAIR ALBERT: Ed. Or Ken.
14	(Pause.)
15	CHAIR ALBERT: So, I just wanted to
16	give you guys an opportunity to respond to some of
17	the
18	MR. SLAUGHTER: I'd like to respond to
19	the general relationship with our valued community
20	partners in our regulatory process. Our
21	commitment to having their input has not changed.
22	We certainly have not scheduled regulatory

versions of our meetings, but the general meetings have gone -- have been ongoing. As you know, this was an adoption of a comprehensive regime to cover a new program.

CHAIR ALBERT: Can you state your name and title for the record?

MR. SLAUGHTER: I'm sorry. My name is Ken Slaughter. I'm the General Counsel of DC Housing. That was quite an effort on our part, and it has gone on for about a year. Our goal as we've pressed against HUD schedules for completing the first two deals drive this urgency today. And we set as a requirement that we get you educated, along with taking public input on our comment.

So, as you recall, we had a seminar. We had an operations committee meeting, and we've had several efforts to make sure you are up to speed on what we're trying to do. The opportunity to continue the dialogue is always there. We certainly will invite a meeting at your pleasure, at your direction, with our advocate friends. And we always want to avoid litigation. At the same

time, we do understand that lawyers disagree sometimes. And so far, no court has said that we're doing anything unconstitutional. And even in our old regime of public-housing regs, but we are always of the charge of keeping up with new law.

It's a very dynamic landlord/tenant environment in the District of Columbia. And it's incumbent upon us to keep up with it. We have prepared, and we understand you guys just got it, a comprehensive, almost point-by-point analysis of comments. In the column where we make our comments, there are several instances where we are agreed that we will make changes.

Advocates may not agree with all the changes or all of our rationale, but we still believe these regs are publishable. And the time frame, again, it's set by demands that you get these deals done after they have authorized in a certain time frame.

I think we're already in an extension period. Is that right? We're in an extension period, and we could lose the opportunity, if we

1	don't go forward.
2	CHAIR ALBERT: So, General Counsel
3	so, if the Board chose today to pass this
4	resolution, what are the opportunities after that
5	and the forums after that for to continue to refine
6	the RAD regulations?
7	MR. SLAUGHTER: If you do not approve,
8	we might lose the opportunity to do the two deals
9	that are under the time clock set by HUD right now.
10	There is the opportunity to there's one
11	requirement, phase-in of rents. And we set it as
12	a high five-year phase-in period.
13	That is absolutely required for us to close. The
14	rest of the regs might have some more time. And
15	we certainly would like to address the specific,
16	serious issue that our friend from the legal
17	services organization put forward to you, because
18	it should be addressed.
19	CHAIR ALBERT: Yes. Please state your
20	name, young man, for the record.
21	MR. KANE: Ed Kane, Deputy General
22	Counsel. With respect, specifically, to the last

comment concerning the right to adjudicate decisions of the Housing Authority, particularly loss of subsidy or evictions, the RAD regs don't abrogate tenants' rights to proceed through an adjudication of an eviction, just as exists now, or grieve the loss of subsidy under the voucher program. The regulations attempt to combine or at least have running parallel the two grievance processes, as well as the process of termination.

There are some triggers in each of them, but not -- the regs do not do anything to abrogate any rights that tenants have currently. So -- and, again, to -- just to sort of allude to what Ken says, these are issues that get adjudicated with some frequency, and we disagree, respectfully, that our processes are violative of tenants' constitutional rights. And, also, as has been said earlier, what we've done is make the attempt, through our review and consideration of the comments to determine where the greater consistency, greater clarity, might be very helpful. And the marked-up version that would go to publication would reflect that.

1	CHAIR ALBERT: Okay.
2	MEMBER GARRETT: I just want to
3	clarify, again. So, Mr. Slaughter, you stated
4	that to date, our policies are not a violation, a
5	constitutional violation. Correct?
6	MR. SLAUGHTER: That we're aware of.
7	We know that some party has
8	MEMBER GARRETT: That we're aware of.
9	MR. SLAUGHTER: taken a side that
10	would make us revise by direction of a court. At
11	the same time, that doesn't mean we're
12	closed-minded to the best way of doing it, and we
13	invite the comments from our friends. And we'll
14	as you will see, we have incorporated several
15	seven or eight of their comments. And, as to
16	whether you can amend in the future, regs can be
17	changed.
18	And the regime that we're doing this
19	this is a totally new regime, RAD. And we're
20	certainly going to learn things as we implement it.
21	We're going to learn things both by impact on our

