

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

John H. Reagan Building
Room JHR 140
105 W. 15th Street
Austin, Texas

September 7, 2017
9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS:

J.B GOODWIN, Chair
LESLIE BINGHAM ESCAREÑO, Vice Chair
PAUL BRADEN, Member
ASUSENA RESÉNDIZ Member
SHARON THOMASON, Member
LEO VASQUEZ, Member

TIMOTHY K. IRVINE, Executive Director

I N D E X

| <u>AGENDA ITEM</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| CALL TO ORDER | 9 |
| ROLL CALL | |
| CERTIFICATION OF QUORUM | |
| Resolution recognizing October as National Energy Awareness Month | 10 |
| CONSENT AGENDA | |
| ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS PRESENTED IN THE BOARD MATERIALS: | 9 |
| EXECUTIVE | |
| a) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on Board meeting minutes summaries for June 29, 2017, and July 13, 2017 | |
| b) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on Board action authorizing of Chair to conduct performance review, and establish salary of Executive Director | |
| LEGAL | |
| c) Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding the adoption of an Agreed Final Order concerning Southdale Apartments (HTC 92179 / CMTS 1090) | |
| d) Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding the adoption of an Agreed Final Order concerning Autumn Oaks of Corinth (HTC 01144 / CMTS 386) | |
| e) Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding the adoption of Agreed Final Orders concerning related properties, Enchanted Oaks (HTC 70082 / CMTS 911) and Lively Oaks (HTC 92043 / CMTS 1042) | |
| f) Presentation, discussion and possible action on a final order in the matter of Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. DeCarlo and Veletta Coleman; State Office of Administrative Hearings ("SOAH") Docket No. 332-17-2472.HCA | |

HOUSING RESOURCE CENTER

- g) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on a draft amendment of the 2017 State of Texas Consolidated Plan: One-Year Action Plan

HOME AND HOMELESS PROGRAMS

- h) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on awards for the 2017 HOME Investment Partnerships Program ("HOME") Single Family Programs Homebuyer Assistance ("HBA") and Tenant-Based Rental Assistance ("TBRA") Open Cycle Notice of Funding Availability ("NOFA")

TEXAS HOMEOWNERSHIP

- I) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on the Single Family Mortgage Loan and Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) Programs Participating Lender List

COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

- j) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on the Section 8 Program 2018 Streamlined Annual Public Housing Agency ("PHA") Plan for the Housing Choice Voucher Program and update on revisions to the Section 8 Administrative Plan

ASSET MANAGEMENT

- k) Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding a material amendment to the Housing Tax Credit Application ("HTC") Application and a change in the ownership structure of the Development Owner, Developer, and Guarantors prior to issuance of IRS Form(s) 8609 13608 Decatur-Angle Apartments Fort Worth
- l) Presentation, discussion and possible action to approve a material amendment to the Housing Tax Credit ("HTC") Land Use Restriction Agreement ("LURA") and Resolution No. 18-001 relating to the Second Amended and Restated Regulatory and Land Use Restriction Agreement 05613 Providence Mockingbird Dallas
- m) Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding material amendment to the Housing Tax Credit Application 16034 Conrad Lofts Plainview

- n) Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding a change in the ownership structure of the Development Owner prior to issuance of IRS Form(s) 8609 for City Square Apartment Homes
15247 City Square Apartment Homes Garland
- o) Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding a material amendment to the Housing Tax Credit ("HTC") Application, a change in the ownership structure of the Development Owner, Developer and Guarantors prior to issuance of IRS Form(s) 8609, and a waiver of §11.9(b)(2) of the Qualified Allocation Plan ("QAP")
16114 The Veranda Townhomes Plano

MULTIFAMILY FINANCE

- p) Presentation, discussion and possible action on Determination Notices for Housing Tax Credits with another Issuer 148
17413 Flora Lofts Dallas
17414 Silver Gardens Apartments Dallas
17430 Chelsea Apartments El Paso
- q) Presentation, discussion and possible action on Determination Notices for Housing Tax Credits with another Issuer and an Award of Direct Loan Funds 123
17423 Palladium Glenn Heights
Glenn Heights
- r) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on Inducement Resolution No. 18-005 for Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds Regarding Authorization for Filing Applications for Private Activity Bond Authority on the 2017 Waiting List
17624 Vista on Gessner Houston

RULES

- s) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on adoption of amendments to 10 TAC Chapter 10, Uniform Multifamily Rules Subchapter F, Compliance Monitoring, §10.610 concerning Written Policies and Procedures and §10.613 concerning Lease Requirements and directing that they be published in the *Texas Register*

- t) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on proposed new 10 TAC Chapter 8, Section 811 Project Rental Assistance Program Rule, and directing that it be published in the *Texas Register*
- u) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on adoption of amendments to 10 TAC Chapter 23, Single Family HOME Program Rules Subchapter B, Availability of Funds, Application Requirements, Review And Award Procedures, General Administrative Requirements, and Resale and Recapture of Funds, §23.25 concerning General Threshold and Selection Criteria; and Subchapter F, Tenant-Based Rental Assistance Program, §23.61 concerning Tenant-Based Rental Assistance ("TBRA") General Requirements, and directing their publication for public comment in the *Texas Register*

CONSENT AGENDA REPORT ITEMS

- ITEM 2: THE BOARD ACCEPTS THE FOLLOWING REPORTS: 9
- a) TDHCA Outreach Activities,
(August-September)
 - b) Report on Department's Fair Housing Activities
 - c) Report on the Reallocation of Program Year 2016 Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program ("LIHEAP") Comprehensive Energy Assistance Program ("CEAP") funds
 - d) Presentation and discussion on the final 2017 State of Texas National Housing Trust Fund Allocation Plan

ACTION ITEMS

- ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE OFFICE 51
- Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding the taking of necessary programmatic, contractual, and other actions with respect to the use of state or federal funds for disaster response and recovery efforts for qualified persons and households most impacted by Hurricane Harvey, and directing the Executive Director and his designees to take certain actions without prior Board approval

ITEM 4: INTERNAL AUDIT 55

- a) Review of Operations in TDHCA's Information Systems Division
- b) Report on the meeting of the Audit and Finance Committee
- c) Review and possible approval of 2018 annual internal audit plan

ITEM 5: COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

- a) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on the reprogramming of non-contracted 2016 Community Services Block Grant ("CSBG") non-discretionary funds, and 2016 and 2017 discretionary and administrative funds, for disaster recovery efforts to be distributed to existing CSBG eligible entities in areas affected by Hurricane Harvey conditioned on approval of such reprogramming by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Designation of this Department Board meeting as a hearing opportunity to accept public input on such reprogramming 57
- b) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on the recommendation to the Governor to select an Eligible Entity to administer the Community Services Block Grant ("CSBG") to provide services in Dallas County 64

ITEM 6: ASSET MANAGEMENT

- a) Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding a material amendment to the Housing Tax Credit ("HTC") Application and a change in the ownership structure of the Development Owner, Developer, and Guarantors prior to issuance of IRS Form(s) 8609 for
 - 16352 Commissioners' Corner El Paso 70
 - 16354 Gonzalez Apartments El Paso 66
- b) Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding Direct Loan terms for:
 - 16185 Merritt Heritage Georgetown 99

16210 Merritt Monument Midland

ITEM 7: MULTIFAMILY FINANCE

- a) Presentation, discussion, and possible 13
action on timely filed appeals under
10 TAC §10.902 of the Department's
Multifamily Program Rules relating to
Appeals and other Provisions

17010 Baxter Lofts Harlingen

- b) Presentation, discussion and possible 129
action on regarding the Issuance of
Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds
(Casa Brendan) Series 2017 Resolution
No. 18-002 and a Determination Notice
of Housing Tax Credits

- c) Presentation, discussion and possible 132
action on regarding the Issuance of
Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds
(Nuestro Hogar) Series 2017 Resolution
No. 18-003 and a Determination Notice
of Housing Tax Credits

- d) Presentation, discussion and possible 135
action on regarding the Issuance of
Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds
(Casa, Inc.) Series 2017 Resolution
No. 18-004 and a Determination Notice
of Housing Tax Credits

- e) Presentation, discussion and possible 137
action on Determination Notices for
Housing Tax Credits with another Issuer

17431 Commissioner's Corner II El Paso

- f) Presentation, discussion, and possible 139
action regarding alternative financing
structures under the 2017-1 Multifamily
Direct Loan Notice of Funding
Availability

ITEM 8: RULES

- a) Presentation, discussion, and possible 152
action on the proposed amendment of
10 TAC Chapter 11 concerning the Housing
Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation
Plan, and directing its publication for
public comment in the *Texas Register*

- b) Presentation, discussion, and possible 192 action on proposed amendments of 10 TAC Chapter 10 Subchapter A, concerning General Information and Definitions, Subchapter B, concerning Site and Development Requirements and Restrictions, Subchapter C, concerning Application Submission Requirements, Ineligibility Criteria, Board Decisions and Waiver of Rules for Applications, and Subchapter G, concerning Fee Schedule, Appeals and Other Provisions, and directing their publication for public comment in the *Texas Register*

| | |
|---|------|
| PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS OTHER THAN ITEMS FOR WHICH THERE WERE POSTED AGENDA ITEMS | 207 |
| EXECUTIVE SESSION | none |
| OPEN SESSION | -- |
| ADJOURN | 216 |

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. GOODWIN: I call to order the Board meeting
3 for the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs,
4 September 7, 2017.

5 We'll begin will roll call. Ms. Bingham?

6 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Here.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Mr. Braden?

8 MR. BRADEN: Here.

9 MR. GOODWIN: Ms. Reséndiz?

10 MS. RESÉNDIZ: Present.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Ms. Thomason?

12 MS. THOMASON: Present.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Mr. Vasquez?

14 MR. VASQUEZ: Here.

15 MR. GOODWIN: We have a quorum, and we will
16 begin with Tim leading us in the pledge.

17 (The Pledge of Allegiance and the Texas
18 Allegiance were recited.)

19 MR. GOODWIN: Before we ask for a motion to
20 approve the consent agenda, we have a few items that are
21 going to be pulled, item 1(p) 17413 Flora Lofts, and item
22 1(q) presentation, discussion and possible action on
23 determination notices for Palladium Glenn Heights.

24 Does any Board member have any other item that
25 they want to pull from the consent agenda? Anybody in the

1 public have anything they want pulled, the staff have
2 anything they want pulled?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. ECCLES: Mr. Chair, by pulled, on Flora
5 Lofts, at least, that's not being removed from the agenda,
6 it's just being pulled from consent and being moved later.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Right. And in fact, also we're
8 doing the same with Palladium Glenn Heights. Right,
9 Marni?

10 MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes.

11 MR. GOODWIN: So both of these items will be
12 taken outside of consent for approval.

13 If not, I'll take a motion to approve the
14 consent agenda as modified.

15 MR. BRADEN: So moved.

16 MR. GOODWIN: So moved. Second?

17 MS. THOMASON: Second.

18 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

19 (A chorus of ayes.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: We have a resolution recognizing
21 October as National Energy Awareness Month. Michael, is
22 that something you want to address?

23 MR. LYTTLE: Yes, sir. The resolution can be
24 found in our board book, it reads as follows:

25 "Whereas, the U.S. Department of Energy has

1 designated October as National Energy Awareness Month;

2 "Whereas, the Weatherization Assistance
3 Program, the nation's largest residential energy
4 efficiency program, was established by the U.S. Department
5 of Energy in 1976 to make homes more energy-efficient,
6 safer, and healthier for those with low and moderate
7 incomes;

8 "Whereas, the Texas Department of Housing and
9 Community Affairs administers a Weatherization Assistance
10 Program, funded with both U.S. Department of Energy funds
11 and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program funds, which
12 is operated by a network of community organizations,
13 nonprofits and local governments;

14 "Whereas, the Texas Weatherization Assistance
15 Program has injected millions of dollars into communities
16 to improve thousands of homes, thereby helping Texans,
17 including many of whom are elderly, disabled, or families
18 with young children, conserve energy and reduce utility
19 costs;

20 "Whereas, the Program conducts computerized
21 energy audits and uses advanced diagnostic technology,
22 investing as much as \$7,212 in a home and providing an
23 array of improvements that include weather stripping of
24 doors and windows; patching cracks and holes; insulating
25 walls, floors, and attics; replacing doors, windows,

1 refrigerators, and water heaters; and repairing heating
2 and cooling systems; and

3 Whereas, weatherization efforts contribute to
4 the state's economic, social, and environmental progress
5 by creating jobs; prompting the purchase of goods and
6 services; improving housing; stabilizing neighborhoods;
7 eliminating carbon emissions; and reducing the risk of
8 fires;

9 "Now, therefore, it is hereby resolved, that
10 the Governing Board of the Texas Department of Housing and
11 Community Affairs does hereby celebrate October 2017, as
12 Energy Awareness Month in Texas.

13 "Signed this Seventh Day of September 2017."

14 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion to approve the
15 resolution?

16 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Move to so resolve.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

18 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. All in favor
20 say aye.

21 (A chorus of ayes.)

22 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: So it is passed.

25 We have a couple of distinguished guests in our

1 midst today that I'd like to recognize. First, State
2 Representative Eddie Lucio, III, and Mayor of Harlingen
3 Chris Boswell. Glad to have both of you. Thank you for
4 attending. Oh, I apologize, State Representative Oscar
5 Longoria.

6 So we're going to take up item 7(a) first.

7 MS. HOLLOWAY: We're going to do that later on.

8 MR. IRVINE: So we're just going straight
9 through the agenda.

10 MR. GOODWIN: We're going to take 7(p) Flora
11 Lofts first. We need a break before Flora Lofts.

12 MR. IRVINE: Would you please come to the
13 microphone and clarify any changes in the agenda order?

14 MS. HOLLOWAY: My apologies, we had some
15 confusion. Marni Holloway, director of Multifamily
16 Finance.

17 The first item we'd like to take up is 7(a) in
18 deference to our guests that are here this morning.

19 MR. GOODWIN: And that's Baxter Lofts?

20 MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes.

21 MR. GOODWIN: And, Brent, you're going to talk
22 about that first?

23 MR. STEWART: Yes, sir.

24 Brent Stewart, Real Estate Analysis.

25 Item 7(a) is the presentation, discussion and

1 possible action on an appeal under 10 TAC 10.901 for
2 application number 17010 Baxter Lofts in Harlingen.
3 Baxter Lofts is a proposed 24-unit adaptive reuse of a
4 nine-story historic building in downtown Harlingen.

5 I should point out that none of what we're
6 going to talk about here has anything to do with the
7 merits of revitalizing this building, it has to do with
8 some technical aspects of the application and the
9 underwriting.

10 During underwriting, Real Estate Analysis
11 determined that the property condition assessment filed
12 with the application, dated February 20, did not meet the
13 requirements of 10 TAC 10.306(a) which are the guidelines
14 and rules for the property condition assessments. Instead
15 of immediately denying the application, the program issued
16 an administrative deficiency on July 12 to provide the
17 applicant an opportunity to submit a compliant PCA report.

18 In response, the applicant submitted a supplement to the
19 original PCA, dated 7/17/17, which staff also determined
20 failed the requirements of the rules. Subsequent to that,
21 Underwriting issued an underwriting report which denied
22 the application.

23 A little background. The PCA is a critical
24 component of the application on things like rehabilitation
25 projects and adaptive reuse projects. Unlike new

1 construction transactions where the underwriter has a
2 multitude of data that can be used to cost a new
3 construction transaction, each rehab development, each
4 adaptive reuse development is very specific, very unique,
5 has its own rehab plan, it's own scope of work, it's its
6 own thing, and so the underwriter has zero ability to cost
7 out one of those transactions without the PCA report. It
8 is the document that tells staff here's what the scope of
9 work is in enough detail to understand it and here's the
10 cost of that scope of work.

11 So part of that is the outgrowth of
12 understanding the scope of work and the cost is under REA
13 rules we're supposed to determine financial feasibility,
14 and from there we're also to determine the amount of tax
15 credits to award to a transaction, and that responsibility
16 comes from IRS Code Section 42(m). Without that cost
17 information in a way that we feel confident is the number
18 to be underwritten, we're unable to meet the rules and
19 we're unable to meet the responsibilities that we have
20 under Section 42.

21 So first, before we get into the specifics of
22 the rule violations, I think there's some things that I
23 need to share with you regarding some other issues.
24 First, generally the PCA lacks information, detailed
25 information about the scope of work. I put the PCA and a

1 supplement to the PCA in your board materials.

2 First, there's a major lack of information
3 regarding some asbestos, lead-based paint and potential
4 lead in the plumbing of the building. These are certainly
5 big to us, certainly big health and safety concerns, and
6 we would expect to see a significant amount of discussion
7 about asbestos and lead-based paint and lead in the
8 plumbing in the report. The original PCA only stated that
9 the presence of these things was probable and that a Phase
10 II study should be performed, and that comment is on page
11 16 of the revised PCA.

12 We don't expect the PCA report provider to go
13 and do testing for asbestos or lead; they're not an
14 environmental consultant, we don't expect them to do that
15 research. But we do expect is that they have a good
16 enough understanding of what potentially could be in that
17 building to be able to say here's how much it might cost
18 to abate the building of the asbestos or the lead. In
19 this case, there was no indication at all about the
20 seriousness of the problem of the asbestos. The report
21 did not talk about where the asbestos was, was it all over
22 the building or was it localized to a specific part of the
23 building, how much of it might be there, what the cost
24 implications were to abate it, was it a \$50,000 issue, was
25 it a \$500,000 issue. We had no way of knowing, zero, it

1 was unknowable based on the PCA.

2 Additionally, there were no pictures inside
3 that building to show us where the asbestos might be. In
4 fact, there were no pictures of the interior of the
5 building at all. As a result of this, combined with other
6 issues in the report, we basically came away with no
7 confidence that that budget was described well enough for
8 us to rely upon to issue an underwriting report. And
9 again, to kind of highlight the absence of information,
10 the entire environmental section in the report was two
11 sentences, one of which was the asbestos and the lead was
12 probable.