residents or our participants first. And we

1	certainly will learn in our advocacy and our
2	response to advocacy. So, it is not a fixed,
3	etched-in-stone kind of process, even though we
4	think that what we're putting forward today is
5	legal and you should approve it.
6	CHAIR ALBERT: Great. Thank you so
7	much. So, I'm going to ask Ashley Graham.
8	MEMBER LANCASTER: If I may, Mr. Chair.
9	CHAIR ALBERT: Yes. You may.
10	MEMBER LANCASTER: You say we have
11	passed the due date to get this in?
12	MR. SLAUGHTER: They're we have been
13	working with HUD on a schedule to get our first
14	deals done and set a deadline for that. And then
15	we got one or two extensions? We've had several
16	extensions as we go through this regulatory
17	process. It required that we get extensions,
18	because we've got to get this in place with you.
19	MEMBER LANCASTER: So, what you're
20	saying now, if this does not pass today, we lose
21	out on it totally?
22	MR. SLAUGHTER: Possibly. HUD could

1	be exhausted in its grants of extension. I'm not
2	predicting that. We certainly would try, but
3	that's what you're running the risk of.
4	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: So, how come we
5	always be running this risk that we going to make
6	new mistakes, and we constantly still make the same
7	mistakes if now, I'm going to concede I'll
8	be honest. HUD has everybody but me in mind. And
9	what I don't understand
10	CHAIR ALBERT: Could you put your mic
11	on, Commissioner?
12	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Oh. I
12 13	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: Oh. I apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in
13	apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in
13 14	apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in mind. If HUD set the policy, because I guess,
13 14 15	apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in mind. If HUD set the policy, because I guess, because I'm a tenant. And public housing give you
13 14 15 16	apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in mind. If HUD set the policy, because I guess, because I'm a tenant. And public housing give you rules. And you learn how to follow the rules. You
13 14 15 16 17	apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in mind. If HUD set the policy, because I guess, because I'm a tenant. And public housing give you rules. And you learn how to follow the rules. You read the rules, and you make the rules work with
13 14 15 16 17	apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in mind. If HUD set the policy, because I guess, because I'm a tenant. And public housing give you rules. And you learn how to follow the rules. You read the rules, and you make the rules work with you by understanding how the rules are written and
13 14 15 16 17 18	apologize. Seriously, HUD has everybody but me in mind. If HUD set the policy, because I guess, because I'm a tenant. And public housing give you rules. And you learn how to follow the rules. You read the rules, and you make the rules work with you by understanding how the rules are written and how you dialogue the rules.

Commissioner, and I don't make the same mistakes.

I'm learning and growing. I do not make the same mistakes. So, if I know that I'm late on this, and I know that if I'm constantly late, is it got something to do with your staff that don't know how to get something done on time?

I mean, everybody going to be late about something, but ever since we've been on this board -- I don't know about you Neil Albert, but I'm telling you the truth, this is a practice of this Housing Authority. What you see here today, always. And that means a new Chair and a new Director get caught up with us, because we're sick and tired of being sick and tired. And we can understand sometimes. But this is now a way of life. And the way of life stinks.

MR. SLAUGHTER: Ms. Vann-Ghasri, let me respond, if I may Mr. Chairman, we certainly have no desire to be late. And we have a new mandate with a new boss saying we shall not be late. This was a big process. It ran up against the urgency that the HUD schedule creates. It is not ideal,

but we're asking you to go forward with it. 1 CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah. 2 3 MR. KANE: Just further clarification, if like. 4 you So, without regulations, the default under the RAD notice would 5 6 be that -- there are provisions in the RAD notice, 7 pursuant to which the properties would operate. And that would also default, essentially to our 8 HCBP program, because that's basically the world 9 10 in which the properties would be converted. 11 MR. SLAUGHTER: And that we would have 12 lost the overall mandate, which is to make a RAD 13 participant have a conversion to RAD, but not lost any rights -- or, in effect, operating as if they 14 were in public housing. 15 this regime is about, 16 That's what trying to do. And we understand the comments from 17 the advocates that some of what we're moving over 18 is not the best version. 19 I get the sequencing. That is what is So, why not fix it now for both? 20 21 before you And we're saying there's now.

opportunity to do that, but we also have this

CHAIR ALBERT: Okay. 2 3 MEMBER GARRETT: And, Commissioners, it doesn't also necessarily mean that we would even 4 5 agree at the end of the day. As you can see, we have two different sides of the table that we're 6 7 looking at with regard to these regulations. addition, it's not our intent for us to be late. 8 It would not be my intention for us to be at this 9 point in time, if I had been given maybe, you know, 10 You know, 120 days, versus the 60 that 11 more time. I've been on board. So, but this is the point that 12 And asking for another extension from 13 we're at. HUD, I don't know whether or not that would actually 14 be possible. 15 So --16 CHAIR ALBERT: Right. MEMBER NEAL JONES: Will the changes 17 that we have identified, that we are aligned with 18 -- will they be incorporated into the version? 19 20 MR. SLAUGHTER: Yes. We are proposing that you approve, subject to our making changes, 21 22 which we've outlined in the document, that you just

limited window to get the two deals done.