13 So we raised that issue with the applicant and
14 said we have these concerns, and with other concerns that
15 we kind of talked through with them, we issued the
16 administrative deficiency and said, Go fix it. They came
17 back with a revised PCA with the same comment that the
18 asbestos and lead was probable but provided no more useful
19 information in that report about the asbestos and lead.
20 It did in the budget provide money, \$88,000 for the
21 asbestos and \$25,000 for the lead for abatement of those
22 two items, but again, we didn't know where it was, how
23 much of it it was, et cetera. So that was in the budget.
24 We didn't know how that money was estimated, we didn't
25 know if they had talked with an environmental person,

1 there was just no information in the report. All of that
2 is on page 36 of the revised PCA.

3 So we published the underwriting report with a
4 do not recommend based on the lack of information about
5 the asbestos and the lead in the building. So what's most
6 disturbing is post-publication of that underwriting
7 report, we found out from the city manager of Harlingen
8 that the asbestos had already been abated, it was abated
9 in 2015 which was much earlier than either of these PC
10 reports were dated. And again, there was no information
11 about the asbestos, there was obviously no information
12 that it had already been abated.

13 On questioning the report provider about the
14 asbestos and the money being put into the budget for
15 abatement of this stuff, it was clear that the PCA report
16 provider didn't know that the asbestos had been abated, at
17 least that's what it looks like from the report itself.
18 So I think there's some issues there with respect to what
19 was in that PCA versus the reality of the conditions on
20 the ground.

21 There are other significant concerns outlined
22 in your board material related to the budget, the overall
23 lack of information in the report, but to underscore and
24 illustrate the concerns about it, PCA reports are
25 generally pretty extensive documents, and granted, they're

1 probably more extensive on a rehab development than they
2 are on an adaptive reuse development, but there's still
3 pretty comprehensive reports. For example, they're
4 supposed to outline what codes and conditions relate into
5 it, are there code violations that are going to be fixed,
6 how are you going to fix they, what are they, how does the
7 scope of work fix those, what does that cost. There are
8 items like that in the report, and the report just
9 basically says all code violations will be fixed. There's
10 no tie from that statement to what is it in the scope of
11 work that you're going to do to fix the code violations.
12 Again, no information at all.

13 So again, PCA reports are pretty long,
14 extensive, and so not that the number of pages tells how
15 good a PCA is or not, because they're going to be
16 different, you may have PCAs that are 400 pages long
17 because they have all the research that they did, all of
18 the discussion, the notes of conversations, the interviews
19 that they did with the folks at the city, with other
20 folks. It's documented in the report what those
21 conversations were and what that person said regarding
22 that building.

23 This report, the entire original report, was 23
24 pages long. Three of it were the cover, the transmittal
25 letter and the table of contents, five of it was resume

1 information about the provider of the report, eight pages
2 of it were pictures of the outside of the building, there
3 were 13 pictures, that leaves seven pages for narrative to
4 discuss the scope of work on a nine-story historic
5 rehabilitation deal that I don't understand how an
6 underwriter was going to get a full understanding of the
7 scope of work of that deal and be able to tie it to the
8 adequacy of the budget.

9 The revised PCA that came in after the
10 administrative deficiency in large part was a
11 rearrangement of the information in the original PCA
12 report. We had provided to the applicant an example of a
13 PCA report that was done in accordance with ASTM, which is
14 kind of a standard that's used for PCA reports. I went
15 out on the web and just grabbed one from a commercial
16 retail center and said, Here is one, not saying you have
17 to do that, not saying that that's what it's going to look
18 like, but here is an example. So the revised one that
19 came back had a revised table of contents, it had the
20 information more organized according to the ASTM, but
21 there wasn't a lot of additional information or narrative
22 or description of that scope of work for us to rely on

23 They did include a page that kind of outlined I
24 guess you could call it the scope. For example, it would
25 list 24 toilets, 24 sinks, 24 lavatories, stuff like that,

1 and then there was a budget that's on a TDHCA form that
2 tied to those line items. The problem was there was no
3 description in the report about those items and the dollar
4 amounts associated with those items were not clear. The
5 toilets, lavatories and sinks were a thousand bucks
6 apiece, and so we were unclear what that meant, is it just
7 the toilet, is it the punch-out to get the plumbing to the
8 toilet, you know, what was it. We had no information
9 about what that was.

10 So 10.306(a) is in our underwriting rules and
11 it lays out the actual aspects of the rule that the PCA
12 report is supposed to meet, and I'm not going to go
13 through them all. They're outlined in your book, but I
14 think there's a couple of them that are important to
15 highlight. One of them I mentioned previously is a review
16 and documentation of any violations of any applicable
17 federal, state or local codes, developing cost estimates
18 to take care of those code violations. The report just
19 simply states that all violations will be fixed.

20 There's a require that the PCA assess to the
21 extent to which any systems or components must be
22 modified, repaired or replaced in order to comply with any
23 specific requirements of the housing program under which
24 the development is being proposed. So there should have
25 been a tie between the scope of work and the QAP and the

1 Department's rules stating specifically how this
2 development is going to meet those rules and the amount of
3 money it is going to take to meet those rules.

4 Another requirement is -- and I don't need
5 questions on this one because this a Megan issue, a Megan
6 question -- relating to accessibility issues. Again, the
7 report simply states that the building will meet all
8 accessibility requirements. There's some narrative about
9 how high the switches have to be and the turning radiuses
10 in the kitchen and some things like that, but that's only
11 a smart part of the accessibility of a building. So
12 there's kind of three subsets of that that relate to
13 accessibility. And again, 10.306(a)(6) is the operative
14 section of the rule that allows the underwriter to tie the
15 scope of work to the budget so that the underwriter can be
16 confident that that is the number to underwrite to that
17 allows us to determine the amount of tax credits to award
18 to the project.

19 So I'm happy to answer any questions that you
20 have, and again, I don't think any of this relates to the
21 merits of the development itself. Underwriting is not
22 saying anything with regards to the merits of the
23 development itself. This PCA did not meet the
24 requirements of the rule, the underwriter was not able to
25 underwrite, even after administrative deficiency was

1 issued, to underwrite the application. And that's the
2 presentation.

3 MR. GOODWIN: And staff's recommendation is?

4 MR. STEWART: To deny the appeal.

5 MR. GOODWIN: To deny the appeal.

6 MR. STEWART: Right.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions for Brent?

8 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I have a question just
9 regarding the timeline. So our board book said that the
10 PCA was basically the same PCA that was provided with the
11 2016 application with some minor revisions.

12 MR. STEWART: That's correct.

13 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: How far did that one
14 get? What did you guys do with that one?

15 MR. STEWART: So Baxter was not underwritten on
16 that deal. They submitted some other applications that
17 were awarded in 2016. They were also adaptive reuse
18 transactions. They submitted those with essentially the
19 same form of PCA and the same information within that PCA
20 about those transactions. We missed it. In the haste to
21 finally get everything 2016 underwriting report done last
22 year, we missed it. That doesn't mean that that's a pass
23 on the rules or that this report needs to conform to the
24 rules.

25 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So there was a PCA in

1 2016 that was not really -- that didn't meet standard
2 either and it slipped through, but are you saying it's
3 from the same applicant or the same architect or the same
4 developer?

5 MR. STEWART: All of it. So there was the 2016
6 report filed with that application. The 2017 report, that
7 was dated in February, was basically an update to the 2016
8 report, and then the administrative deficiency was issued,
9 and then July 7 the revised PCA came in. In between
10 there, there was some discussions with them about issues,
11 some questions about the transaction, but that's what we
12 had.

13 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: In the board book it
14 says we issued the administrative deficiency on the 12th
15 of July, they submitted a revised one on the 19th. Did I
16 get that, or no?

17 MR. STEWART: It was on the 19th; it was dated
18 the 7th.

19 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: And what was the
20 turnaround time on that? If we issued the administrative
21 deficiency on the 12th, how much time did they have to
22 like materially go back and get a more thorough
23 assessment.?

24 MR. STEWART: Seven days is the clock.

25 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I don't have any other

1 questions.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. GOODWIN: Before we hear comments, I would
5 like to entertain a motion to listen to comments regarding
6 this issue.

7 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I'll so move.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Moved? Second?

9 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

10 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

11 (A chorus of ayes.)

12 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. GOODWIN: I want to remind you if you're
15 wanting to come up to speak to please sign in and we're
16 going to adhere to the three-minute rule.

17 MS. ANDRÉ: Good morning. My name is Sarah
18 André. I'm here to speak on behalf of the project.

19 At issue here is not whether this project met
20 the rules. Rule violations are not the case; we met the
21 rules. At issue here is whether or not TDHCA had enough
22 information to underwrite this deal. I think you're going
23 to hear testimony from a number of people, that's because
24 we're very passionate about this project. It goes above
25 and beyond meeting all the scoring criteria. We were the

1 number one scoring deal in Region 11 with 156 points, but
2 it truly furthers the mission of the Department which is
3 to improve the quality of life and achieve better
4 communities in Texas, and this project really does that.

5 By way of introduction, the developer in this
6 case, MRE Capital, has extensive experience with this type
7 of project. They have eleven historic projects under
8 their belt; all of those projects are bigger than the one
9 we are talking about today. They get glowing
10 recommendations from the communities they work in; they
11 definitely know what they are doing.

12 The PCA report providers, Mike Klefner and Jim
13 Holub are both here today. They, between the two of them,
14 have done more than 600 of these reports in multiple
15 states; they've never had one rejected, not in Texas, not
16 in any state in the nation. The developer and the design
17 team and the city are all intimately familiar with this
18 building. There have been 14 site visits from the team to
19 the building over the time.

20 And from Brent's perspective, you heard about
21 one report. What he has left out is that we submitted an
22 environmental site assessment which would cover all kinds
23 of things, in addition to the PCA. You have accessibility
24 certifications from the architects, and a number of other
25 assurances about this project.

1 Further, I'd like to state that this is not a
2 rehab project, this isn't some garden apartments that
3 we're going to put new cabinetry in and new carpet and
4 call it a new deal, this is gut rehab, it's adaptive
5 reuse, it is basically new construction inside a historic
6 shell. PCAs are intended to give you information about
7 rehabilitation. They are useless in this case. When you
8 are doing all new construction, you don't write a list
9 that says every code violation that you're going to
10 mitigate with your new construction. This would be all
11 new wiring, all new plumbing, all new systems, all new
12 interior walls. I mean, there's nothing in there that is
13 salvageable. I don't think a 100-page report, a 10,000-
14 page report detailing that would have provided the
15 information that was needed.

16 Further, the rules did not change. The very
17 first thing I did when I heard that we had a deficiency on
18 this was I thought I missed something, and I went and
19 looked and word for word they were exactly the same.

20 It's going to be very difficult to wrap up.
21 May someone donate their time to me?

22 MR. GOODWIN: Sure.

23 MS. ANDRÉ: Thank you.

24 The rules have not changed from 2016 to 2017.
25 The team did submit identical PCAs for two projects that

1 are currently under construction, they were awarded last
2 year. And I find the idea that the excuse we missed it is
3 good enough for TDHCA but it's not good enough for an
4 applicant appalling.

5 You know, you have got a very long list from us
6 in your board report going point by point about how we
7 believe this met the requirements of the PCA, so I'm not
8 going to go through that. What I want to talk to you
9 about is how the underwriting team had many opportunities
10 and ways to determine the costs on this. You know, you
11 heard that they had zero ability to determine the costs,
12 but you know, they have many other means at their disposal
13 which they use all the time, because I'm familiar with
14 these, I do all kinds of projects and I get these
15 questions and provide this information. They could use
16 their extensive database of projects that have been
17 developed in Texas.

18 You know, Mr. Stewart has extensive contacts in
19 the construction industry, he used to be a developer, he
20 has a lot of knowledge about these things, and he does
21 talk to those contacts, I know that he does. They have
22 online resources at their disposal. They could have
23 looked at other projects submitted this year, and I know
24 that they do that, comparative analysis, because I get
25 questions about, hey, this other project had XYZ costs,

1 why is yours different. Our costs per square foot are
2 almost identical to another project, a historic adaptive
3 reuse rehabilitation project in Longview this year. We're
4 literally maybe two dollars a square foot off of those.

5 And you know, I just want to emphasize, once
6 again, is really for rehab. This is not rehab, it is a
7 complete new construction inside a shell. And I think for
8 us we just felt like the Department kept changing its tune
9 about why they didn't like the project. We went through
10 numerous questions about the underwriting on this deal,
11 including the structure, the operating costs, the
12 staffing, talking about the numbers in this project, and
13 then at the eleventh hour in July we received this
14 deficiency. The deficiency was vague, it said, Hey, your
15 PCA isn't sufficient. The only thing I have, other than
16 the example that Mr. Stewart sent us -- which was very
17 kind -- is what the rules say, and we went point by point
18 through those and tried to make it match. I really had no
19 way of knowing.

20 After we were denied, we were told that there
21 were concerns with the roofing, the HVAC, the asbestos.
22 All the Department had to do was issue a deficiency if
23 they truly wanted to know about those issues and we could
24 have answered those. I believe that the PCA was deficient
25 and at issue is the project is doable and feasible, it's

1 very doable.

2 Thank you so much for your consideration today,
3 and I'll let the other speakers have a turn.

4 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

5 (No response.)

6 MS. BAST: Good morning. Cynthia Bast from
7 Locke Lord, representing the applicant.

8 As you just heard from Mr. Steward and from Ms.
9 André, each rehab, particularly each adaptive reuse is
10 unique, and therefore, the PCA that is presented for that
11 particular development must suit that particular
12 situation. And as Ms. André said, the applicant believes
13 that the provided a PCA that is fully compliant with the
14 rules. If you go to 10.306, you see six categories that
15 require analysis and discussion. The underwriting report
16 says that the PCA was deficient in these categories and
17 gives examples of the deficiencies, but if you look at
18 their appeal, which is on page 208 of your board book
19 supplement, you will see that they addressed each and
20 every one of these deficiencies and identified where the
21 item was or how it could be found in the PCA that was
22 presented.

23 The underwriting report goes on to say that in
24 order to grant this appeal that the Board must waive the
25 requirements of Section 10.306 with regard to PCAs, and

1 the applicant disagrees with that. If the PCA does
2 contain the items required by the plain language of the
3 rule, then the Board doesn't need to waive anything to
4 grant this appeal, rather they just need to instruct staff
5 to address any of their questions that they have about the
6 PCA through the administrative deficiency process. And as
7 you heard, there was one administrative deficiency issued
8 that basically said. This is not what we want, fix it.
9 With more opportunity to talk about the specific items of
10 concern through administrative deficiencies, which would
11 be appropriate to this kind of development, I believe that
12 the questions could be addressed.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Cynthia.

17 MR. SERNA: Good morning. My name is Dan
18 Serna, the city manager for Harlingen. Thank you for your
19 time and thank you for hearing us out.

20 I can tell you that we've been working on this
21 project, I've been with the City of Harlingen now going on
22 28 years, and as long as I can remember, we've been
23 talking about this nine-story building that needs to be
24 rehabilitated and put back in service. It's a beautiful
25 building in our downtown that needs to be re-energized and

1 put back in play.

2 I want to address the asbestos. When we had
3 the opportunity to take over the building and purchase the
4 building about four years ago, we knew as a city that in
5 order to make it appealing and feasible to undertake a
6 project like this, we were going to have to find a private
7 partner to come in and help with this renovation. So what
8 we did was we took on the responsibility of abating the
9 asbestos in the building, so we performed a full
10 environmental on the building and removed all the
11 asbestos-containing material. That was done in June of
12 2015.

13 Inclusive of that, as part of that project we
14 also removed the asbestos-containing material on the roof.

15 I know that's one of the items in the underwriter's
16 report. So when we removed the asbestos-containing
17 material on the roof, we had to put a new roof in place so
18 that, of course, you don't get water damage inside the
19 remaining building, so we went ahead and put a polymembrane
20 roofing system as part of that project, and we spent about
21 \$144,000 on that abatement process. So I wanted to
22 address that because I thought that was important. I saw
23 that in the underwriter's report and I wanted the Board to
24 know that we did that to make it more appealing for a
25 private partner to come in and help us.

1 I can tell you that this project is vital to
2 our downtown, the renovation of this project is vital to
3 our downtown, and without private assistance from a
4 private partner and without the low income housing tax
5 credits, this historic structure will remain as is for a
6 long time to come, and we'd really like to get this back
7 in play, and we ask for your help and for your approval of
8 the appeal.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

11 Any questions?

12 MR. VASQUEZ: I do have a question. So just to
13 reiterate the asbestos material have already been abated.

14 MR. SERNA: Is gone. I have a binder where we
15 not only abated all the asbestos-containing material, we
16 also hired a third party consultant to do the air quality
17 monitoring during the abatement process, and then we also
18 filed the necessary certification with the Texas
19 Department of Health once it was completed. All those
20 components were finished in 2015.

21 MR. VASQUEZ: And I was going to save this
22 question till the end, but since it's on the same topic,
23 the lead-based paint probability, that's being addressed
24 because you're stripping out everything and basically
25 taking it out to the shell.

1 MR. SERNA: This project is a complete gut
2 rehab, even the windows are going to have to come out, so
3 you're going to end up essentially with a brick exterior
4 shell and new construction inside completely. There are
5 no usable parts. I've been in this building several
6 times. There are no usable components that exist in the
7 building right now, especially after the asbestos removal.
8 We went as far as removing the boiler in the basement
9 because it contained some asbestos insulation, so that's
10 as far as we went, and that was not an easy task. So we
11 did that to make it more appealing, and we're fortunate
12 that we did find a developer like MRE Capital, Interstate
13 Holdings to come in and take this challenge on, something
14 we really want to do.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions?

16 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I have just a followup
17 question. It really goes to Sarah's comments, but now
18 that you've made these. So one of the observations about
19 the PCA was that, you know, it just had the couple of
20 sentences on the lead-based paint and asbestos, but given
21 what you said and what Sarah said, so the PCA looks like
22 it pretty much focused on the infrastructure, the overall
23 exterior of the building. As city manager, since you had
24 already done all the pre-work on the interior, plus you
25 knew it was a complete gut project, when you guys saw the

1 PCA, did you think that it was appropriate because it was
2 really focused?

3 I know there some photos where there's some
4 weaknesses in the concrete at the base of one of the
5 corners of the building, or something like that. Was your
6 thought, hey, the main focus of the PCA would be the
7 actual structure and not necessarily all the interior
8 issues because you had already corrected the asbestos ones
9 and you knew the rest of them would be taken care of
10 through the gutting of the interior?