1	got late. So, they are there for you to see. The
2	advocates have seen some of the advocates have
3	seen them. But that is our plan to adopt, a
4	reg-line from the last proposed version that would
5	incorporate changes that we've identified and that
6	the advocate have urged us to make. It may not be
7	all, but we think we'll have a good set of regs at
8	that point, subject to perfection over time and
9	experience.
10	MR. KANE: As a matter of practice, the
11	proposed regs don't automatically become final.
12	We actually have to republish them.
13	CHAIR ALBERT: Right.
14	MR. KANE: Right. So what we
15	republish will incorporate the changes that we've
16	outlined and accepted.
17	CHAIR ALBERT: So, if these rules, if
18	these regs get published, what's the publish
19	period? Is it two months? Three months? And how
20	do they where do they get published?
21	MR. KANE: On the D.C. Register.
22	CHAIR ALBERT: Right. So

1	MR. KANE: So, and they are the
2	proposed regs would offer 30 days of public
3	comment. These will be as final and then would
4	have to be amended through a process that looked
5	like this.
6	CHAIR ALBERT: And what so, just
7	explain to me what that process would look like,
8	if we needed to amend these.
9	MR. SLAUGHTER: We would propose
10	amendments. They would come for your
11	consideration. They would be published for 30
12	days for notice and comment. And then they would
13	if that period went on and was expired, we could
14	go final with changes. I want to address
15	CHAIR ALBERT: But you can amend those
16	at any time. Right?
17	MR. SLAUGHTER: Any time. Yes.
18	CHAIR ALBERT: At any time. So, if the
19	advocacy community and you guys were able to get
20	in a room and would I'm looking at Jennifer
21	within 90 days, agree on what should be
22	MR. SLAUGHTER: Or disagree,

1 CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah. I worked with the advocacy community, and Jennifer knows for a 2 3 long time that we never really agree on everything, but we reach agreement. 4 5 MR. SLAUGHTER: Yes. 6 CHAIR ALBERT: And we agree to disagree 7 on some parts. But, so, that's where I'm hoping So, if 90 days from now -- and I'm not we'll get. 8 setting anything in stone here, after a continuous 9 dialogue between the sides, we get to a reasonable 10 11 place -- not to -- maybe full agreement would be 12 utopia, but a reasonable place. So, what happens 13 next? Do you come -- you come back to us? You come 14 back to --SLAUGHTER: If we have 15 MR. some 16 agreements on changes --CHAIR ALBERT: Uh-huh. 17 MR. SLAUGHTER: We would fashion a set 18 of proposed amendments to the then-final regs, the 19 ones you would have approved today. And then we 20 publish them for 30 days. And then the new reg 21 22 regime would include those changes. And that

1	would be us having benefitted from a dialogue with
2	our advocate partners for the 90 days. Which, you
3	said, that will meet it.
4	MR. KANE: And generally the
5	permission to publish the first set of proposed
6	comes from your operations committee.
7	MR. SLAUGHTER: Yes. That would be
8	good. The only hang up would be the January break
9	you take.
10	CHAIR ALBERT: Well, I think it would
11	take more than
12	PARTICIPANT: We don't ask for it
13	MR. SLAUGHTER: That would be time for
14	us to meet.
15	CHAIR ALBERT: Well, I don't want to
16	and, look, again, I do have a history of working
17	with some of the folks in the audience today, and
18	witnesses. It's going to take you know,
19	Jennifer, I don't mean to disagree with you
20	publicly. It's going to take more than a few days,
21	just given my history of working with your

community on issues. And, so, I am sort of

recommending more like a 90-day period and then a, you know, a few-weeks period of dialogue.

Just to be -- I mean, it's the holiday season. And I, you know, I know Jennifer loves working on the holidays -- I'm just picking on you Jennifer.

Ι just want to set reasonable expectations here, that this is not something we're going to get accomplished by the end -- by the end of the month. And, so, what I would love to -- like to suggest -- and, Ashley, we're still going to hear from you, is that -- and I'll talk to you guys off-line, is that we actually amend this resolution somewhat that would authorize us to go forward for the deal purposes that we have. But put something in here that requires that within 90 days we bring this back to -- we reopen it. You quys can wordsmith it. We bring this back to the Board after you've had significant input from the advocacy community.