11 MR. SERNA: That's a great question, and I'll
12 be honest with you, I did not see the PCA prior to it
13 being submitted. So I'm going to be truthful, I did not
14 see it, and so I wasn't aware until we received the denial
15 that that was the issue, and then I chimed in saying,
16 well, in 2015 all that stuff was done. Now, us and the
17 developer, we had talked about that, they knew that, and
18 somehow it didn't make it into the report. But I will
19 say, just like with all construction projects, new or
20 renovation, you always have a contingency for certain
21 unforeseens, and I suspect that that's what the architect
22 did on the probable comment is that he was trying to cover
23 himself just in case on a nine-story building something
24 comes up that wasn't caught in the original abatement
25 process. So you've got to cover yourself.

1 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Thank you. Nothing
2 further.

3 MR. SERNA: Thank you.

4 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

5 MAYOR BOSWELL: Good morning. My name is Chris
6 Boswell, and I'm the mayor of the City of Harlingen. Mr.
7 Chairman, members of the Board, Mr. Irvine, thank you for
8 the opportunity to address you all here this morning on
9 what is a very, very important project for our community.
10 We have our Harlingen Area Chamber of Commerce executive
11 director, Chris Gonzales, here this morning and some of
12 his staff, we have our Economic Development Corporation
13 director, Raudel Garza here, also to stress the importance
14 of this project to our community.

15 I want to say three things, really, I want to
16 make three points. One is in Harlingen we're very
17 passionate about affordable housing. In the last five
18 years we've partnered with the Texas National Guard to go
19 into neighborhoods and tear down old dilapidated houses
20 and structures which are safety concerns for the
21 neighborhoods, which are drug hangouts, which are graffiti
22 magnets, and we've eliminated those structures. And then
23 we're partnered with Habitat for Humanity to come in and
24 rebuild new housing in those areas, in those neighborhoods
25 where we've torn down those hold dilapidated structures.

1 We want to see more affordable housing in our community
2 and we've taken it upon ourselves to do that, and over the
3 last five years we've done 156 of those teardowns and
4 we're working as hard as we can to build new houses in
5 their place.

6 The second thing I'd like to ask you to
7 consider is what's been mentioned before. These are the
8 two property condition assessments for projects that were
9 submitted by the same developer, by the same architect in
10 Plainview and Cisco last year, and they're both 28 pages
11 long, just like the one that was submitted for Baxter last
12 year. We're not asking you to treat Harlingen any
13 differently, we're not asking for a special pass, we're
14 not asking for anything different than to be treated like
15 these two projects were treated. These two PCAs passed
16 muster last year and they were funded. They're underway
17 right now. They're the same kind of '20s era building,
18 they're old Hilton Hotels. The communities that they are
19 working in, this developer is working in, are delighted to
20 have rehabilitated in their downtown area.

21 And finally, I just want to say that this is
22 one of many projects for you, it's one of many projects
23 for the staff, one of many projects for most of the people
24 in this room who do this for a living, and I know that
25 everyone takes pride in their work and I know that you

1 take each and every project seriously, but this is not one
2 of many projects for the City of Harlingen, this is the
3 project of a generation, maybe two generations. We've
4 been trying to do something with this building for 35
5 years, and if we can add, to what we've already done in
6 our neighborhoods, another 24 affordable housing units in
7 our downtown where they are desperately needed, then this
8 will be a project that you can be proud of, that our
9 community can be proud of, and it desperately needs to be
10 done.

11 I ask you to sustain our appeal and allow this
12 project to go forward. Thank you.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

16 MR. Longoria: Good morning, Chairman Goodwin
17 and members. My name is Oscar Longoria, and I'm actually
18 the state representative for House District 35 which
19 encompasses the City of Harlingen.

20 Today I appear on behalf of my constituents and
21 on behalf of somebody living in South Texas to explain to
22 you the importance of this project to the area. I commend
23 Mayor Boswell, the city council, various entities that
24 have been involved with this project throughout the years,
25 and it's been a true collaboration with everybody working

1 together.

2 The Baxter Lofts will not only promote the
3 economic activity in the area, but it's going to help
4 revitalize the downtown Harlingen area as well. The
5 remodeling of the house will be beneficial not only to
6 provide housing to the community, but it's also going to
7 provide a historical resemblance of the area, so it's
8 truly a remarkable project. I stand side by side with the
9 City of Harlingen. I think this is a regional project
10 where the implications for South Texas can be profound.

11 So I ask for your consideration on this appeal
12 and I'm open for any questions.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

16 MR. LONGORIA: I appreciate it. Thank you very
17 much.

18 MR. LUCIO: Good morning. My name is Eddie
19 Lucio, III. I'm a state representative for the other half
20 of Harlingen. Oscar and I share this wonderful city that
21 we have the honor of representing.

22 I have just finished serving my sixth session
23 in Austin. I can't believe it's gone by so quickly. But
24 in those eleven-twelve years I've been working with the
25 city, I've seen a true passion for local government to

1 make a difference in the community. I do represent House
2 District 38, I have one of the poorest districts not only
3 in the State of Texas but in the entire country, so
4 affordable housing down there, every unit is extremely
5 critical and vital. I'm fifth generation to be born and
6 bred and then moved back to Brownsville to make the home.

7 The Brownsville-Harlingen area, we are making
8 strides in terms of the quality of education. I'm so
9 proud of the school district of Harlingen. They had a
10 tremendous summer program, that I went and toured, in
11 robotics. There are so many projects that are going on
12 there, both commercial and industrial that are going to
13 make a difference for the future and quality of life for
14 our community, but these affordable housing projects are
15 truly critical.

16 You've heard a lot of information, a lot of
17 back and forth. I just finished and moved in this week to
18 a restoration project back in my district, a 100-plus year
19 old home. We gutted everything, there was nothing
20 salvageable, no wires, no plumbing, it didn't even have
21 HVAC, so we added all of that. So if someone were to ask
22 me what do you plan on doing to get your building into
23 code, I would have said, Well, we're going to have to
24 start from scratch. And that would have been the exact
25 details that I would be able to give. For me to say,

1 well, this existing wiring doesn't meet code because of
2 XYZ wasn't really relevant to me at the time, so when the
3 city came in and I met with them, I said, Look, I'm
4 gutting the whole thing. The only thing that was usable
5 for me was the shell of the building, and I think we have
6 the same scenario here.

7 If you've ever been involved, and I know you
8 have, in evaluating these applications, I'm in my time in
9 office becoming more and more concerned with how
10 cumbersome the application process is for people applying
11 to do either work with the city or seek funding from
12 government. I just tried to get an SBA loan -- I don't
13 know if you've ever tried to do to that -- for a project
14 I'm working on. I spent two months on the project and
15 gave up and just went the commercial route. These are
16 government types of applications and they're so cumbersome
17 that it requires experts in the field that cities like
18 Harlingen or small businessmen like me just don't have
19 resources for. So the number of people that can
20 participate in the programs that we create as state
21 government or federal government becomes more and more
22 limited and we make it more and more cumbersome.

23 What is very important to understand is that
24 this applicant scored very, very high on numerous scoring
25 criteria, and if it wasn't for this one technicality, this

1 project is considered a good one by this very agency. So
2 I ask for that consideration.

3 It's interesting to be on this side of this
4 panel, I usually sit over there. But I thank you very
5 much for your service. I know it takes away from the work
6 you do to put food on the table, and we appreciate those
7 at state agencies who volunteer their time. Thank you so
8 much.

9 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

10 Any questions? Anybody else that wants to
11 speak?

12 MR. LYTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a letter, one
13 more letter from Senator Lucio, to read on this issue.
14 It's addressed to you and the Board, reads as follows:

15 "Please accept this correspondence as my full
16 support to the City of Harlingen on a formal appeal before
17 you on Housing Tax Credit project 17010 Baxter Lofts.
18 Because of the critical affordable housing needs that we
19 have in our region and the importance of this housing tax
20 credit project in Harlingen, I respectfully request that
21 the Board consider the substantive merits of the matter
22 before you and approve the formal appeal.

23 "My longstanding support for this affordable
24 housing endeavor is well documented with TDHCA and
25 evidenced through a letter of support I submitted to your

1 Board on May 23, 2016. As I shared with you then, I
2 restate today, this project is well deserving of the
3 State's support. I hope that after reviewing the
4 substantive elements of the appeal that you will agree
5 that Harlingen's effort to preserve and revitalize the
6 historic downtown Baxter Lofts property by converting it
7 into an affordable housing project, which will provide
8 needed housing to low income families, is a commendable
9 endeavor.

10 "For these reasons, I respectfully request that
11 the Board take into consideration the community-wide
12 support that this project has garnered, especially the
13 stakeholders, institutions and partners that have come
14 together in support of this noteworthy effort, such as
15 Habitat for Humanity, United Way, Harlingen Chamber of
16 Commerce and the Harlingen Boys and Girls Club, while you
17 review the substantive merits of the appeal.

18 "In closing, I thank you for providing me the
19 opportunity to reaffirm my support to the City of
20 Harlingen's effort to revitalize the downtown area by
21 transforming the Baxter Lofts property into an affordable
22 housing project. With the housing needs of my district in
23 mind, I respectfully ask that the Board focus on the
24 fundamental elements before you and hope that you see the
25 appeal in a favorable light.