So, that's where I'm thinking I'm going to go on this. So, but thank you gentlemen very

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	much. You did a very good
2	MEMBER LANCASTER: Mr. Chair, just a
3	moment, please, if I may.
4	CHAIR ALBERT: Yes.
5	MEMBER LANCASTER: Now, what I'm
6	hearing is, that you speak of those 90 days, there's
7	no way at this particular time we can get a friendly
8	amendment of this before we leave here today?
9	CHAIR ALBERT: Oh, no. That's what
10	I'm proposing.
11	MEMBER LANCASTER: Yeah. But I'm
12	before going public. I'm talking about before
13	going to publication.
14	CHAIR ALBERT: So, I don't know that we
15	can do that, because we're not meeting between now
16	and I can't meet between now and the end of the
17	year. We can meet next week, obviously.
18	MEMBER LANCASTER: Great.
19	CHAIR ALBERT: I don't know that
20	there's sufficient time between now and next week
21	to do this. And, again, if we want to make, sort
22	of, RAD policy the policy, I think we need to

1	take time to do it. And, you know, I'm thinking
2	three months at a minimum. So, my amendment would
3	allow the deal to go forward, or the submission to
4	HUD to go forward, but at the same time leave room
5	the window wide open for the advocates' input.
6	MEMBER SLOVER: What clarification.
7	CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah.
8	MEMBER SLOVER: I had a feeling that
9	this is where this would go. Would it work to call
10	out the deals that are on the chopping block?
11	CHAIR ALBERT: Specifically into
12	MEMBER SLOVER: Into this, and say,
13	this only is valid
14	(Simultaneous speaking.)
15	CHAIR ALBERT: I think that's a great
16	idea.
17	MEMBER SLOVER: for these two
18	things, but also those are subject to change as
19	well. I mean, in other words, in an attempt to try
20	to, you know, alleviate the pressure, which is
21	these two particular deals, right?
22	CHAIR ALBERT: Right.

1	MEMBER SLOVER: You would cordon this
2	thing of, these regulations are only valid for
3	these two deals.
4	MR. SLAUGHTER: Exactly.
5	MEMBER SLOVER: And then, going beyond
6	that, you're saying, but these can also be changed.
7	In other words, you don't want those two to be out
8	on an island.
9	CHAIR ALBERT: Right.
10	MEMBER SLOVER: When we get closer,
11	with the people who are going to sue us over this.
12	I mean, what I see is the people in front of us who
13	are having a problem with it. We need to get
14	closer.
15	CHAIR ALBERT: They're never going to
16	sue us. They're our partners.
17	MEMBER SLOVER: They can and might.
18	We'd like to get closer together with them where
19	they are. Is that a possibility from a compliance
20	perspective, in terms of trying to appease
21	everybody in the room?
22	MEMBER GARRETT: Commissioner Slover,

1	what if one thing we've discussed is a phase-in
2	process for this. But also, the other piece, I
3	just want to I just have a question. If we were
4	to do it in that manner, what happens to the other
5	opportunities, if there is no final agreement
6	between the advocates and the agency at the end of
7	the day? I mean, how do we
8	MEMBER SLOVER: We bring it back to
9	another vote. Vote on what we've got right now.
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	MEMBER GARRETT: It's just that No.
12	No. Because we'll probably be at this same point.
13	MEMBER SLOVER: But, Director, I think
14	we will have bridged.
15	(Simultaneous speaking.)
16	PARTICIPANT: Well, hopefully we'll
17	have bridged hopefully we'll be a little bit
18	closer. And we won't be in a, you know
19	MEMBER LANCASTER: And that would be
20	part of the amendment that I'm seeking right now
21	to get this thing
22	MEMBER SLOVER: What I'm seeing is

people who are pissed off that they weren't participating in the process. And they feel like they want to be heard, and they weren't heard. And that's what I'm seeing. And what I'm saying, is we may be here, and they may be here. If we can get to here, we're better off than where we are right now.

So, I just want to echo. CHAIR ALBERT: So, I know Commissioner Slover hears from the advocacy community directly. I also hear from And they're angst is really that there them. hasn't been sufficient time for them to really give deep and thoughtful consideration of -- sweeping is the word one person used. I wouldn't describe -- I wouldn't call her out. I wouldn't describe it as sweeping, but in her mind it's sweeping. And, so, it needed a longer time frame and a better process of input from the community. So, what I'm trying to do is to -- give us -- give the staff what it needs to move forward, but also give our partners and the community to weigh in on this in a significant manner, so that at the end of the day,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

even if we don't agree on the specifics, at least we wouldn't be accused of rushing a process that could affect people's lives.