1 "Please do not hesitate to contact me if you
2 have any questions. Sincerely, Eddie Lucio, Jr., State
3 Senator."

4 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Michael.

5 MR. VASQUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask
6 Brent a couple of followup questions.

7 Just so the Board understands, the fundamental
8 problem and the staff's concern is that the PCA noted
9 probable asbestos and lead paint at the site. Is that
10 really what it fundamentally comes down to?

11 MR. STEWART: No, sir. It does not materially
12 meet the requirements of the rule.

13 MR. VASQUEZ: The PCA report does not meet the
14 requirements of the rule.

15 MR. STEWART: That's right. And yes, they did
16 provide kind of a side-by-side of how the report did meet
17 the rule, and I'd be happy to go through what they pointed
18 to as satisfaction of the rule that they're pointing to,
19 and again, it doesn't meet the requirements of the rule.
20 Code violations, for example, and maybe you guys can find
21 other places that it talks about code violations, but
22 there's a reference to code violations about smoke
23 detectors, and then somewhere, and I couldn't find it, it
24 just said there are multiple code violations and that they
25 will be fixed.

1 MR. VASQUEZ: And again, just help me work
2 through this.

3 MR. STEWART: Sure.

4 MR. VASQUEZ: We understand that this is going
5 to be a complete gutting of the building, so even if there
6 were smoke detectors there, it's all going to be torn out
7 and replaced anyway. I mean, regardless of the report,
8 but the reality of the situation is that any code
9 violation in there is going to get pulled out and
10 restarted.

11 MR. STEWART: So Ms. André outlined the fact
12 that -- and I spoke to it earlier -- that each adaptive
13 reuse transaction, each rehabilitation transaction is
14 different, different specifications. There's different
15 parts of the building that are there that may be reused
16 and not reused; there were aspects of the building that we
17 were unclear that was going to be reused or not; we had
18 schematics of the units and the floor plans. There was a
19 piece of the PCA that referenced wall trim: We observed
20 that the base trim in the units was present, was likely
21 original, in most cases in poor condition, the trim should
22 be replaced with a replication base trim as part of the
23 rehabilitation. That doesn't tell me that they're keeping
24 the walls and that trim and they're trying to match the
25 trim to the existing walls. No place in the report does

1 it say we're ripping out the walls, and we had no
2 photographic evidence that there were any walls in the
3 building to begin with.

4 There's a reference to in terms of code as it
5 relates to accessibility, it talks about some stuff on the
6 inside of the units with respect to 30-inch work spaces at
7 the countertops, wall cabinets should be lower. It goes
8 into those types of requirements, which, great, that's
9 what we would expect to see in the report. Then it says:
10 We recommend that the units be located on an accessible
11 route from the accessible parking spaces at the new
12 covered parking garage. There is no new covered parking
13 garage. Later it goes into the fact that there should be
14 onsite parking, and there is no onsite parking.

15 We are supposed to take a totally self-
16 contained document that tells the story of that building.

17 If it's a gut rehab, it's a gut rehab and there needs to
18 be specifications and information about how much stuff is
19 going to cost. If you look in your board materials at
20 this document, this is a side-by-side of the budgets that
21 were submitted between the 2016 application, the 2017
22 original application and the supplement that was dated
23 July 7, and I'll point your attention on the second page
24 for that, if you look across at doors, windows and
25 drywall, you'll see quite a bit of fluctuation over the

1 period of the cost of those items. Okay. Why? We don't
2 know. There's probably a good explanation, but it's not
3 in a self-contained report.

4 MR. VASQUEZ: Well, I just want to make the
5 statement that I understand, and I believe the Board
6 understands that the staff needs to operate on that self-
7 contained report that was submitted in the application,
8 and it appears to me that the application didn't quite
9 clearly define the scope of how things were going to get
10 redone in this case, so I agree with your analysis. Given
11 the strict letter of our rules and regulations and such,
12 you're left with no alternative but to recommend denial of
13 the application.

14 MR. STEWART: Correct.

15 MR. VASQUEZ: So I'm thanking you for following
16 the rules and continuing with your job, however, I think
17 this is what the whole appeals process is for is that the
18 Board can look at the reality of things and the other
19 extenuating circumstances. Even in the QAP Committee
20 meeting yesterday, we were trying to fight through the
21 battle of there is no one size fits all for every type of
22 project across the state. And in my mind, this is clearly
23 an exceptional project and from the speakers and the
24 description of the project, personally, I'm satisfied with
25 the application and the appeal to grant the appeal, given

1 the information that we've heard today and in all the
2 materials.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions for Brent?

4 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Yes. So my question
5 might piggyback on that one, which is you have no choice,
6 as staff you have no choice but to recommend denial of the
7 appeal because the PCA doesn't meet the rules. So our
8 question would be what would the Board need to do -- and
9 maybe this is a question for counsel -- what would the
10 Board need to do to allow the appeal and to allow you to
11 gather the rest of the information you need to completely
12 underwrite the project? Is that a question for you or a
13 question for counsel?

14 MR. IRVINE: Before you jump into that, I would
15 point out that in accordance with the Internal Revenue
16 Code, when tax credits are awarded, they are underwritten
17 at multiple stages. The way that I understand it right
18 now, the amount of the award that is in consideration is
19 something that the applicant certainly believes is
20 sufficient to carry out their development. You have not
21 been able to reach firm and final conclusions on that or
22 on the ability of them to operate in accordance with their
23 budget. So if, hypothetically, it were to move forward
24 from this point, it would be moving forward with some
25 uncertainty over it. However, after the development was

1 completed and it underwent cost certification, it would
2 come back for further underwriting, and if it turned out
3 that too many credits had been awarded, the credits could
4 be cut. Is that accurate?

5 MR. STEWART: That's accurate for every
6 transaction, yes. Again, the procedure, the process for
7 us to determine that award is based on, in part, cost, and
8 what underwriting is saying is we have a sorely deficient
9 document to be able to determine cost.

10 MR. GOODWIN: What I hear you, Brent, is you
11 can't underwrite this based on the information that you
12 have today, so if we granted this appeal, something would
13 have to happen subsequent to this to provide you enough
14 detailed information to do that underwriting, I assume.

15 MR. STEWART: We would accept their cost number
16 in the underwriting.

17 MR. GOODWIN: The other question I have is was
18 the \$88,000 for asbestos removal in the original PCA or
19 was it in the one modified on, I think you said, July 7?

20 MR. STEWART: The \$88,000 for the asbestos
21 removal was new to the development cost schedule on the
22 revised PCA.

23 MR. GOODWIN: So the last PCA had this \$88,000
24 for asbestos removal that was not on the initial PCA. Do
25 I understand that correctly?

1 MR. STEWART: That's correct. That line item
2 was not on the original PCA.

3 MR. GOODWIN: It was not on the original PCA,
4 but after we issued a deficiency, it was added to the one
5 that was prepared on July. Is that correct?

6 MR. STEWART: That's correct.

7 MR. VASQUEZ: But to clarify, that's an
8 additional line item, budget line item in the event
9 there's still some asbestos left.

10 MR. STEWART: Maybe. We don't know. I'm just
11 saying that the report was deficient and we don't know.

12 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions for Brent?
13 If not, does somebody wish to make a motion?

14 MR. BRADEN: I'll make a motion.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

16 MR. BRADEN: I'll make a motion that the appeal
17 be granted.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a second?

19 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Any discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. GOODWIN: All those in favor say aye.

23 (A chorus of ayes.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. GOODWIN: The appeal is granted.

2 MR. IRVINE: Might I seize the soapbox for just
3 a moment?

4 MR. GOODWIN: You may.

5 MR. IRVINE: I think that this really
6 underscores the incredible complexity of all developments,
7 but especially things like historic rehabs, and I
8 sympathize with the challenge of coordinating all of the
9 pieces, but I implore everyone, when you go forward on
10 these deals make sure everybody knows what everybody else
11 is doing and that it all makes it into the final document.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. GOODWIN: We're going to go back to the
14 action items and start with item number 3. Tim, do you
15 want to talk about what item number 3 accomplishes?

16 MR. IRVINE: Sure. And I have Jennifer here to
17 present.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Jennifer.

19 MS. MOLINARI: Thank you, Tim.

20 Good morning, Chairman, Board members.

21 Jennifer Molinari, and I'm the director of our HOME and
22 Homeless Programs.

23 So item 3 is a recognition by staff that some
24 programmatic, contractual and other actions may be
25 necessary with respect to the use of state and federal

1 funds for disaster response and recovery efforts to
2 provide urgent assistance for qualified persons and
3 households most impacted by Hurricane Harvey. The item
4 lays out awarding contracts for discretionary funds, de-
5 obligating and reprogramming and awarding uncommitted
6 funds to provide emergency shelter assistance and
7 providing the necessities of life to eligible households
8 and individuals using Community Services Block Grant
9 funds, Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program funds,
10 and other state and federal funds that may be lawfully
11 used for such purpose.