MEMBER NEAL JONES: Clarifying question though.

CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah.

MEMBER NEAL JONES: If we were to cordon it off and make it specific -- if we revise the regulations, would that automatically apply to everything, like, even if we did single out these two deals?

MR. KANE: So, it sounds as though what you're attempting to do is -- we're going to -- if you approve the regs, they will be the regulations under which properties converted under RAD would operate. You would open period to have a more intense dialogue with the advocacy community for 90 days. And until you have the ability to review the results of that conversation, my presumption is that you would toll or stop any further attempts to convert additional properties under RAD or do more deals. The regulations would continue to be

1	effective until you either amended it or repealed
2	it. So, what you'd be because you'd have
3	properties that were converted, would be operating
4	under that scheme. They would be subject to
5	amendments to the scheme. So, to the extent that
6	anything changed, those properties converted under
7	RAD would still fall under the application of the
8	regulations.
9	MEMBER NEAL JONES: And right now, at
10	least for the next three months or so, we don't
11	foresee any other RAD properties coming in?
12	PARTICIPANT: No.
13	MEMBER NEAL JONES: Okay.
14	CHAIR ALBERT: Okay. I'm going to ask
15	Ashley to come forward and give her testimony.
16	MS. GRAHAM-WTANABE: Good afternoon.
17	PARTICIPANT: Good afternoon.
18	MS. GRAHAM-WTANABE: Thank you, Board.
19	Thank you, Executive Director Garrett for the
20	opportunity to come speak. My name is Ashley
21	Graham-Watanabe, and I am a housing staff attorney
22	at Neighborhood Legal Services Program or NLSP.

Now, you're used to seeing Lori Leibowitz here, who is also a staff attorney at Neighborhood Legal Services Program. She was unavailable today. So, I will try my best to live up to her great standards.

Just, before I get started with the testimony I've prepared, I want to speak for Jennifer, Amanda, and I, saying, you know, we welcome every single opportunity to come to the table to speak about these issues, recognizing every single person in this room is very busy. So, we'd like to get in touch with everyone early. We'd like to get in touch with everyone often, so we can coordinate schedules, so we can make sure we're meeting these time deadlines as best possible. It's vitally important to us to be at the table to give our input, and meeting with us early and often is the best way, we think, going forward.

Now, I want to specifically talk about one area of the proposed regulations that NLSP and the advocacy community find problematic. And

that's the regulations dealing with transfers. Now, we did receive notice yesterday about that some of the language regarding transfers would be changed. However, as both of my colleagues have addressed, we are a little -- we don't have the final language. Just that it would be addressed. So, I might be speaking to some old language, but we just want to make it clear, we don't know what that language is as of now. We just know that something is going to change.

So, in the proposed regulations, there are three different types of transfers. One is mandatory transfers. There is priority are transfers, and there standard voluntary Mandatory transfers are the ones transfers. required by DCHA. A property is being renovated and demolished, and the family needs to move. There are housing conditions that are a threat to family safety. They are in a wrong-sized unit, or a family that is an accessible unit does not need that accessible unit -- another, anymore, for some reason.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Priority voluntary transfers are the second category. And those are for those who require accessible units. Those who are victims of domestic violence, and households for whom the HAP contract has been terminated between the owner and the DCHA.

Standard voluntary transfers are those requested for the convenience or other purposes not listed. For both kinds of transfers listed as voluntary, leases are required to be lease compliant, and, unless they are requesting a transfer as a reasonable accommodation, must have lived there for 12 months.

The first issue is the problem of the specific category priority voluntary transfers. Treating a transfer that is required for a disability or because of domestic voluntary is both problematic and potentially illegal. If implemented as written -- and, again, we're going by what we have received actually written, this would likely violate both VAWA, the Fair Housing Act, and local and federal anti-discriminations

laws.

These should be called just simply priority transfers. They are not voluntary. And they should be treated more similarly to mandatory transfers than as voluntary transfer.

There should be a separate section governing these transfers, as transfers for these reasons are required by law. Calling these voluntary transfers and requiring full lease compliance before transfers be made may also violate fair housing laws.

People who have disabilities or who have been victims of domestic violence should not be required to have every household member compliant with all lease terms and conditions. For instance, good housekeeping. If someone's a victim of domestic violence and is in a dangerous situation, things like good housekeeping should not be considered.

As a solution, restoring the language that was previously contained in 6402.7 should solve the problem. And we do notice that that is

listed as a potential solution in what we received yesterday, but we just don't have that language to see it.

Additionally, the requirement that a victim of domestic violence should live in their unit for 12 months before they are eligible for transfer is a violation of FAWA. A victim of domestic violence should not have to wait in a dangerous situation before they are eligible to move. Simply put, priority voluntary transfers should be called priority transfers.

Secondly, I would like to address the prioritization of transfers. The way the prioritization of transfers request is written now, as listed under section 5750.16, people who are under, over household -- under house, take priority over situations of a life-threatening medical or public safety nature.

This could simply be fixed by moving the priority sections together. Under -- as the regulations are written now, they are in different sections. This would create one hierarchy for all

transfers, instead of prioritizing mandatory transfers over the voluntary transfers, which, as we discussed, aren't really voluntary. This way, people who needed to be transferred because of situations of life-threatening medical or public safety natures, and who require reasonable accommodations, will be prioritized over mandatory transfers because of housing over under the unit.

Third, I want to speak about the number of offers an individual receives under a mandatory transfers. Under the proposed regulations, a household who is under a mandatory transfer will only receive one offer of transfer. We contend that this household should receive at least two transfer offers for the other units when they are being forced to move, either because of a change in household competition or because the building they are in is being demolished.

Example that we have come through our doors is domestic violence. So, when someone is a victim of domestic violence, that's -- you know they're the victim of domestic violence, and

mandatory transfers may not go hand in hand. Our client was under a mandatory transfers for over and under house. And the first unit she was offered was literally in the same hallway as her abuser. She had a stay-away order from the individual. She wasn't -- she could not be in that same area, and the first place they offered her was literally down the hall.

Under the regulations right now, she would be required to move, or she would lose her assistance. Thankfully, we were able to get involved and stop that, but our fear is those who don't have those representations might not have that same outcome.

Finally, I would like to speak briefly about the time periods listed in the proposed regulations in regard to transfers. So, 5751.10 states that a tenant's transfer voucher shall expire at the earlier date of issuance or when DCHA has terminated the HAP contract to the previous landlord. We contend that this should be the later of the two. It is often takes our clients more than

six months to find and lease up in a new unit with a voucher. Tenants in RAD -- Tenants in RAD units should not be given less time to find a new place with the tenant-based vouchers.

Additionally, 5751 states that a family shall not -- not be eligible for another voucher for two years if they issued a transfer voucher that has expired. This should be deleted. Neither HCVP or the public-based vouchers has a 24-month waiting period when a household fails to secure housing with a transfer voucher. Realistically, going to the bottom of the RAD-tenant voucher waiting list will mean that the household has to wait more than 24 months to receive another voucher.

In closing, I hope that you take our suggestions into consideration. For our clients, housing assistance is vital, and each regulation you pass has a direct impact on a family. Thank you.

CHAIR ALBERT: Thank you very much,
Ashley. Any questions, comments from any of the

Commissioners?

Great. So, at this time, I'm going to ask that we take a three-minute recess. The staff's working on the language for the revised resolution that I proposed. And then we will reconvene and hopefully adjourn soon after.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:35 p.m. and resumed at 12:55 p.m.)

CHAIR ALBERT: Okay. We're going to reconvene our special board meeting. When we left we asked the staff to prepare a revision to the resolution to reflect comments and desires of the Commissioners. Ed, can you read what you came up with?

MR. KANE: Sure, Mr. Chair. The -- so, the revision is to the actual resolution paragraph, that now -- now therefore be resolved. And then the addition of a second proviso paragraph. So, I'll read both of them in full.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of District of Columbia

Housing Authority that in order to facilitate the conversion under the RAD program of Colorado Apartments, Columbia Road, Fairlawn Marshall and Matthews Memorial, proposed in Chapter 57, Rental Assistance Demonstration Administrative Plan, and the following proposed amendments to Chapter 61 Public Housing Admission and Re-certification, Low-rent Housing, Chapter 64 Public Housing Transfer Policy, and Chapter 89, Informal Hearing Procedures for Applicants and Participants of the Housing Choice Voucher and Moderate Rehabilitation Program, collectively, the RAD regulations, adopted as proposed herein be -- herein as final regulations. Thank you.