12 It also specifically provides authority for the
13 Department to program or direct state or federal funds
14 that may be lawfully used for disaster related assistance
15 to subrecipients serving eligible households and
16 individuals displaced by Harvey, including but not limited
17 to using de-obligated and reprogrammed funds available
18 under the HOME Investment Partnerships Program and the
19 Emergency Solutions Grants Program.

20 In addition, it directs staff to provide
21 assistance to affordable rental properties in the
22 Department's portfolio that have sustained damage as a
23 result of Harvey that need emergency repairs to enable
24 them to serve households or individuals, and such
25 assistance may be made available using the HOME Program,

1 National Housing Trust Fund, and Tax Credit Assistance
2 Repayment funds.

3 It provides the Department should seek such
4 state or federal waivers or suspensions or approvals as
5 may be deemed necessary or advisable to effectuate the
6 foregoing, as well as providing authority for the
7 Department to execute, deliver and cause to be performed
8 on behalf of the Department awards, contracts, loan
9 documents, land use restriction agreements, and other such
10 document and instruments in writing as they or any of them
11 may be deemed necessary or advisable to effectuate the
12 foregoing, and execute and deliver and cause action on
13 Department loans and properties in our Single Family and
14 Multifamily portfolio, granting deferments or other
15 remedies necessary to assist the Department's borrowers.

16 Any action taken under this authority will
17 require executive director approval, in consultation with
18 the Board chair, and subsequent ratification by the Board,
19 and as such, will be limited to actions that must be taken
20 only for matters where legal rights, opportunities or
21 remedies may lapse prior to the Board having the
22 opportunity to hear the matter at the next meeting.

23 Given the specificity of this action and the
24 recognition that some elements of potential needed action
25 may not have been clearly identified in the written action

1 item, we would also like to include in the record the
2 authority of the executive director to extend benchmarks
3 or other deadlines which otherwise could only be extended
4 through Board action which do not violate federal or
5 statutory restrictions unless waived by the appropriate
6 federal or state authority, and that this will only be
7 available to the extent that such action may be taken for
8 matters where legal rights, opportunities or remedies may
9 lapse prior to the Board having the opportunity to hear
10 the matter at the next meeting, and must be subsequently
11 reported and ratified at the next available meeting.

12 So that was a lot of information and there's a
13 lot of staff that are also here to answer any questions
14 you might have. Basically, and in summary, this is asking
15 for authority to take actions that we might need to take
16 to immediately help in those ways that we can with the
17 available resources that we have at our disposal.

18 MR. IRVINE: And while that was very
19 lawyerly -- and I confess to participating in writing
20 it --

21 MS. MOLINARI: Can you tell:

22 (General laughter.)

23 MR. IRVINE: -- the bottom line is things may
24 come along, and I'm sure they will come along, that
25 require immediate action. They would certainly be actions

1 that would be consistent with law and they would be
2 actions that this Board would have the full authority to
3 approve but we just don't have time to wait on posting a
4 Board meeting. Our scale of values puts health and human
5 safety first and foremost, and when you're responding to a
6 disaster, act like it's a darn disaster. So that's what
7 we're asking for.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. GOODWIN: If not, I'll entertain a motion
11 to approve.

12 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Move staff's
13 recommendation.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

15 MS. THOMASON: Second.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any other
17 discussion?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. GOODWIN: If not, all in favor say aye.

20 (A chorus of ayes.)

21 MR. GOODWIN: The motion passes.

22 Next, Mark, Internal Audit.

23 MR. SCOTT: Good morning, Chairman Goodwin,
24 Board members.

25 We had a very productive Audit and Finance

1 Committee meeting this morning. I went over the audit of
2 Information Systems and I went over the 2018 audit plan.
3 Ms. Thomason chaired the meeting, and the committee
4 recommended approval of the 2018 audit plan that is in
5 your books, so I would like to ask for Board approval of
6 the 2018 internal audit plan.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion?

8 MS. THOMASON: Motion.

9 MR. GOODWIN: Motion made. Second?

10 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Second.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Any comments? Sharon, anything
12 you want to share with us?

13 MS. THOMASON: No. Short and sweet.

14 MR. SCOTT: Thank you very much.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. All in favor say aye.

16 (A chorus of ayes.)

17 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. GOODWIN: It passes. Thank you, Mark.

20 Thanks for the great job you do, you and your staff.

21 MR. IRVINE: While you're giving shout-outs, he
22 did provide an update on a recently completed audit of
23 Information Systems, and I've just got to say our
24 Information Systems team absolutely rocked. We could not
25 serve Texans as well as we do without the critical

1 infrastructure that they provide. And also, I'd like to
2 shout-out our information security officer, Jordan. He
3 really keeps front and center at all times the importance
4 of safeguarding the information that we have. So thanks
5 to them.

6 MR. GOODWIN: Our next item, Community Affairs,
7 Brooke.

8 MS. BOSTON: Thank you, Chair Goodwin and Board
9 members. I'm Brooke Boston, one of our deputies.

10 This is item 5(a). I'd like to draw your
11 attention to a revised Board action item that's been
12 provided to each of you and has been made available to the
13 meeting attendees, so that should be in front of you as a
14 handout.

15 As was noted in the original writeup, we had
16 anticipated that revisions would be needed because this is
17 related to Hurricane Harvey assistance and we had expected
18 there would be changes potentially in the areas needing
19 assistance from the time we posted the book. So I'll
20 first brief you on just the item overall, and then I'll
21 mention a few changes from the time that we posted.

22 This item relates to the reprogramming of
23 several sources of Community Services Block Grant funds,
24 which we call CSBG, for the immediate responsiveness to
25 Hurricane Harvey. To refresh you, CSBG is a program

1 funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human
2 Services, and typically, 90 percent of the funds are
3 considered non-discretionary and are provided to
4 designated eligible entities to reduce poverty, revitalize
5 low income communities and to empower families to become
6 self-sufficient. The type of services and programs
7 supported with CSBG funds typically include case
8 management, employment and educational services, emergency
9 assistance and coordinating local assistance efforts.

10 The CSBG funds are disbursed by the Department
11 through a network of 39 agencies that are designed to
12 serve all the counties in the state. Staff has identified
13 two sources of CSBG funds for reprogramming to immediate
14 disaster assistance. First, one area of the state,
15 Dallas County, does not currently have an eligible entity
16 providing services, as they have been removed in
17 accordance with appropriate federal procedures. We've
18 been taking steps to identify a replacement provider for
19 the area, however, their 2016 CSBG non-discretionary funds
20 for that area in the amount of just over \$3 million are
21 available. Those funds require obligation by September
22 30, 2017, so this month, to prevent the possible loss of
23 those funds to the state. Staff has spoken with U.S. HHS
24 and they've concurred that our proposal of reformulating
25 those funds to be used for this activity and putting them

1 towards Hurricane Harvey assistance is an acceptable
2 proposal.

3 The other source of CSBG funds that we have is
4 approximately \$575,000 in 2016 and 2017 discretionary and
5 administrative funds. Under the immense and immediate
6 needs for Hurricane Harvey, staff is recommending that
7 those funds, combined totaling about \$3.6 million, be used
8 for disaster recovery. The funds would be provided only
9 to CSBG eligible entities and only for delivery of
10 services in those counties have a FEMA disaster
11 declaration for individual assistance. Uses of the funds
12 will be for immediate expenditure relating to direct
13 assistance for the provision of food, cloths, fuel,
14 temporary housing, personal items, or other CSBG eligible
15 activities as needed buy households at or below 125
16 percent of federal poverty who were directly impacted by
17 Hurricane Harvey.

18 Because the need for assistance is immediate
19 and the deadline to expend funds is very short, and at
20 this time the disaster estimates are not readily and
21 reliably available yet, the methodology that we've
22 suggested is as follows: any county with a FEMA disaster
23 declaration for individual assistance by the close of
24 business today would be included in our calculation
25 tomorrow morning. Because there's an immediate need

1 prevalent for the type of assistance in all of the
2 affected counties, the Department has set a minimum
3 assistance amount, or essentially a floor for each county.

4 When we had originally tried to calculate things just
5 based on a formula, some of the counties just got so
6 little that we felt like that was almost just insulting
7 for the households that live there.

8 After applying the floor, we then applied a
9 formula based on each county's proportion of the poverty
10 population which is typically the way we evaluate CSBG is
11 based on poverty population. We did that with the
12 exception of Harris County, we kind of pulled them out of
13 the calculation. This was to make sure that Harris didn't
14 eat up all of it. After applying the floor and the
15 poverty calculation, Harris would get everything that
16 remained. Doing it that way ensures that each county
17 receives a sufficient amount to be impactful, while still
18 directing a large amount of funds to the densest poverty
19 population in Harris County.

20 The list of counties and amounts in your new
21 board item is reflective of the county status as of
22 yesterday afternoon and revised amounts. A table is also
23 provided that shows you the aggregate amount for each
24 eligible entity based on the counties in their service
25 area. If not additional counties are added by the end of

1 the day today, that list before you will be the list
2 that's approved for the awardees and the amounts that they
3 would receive. We're prepared to execute contracts
4 tomorrow and get those out to the network.

5 Now, I'll be the first to tell you that we are
6 not sure that all of the subrecipients are immediate in a
7 position to sign right away, although they're prepared to
8 get the funds out over time. Several of us were talking
9 before the meeting about the fact that some of the
10 community action agencies are themselves going through
11 struggles with their own staffs and trying to just get
12 their personal lives back in order.