Provided, however -- next paragraph -- provided, however, that DCHA shall not undertake any further conversions under RAD of DCHA-owned or mixed-finance properties, and no such conversion shall be authorized by the Board of Commissioners unless and until, within 90 days of the date hereof, DCHA staff and representatives of its Office of General Counsel shall have met and discussed with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	representatives of the Legal Service Provider
2	Community, comments and or proposed changes to the
3	RAD regulations. The DCHA Board of Commissioners
4	shall have considered any revised regulations
5	resulting from said consultations with Legal
6	Service Providers, and the Board of Commissioners
7	shall have affirmed the effect of the RAD
8	regulations as published, or authorize publication
9	of any amendments to the RAD regulations, resulting
10	from a consultation with the Legal Service
11	Providers.
12	CHAIR ALBERT: That's a mouthful. Any
13	questions or comments from Bill?
14	MEMBER SLOVER: I just want to make
15	sure it's clarified that those I'm sure it's a
16	technical thing, but that the four identified
17	properties would be subject to the if-amended RAD
18	regulations. I assume that that would just happen
19	naturally.
20	MR. KANE: So, once they the by
21	construction of the regulations, the applicability
22	would include these properties. That won't change

1 if they're amended. And that, as a matter of fact, we -- you know, the application of the regulations 2 3 to the properties will continue without regard to any amendment. The amended regs will continue to 4 5 apply to the properties, as amended. 6 MEMBER SLOVER: And that opens up a different question, which is -- the regs of the 7 application to the property. Can you walk through 8 how that works from a -- from an ongoing, like, 9 10-year-from-now perspective? So, say, 10 years 10 11 from now, how does it -- how does the -- a different 12 board decides to sell it to somebody else, and we're no longer the owner. How do we -- does it go with 13 the title, with the deed, with the property? 14 MR. KANE: Right. 15 These regulations that 16 MEMBER SLOVER: we are talking about. 17 So, there are few different 18 MR. KANE: ways that that connection's made. 19 First of all, there would be a use agreement that looks like a 20 21 regulatory operating agreement in and

mixed-finance situation, which would pull over

onto it all of the RAD-specific and public-housing 1 type in these regulations. All the requirements 2 3 that would touch the operation of the property would be codified in the use agreement, which I 4 believe is a recorded document like an RNO is. 5 In addition to that, there's a restriction document 6 that is recorded against the land that puts in place 7 the affordability and locks that in as well. 8 And I think that the -- where you're --9 10 and then via the use agreements and control 11 documents, which are contractual between the 12 Housing Authority and the owner of the property, it would pull over the application of the regs, in 13 addition to which, the regs, by their own language, 14 applied to any property converted under -- any DCHA 15 property that's converted under RAD, whether it be 16 mixed-finance or DCHA-owned public-housing 17 18 property. And then would be 19 MEMBER SLOVER: subject to future amendments as well. 20 21 MR. KANE: Yes.

MEMBER SLOVER:

22

In other words, you

1	know, one of the concerns is, you know, you're
2	stepping away from control.
3	MR. KANE: Sure.
4	MEMBER SLOVER: So, the door back into
5	control is through this mechanism you just walked
6	through, essentially? What little control we have
7	left.
8	MR. KANE: I'd describe it a little
9	differently. I think you are the control
10	mechanism is contractual, rather than direct
11	ownership. So, you still have to impose the regime
12	on the property somehow. You do it by a system of
13	contracts and declarative-type documents that run
14	with the wind.
15	MEMBER SLOVER: Okay.
16	CHAIR ALBERT: Great. Any other
17	questions or comments?
18	MEMBER SLOVER: And just one the
19	final question would be, they all the document
20	that you circulated last night, which referred to
21	some potential changes
22	MR. KANE: Yes.

1	MEMBER SLOVER: is that referenced
2	at all in here, in terms of accepting or adding or
3	doing anything with those?
4	MR. KANE: Referenced where? I'm
5	sorry.
6	MEMBER SLOVER: In this resolution. I
7	didn't recall that.
8	MR. KANE: No. Not specifically.
9	What that chart represents is it is a guide for
10	the reader to understand the results of our
11	consideration of the comments.
12	MEMBER SLOVER: Right.
13	MR. KANE: So, it's a working document,
14	as opposed to so, there's going to be a markup.
15	There's that basically summarizes changes in the
16	same 140-page document that the Legal Service
17	Providers have been reviewing.
18	MEMBER SLOVER: Okay. So, this goes
19	in another thing, that I'm sure everybody's tired
20	of me hearing say this, but it goes to the
21	approving stuff, that we have no idea what we're
22	

1	authority. And, so, it's another example of you
2	asking us to approve a document that we've actually
3	not read, because it's actually not done.
4	MR. KANE: I think that is certainly
5	true. But I think what we're also doing is we are
6	approving a set of regulations drafted pursuant to
7	policy that you've outlined, incorporating
8	comments that we've received.
9	MEMBER SLOVER: Right. But, I just
10	want to be clear that this is another you know,
11	just like with these development deals and
12	everything else, we're acceding authority to the
13	Executive Director to go ahead and do something
14	that we actually don't see. And I just want to
15	I want to put that on for
16	CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah. But that's not
17	factual at all.
18	MEMBER SLOVER: Why when you're
19	asking us to
20	CHAIR ALBERT: We've had RAD
21	symposium. Right? So, this is specific to the
22	RAD regulations. We've had RAD symposiums. I

1	think there's more than one we've had. So, we've
2	had two. And, so, we're not seeing this for the
3	first time. So
4	MEMBER SLOVER: But the RAD
5	regulations are not finalized, Neil. My point is
6	
7	CHAIR ALBERT: Yeah. I know, but
8	we've seen the foundation of those regulations.
9	What you have and what was not finalized was the
10	conversation of the back and forth between the
11	advocacy community and the staff. So, I would
12	agree with you on that part.
13	MEMBER SLOVER: So, we're approving a
14	concept, I mean, is what you're saying. We're
15	approving a set of disgusting conceptual ideas that
16	are then going to be put into a legal document.
17	CHAIR ALBERT: We're approving a set of
18	a set of guidelines that were presented to this
19	board twice in the RAD symposium Not RAT, but
20	RAD symposium. And we are making provisions for
21	further amendments or adjustments to those,
22	through this process. That's where this

1 resolution --MEMBER SLOVER: Okay. But what I'm 2 saying as a board member is, in the future, I 3 personally don't feel comfortable about approving 4 something -- I would actually like to see what it 5 6 is that I'm approving. Whether it's 7 regulations or the disposition of a piece of property, or a mixed-finance deal. I want to get 8 9 away from, you know, go use your best efforts and come back to us five years later, and tell us how 10 11 I want to get away from that. it went. 12 CHAIR ALBERT: Okay. So, I'm ready to 13 call a vote. I'm not going to ask you to repeat the revised resolution, but I move approval of the 14 resolution as revised. 15 MR. KANE: Ask for a motion. 16 CHAIR ALBERT: You can say it out loud. 17 MR. KANE: Ask for a motion. 18 I would like to 19 CHAIR ALBERT: Oh. obtain a motion to -- for the resolution as revised. 20 Is there a motion? 21

Motion.

PARTICIPANT:

1	CHAIR ALBERT: Is there a second?
2	MS. MCNAIR: Second.
3	CHAIR ALBERT: All those in favor.
4	(Chorus of aye.)
5	CHAIR ALBERT: Do you want to do a roll
6	call on that? Commissioner Kenner?
7	MEMBER KENNER: Yes.
8	MS. MCNAIR: And I just want to state
9	for the record that Commissioner Lancaster joined
10	us after the call for a quorum. So, we have eight
11	Commissioners present.
12	Commissioner Kenner.
13	MEMBER KENNER: Yes.
14	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Lancaster.
15	MEMBER LANCASTER: With the further
16	amendment to resolution 1731 to authorize the
17	publication of final regulation for implementation
18	
	of the demonstration plan, with that further
19	of the demonstration plan, with that further amendment, I say, yes.
19 20	
	amendment, I say, yes.

1	Vann-Ghasri.
2	MEMBER VANN-GHASRI: No.
3	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Fisher.
4	MEMBER FISHER: I abstain.
5	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Council.
6	MEMBER COUNCIL: No.
7	MS. MCNAIR: Commissioner Slover.
8	MEMBER SLOVER: No.
9	MS. MCNAIR: Chairman Albert.
10	CHAIR ALBERT: Yes.
11	MS. MCNAIR: There was a four yes, one
12	no I'm sorry. Three nos, and one abstention.
13	The resolution does not pass as amended.
14	CHAIR ALBERT: Great. Thank you very
15	much. Is there any other business to come before
16	the board today? Hearing none, we are adjourned.
17	Thank you so much.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
19	went off the record at 1:05 p.m. and resumed at 1:12
20	p.m.)
21	CHAIR ALBERT: So, we're reconvening
22	the Board meeting, the special board meeting, just

1	for clarification on the vote that was taken.
2	Standing before us is our General Counsel. You'll
3	want to state your name for the record.
4	MR. SLAUGHTER: My name is Ken
5	Slaughter. I'm the General Counsel of DC Housing.
6	After consultation with the chairman and reviewing
7	the rules, we believe that a correction should be
8	made to the record, showing that the last
9	resolution, number
10	PARTICIPANT: 17-31.
11	MR. SLAUGHTER: 17-31? All right.
12	That should be recorded as approved by a vote of
13	four to three with one abstention not counting.
14	CHAIR ALBERT: So, and is that your
15	opinion?
16	MR. SLAUGHTER: That is my opinion.
17	CHAIR ALBERT: Great. Any questions?
18	Hearing none, our meeting is adjourned.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
20	went off the record at 1:13 p.m.)
21	

1

2

3

4