13 Since the time of posting, several revisions
14 were made: eleven counties were added, one new
15 subrecipient was added, the total available funds was
16 reduced by \$100,000, and EARAC approval has been obtained
17 for the subrecipients, with two of the subrecipients
18 having conditions placed on their award as noted in your
19 writeup.

20 On a last note, I would mention that to make
21 every effort at being transparent with our use of the
22 money, we have posted today's meeting as a public hearing
23 opportunity if anyone wanted to come and comment on the
24 possible reprogramming of funds, so they could do that if
25 they wanted right now. And with that, I'd just be happy

1 to answer any questions you have.

2 MR. IRVINE: I'd like to offer a comment on the
3 reprogramming, and correct me if I'm wrong in this. If,
4 for example, you had an existing CSBG recipient that
5 served five counties that each got \$50,000 per county,
6 there would be \$250,000 available in that Community
7 Service Block Grant's jurisdictional area to expend in an
8 appropriate manner to assist in IA impacted counties.

9 MS. BOSTON: Correct. And actually to
10 clarify -- and I'm glad you brought that up -- the case
11 with most of these is that their whole service area isn't
12 fully affected, and so let's say if it's a community
13 action agency with ten counties and four were affected
14 they're giving whatever the amount listed on the county
15 list was and aggregated only for use in the four counties.

16 Well, I clarify, only for people affected from those
17 counties. If, in fact, let's say Jane was in one of the
18 affected counties and is choosing to move and get
19 assistance in a county that's not currently designated, we
20 can still help her.

21 MR. GOODWIN: Any question?

22 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Yes, Mr. Chair.

23 Tell me again what was the methodology once you
24 carved Harris County out and then to make sure that they
25 did get an allocation?

1 MS. BOSTON: Well, we looked at poverty
2 population, which typically is one of our key criteria for
3 CSBG funds, so we identified the poverty population in all
4 of the affected counties and then figured out each one's
5 kind of pro rata share of that. We then made sure we
6 applied a floor of at least 50- for each of them, so if
7 that pro rata share had been less than 50-, we boosted
8 them up, and then out of what was left, we took that and
9 gave it to Harris.

10 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I really appreciate and
11 acknowledge the quick work that you guys did to get some
12 money out there. I'm overwhelmed seeing 39 counties on
13 the list.

14 I'll move to approve.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

16 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions, discussion?
18 Anybody out there want to speak to this?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

21 (A chorus of ayes.)

22 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: Motion passes.

25 5(b), Brooke.

1 MS. BOSTON: Yes. So 5(b), this is actually
2 just based off what's in your posted board book. This
3 relates to approval of a recommendation to the governor to
4 designate an eligible entity to administer the Community
5 Services Block Grant program in Dallas County.

6 As I mentioned in the prior item, Dallas County
7 doesn't have a current designated eligible entity to serve
8 its residents. The provider that previously had been
9 serving as a CSBG eligible entity was called Urban
10 Community Centers of North Texas. They were not
11 performing effectively, and in October 2016, the Board
12 approved an order to terminate our relationship with them,
13 and you directed staff to proceed with trying to find a
14 replacement provider.

15 Eligible entities are actually designated by
16 the governor, and so the Department identifies an entity,
17 we'll recommend that entity to the governor after your
18 approval, and then the governor will actually make that
19 official designation.

20 In February 2017, the Department released a
21 request for applications, which is the process we use to
22 try and find a replacement. In April 2017, before the
23 response submissions were due, we did receive confirmation
24 from the U.S. Health and Human Services Department that
25 the process we had used in terminating UCC was appropriate

1 and sufficiently documented, which let us officially
2 proceed. In May 2017 we received two responses by the
3 deadline. One of those submissions did not satisfy the
4 criteria. The other submission, the Community Council of
5 Greater Dallas, Inc., CCGD, is a strong Dallas nonprofit
6 entity with great breadth in providing human and social
7 services in the area. They full satisfied the threshold
8 criteria and have also been reviewed for previous
9 participation requirements and been recommended for
10 approval from our Executive Board Review and Advisory
11 Committee.

12 With this action, CCGD will be recommended to
13 the governor to be designated as the CSBG eligible entity
14 for Dallas County, and if approved, they will receive an
15 award of 2017 CSBG funds for Dallas County in the amount
16 of \$3,236,718. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any
17 questions.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: If not, do I hear a motion for
21 approval?

22 MS. RESÉNDIZ: So moved.

23 MR. GOODWIN: It's moved. Second?

24 MS. THOMASON: Second.

25 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any other

1 discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

4 (A chorus of ayes.)

5 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Brooke.

8 MS. BOSTON: Thank you for your support.

9 MR. GOODWIN: Item 6(a), Raquel.

10 MS. MORALES: Good morning. For the record, my
11 name is Raquel Morales. I'm the director of the Asset
12 Management Division for the agency. Today I will be
13 presenting item 6(a) which are material amendments and
14 changes in the ownership structure for two competitive tax
15 credit applications that were submitted back in 2016. One
16 is for application number 16352 Commissioners' Corner, and
17 the other is for 16354 Gonzalez Apartments. I was just
18 asked by Barry if we could take them out of order and take
19 Gonzalez first before Commissioners' Corner.

20 MR. GOODWIN: I don't have any objection to
21 that.

22 MS. MORALES: If that's okay with you guys, I'm
23 fine with doing that.

24 MR. GOODWIN: Raquel, I had mentioned to Marni,
25 because I believe staff's recommendation on this is

1 neutral.

2 MS. MORALES: On Gonzalez, it is an approve
3 recommendation. Commissioners' is a neutral, and we'll
4 get to that one.

5 MR. GOODWIN: I just ask that you advise the
6 Board beforehand.

7 MS. MORALES: Sure.

8 MR. GOODWIN: So let's do Gonzalez.

9 MS. MORALES: So Gonzalez Apartments, as I
10 mentioned, was allocated in 2016 during the competitive
11 tax credit round. The Housing Authority for the City of
12 El Paso, or HACEP, as I will refer to them moving forward,
13 is the applicant. And what they are asking to do in terms
14 of a material amendment is to significant modify the site
15 plan which includes a reduction in the number of the
16 residential buildings from sixteen to seven. They have
17 also proposed changes to the architectural design of the
18 development, reduced common area square footage. In your
19 board book in the board action request there is a table
20 that kind of gives you a visual of what the application
21 submitted and proposed at application, what they're asking
22 to do now on the right-hand side as the amendment.

23 The total number of units for Gonzalez remains
24 unchanged. They committed at application to build 153 and
25 it was actually a relocation and one-for-one replacement

1 of existing public housing units from the City of El Paso.

2 They are continuing on and moving forward with the 153
3 units as originally proposed.

4 In staff's board writeup, it was a quite
5 verbose writeup, if you will, because we discussed in
6 detail other changes that were reflected in the amendment
7 request, including changes to the construction costs for
8 the development for this amendment and for Commissioners'
9 Corner. It's a pattern that we've noted with this
10 particular applicant with amendments that they have
11 submitted, material amendments that have been brought to
12 the Board, costs increasing significantly, and so we just
13 wanted to disclose that to the Board in that board action
14 request so that they could see the pattern that we're
15 seeing, and if there were any questions about that.

16 I know that our Real Estate Analysis Division,
17 at the time that we initially posted this amendment --
18 which is required to be posted 15 days before this Board
19 meeting, it did go out as a neutral -- and that was
20 because underwriting wasn't complete with their analysis.
21 They had questions about some of the cost increases that
22 were reflected between application and the amendment. I
23 think ultimately, though, by the time we posted this in
24 the board book, the analysis had been completed,
25 underwriting concluded a feasible transaction despite the

1 cost increases, noted those cost increases, but the
2 development remains eligible for the tax credit award that
3 they received previously.

4 One of the bigger things that's going on with
5 Gonzalez, besides the changes that I've previously
6 summarized, is that they are adding a new partner, if you
7 will, into the development owner, the guarantor and the
8 developer structure. HACEP has acquired quite a bit of
9 housing tax credit pipeline with our previously awarded
10 applications, and so in efforts to help them execute and
11 deliver on those previous applications, they have sought
12 assistance by adding in other experienced developers to
13 help them do that. In this case, the addition of Franklin
14 Development, which is owned by Aubra Franklin, is proposed
15 to be incorporated and added into the ownership structure,
16 again, of the development owner added as a guarantor,
17 added as a developer.

18 I think with Gonzalez, like I said, the
19 amendment is pretty self-explanatory. They are going
20 through some changes, material changes, according to the
21 amendment request, to deal with the changes in the equity
22 financing that several of our 2016 awardees have mentioned
23 that they have gone through. At application they had a
24 price maybe of a dollar or so; after November of 2016,
25 that all changed and so they've had to deal with the

1 decrease in equity as a result, and so one of the ways
2 they've been doing that is to redo their deal, value
3 engineer where they can, or what-have-you.

4 So for Gonzalez Apartments, staff is
5 recommending approval of the amendment.

6 MR. GOODWIN: Before I ask for a motion,
7 because we're moving for approval, did you want to
8 comment? Nobody wants to talk about Gonzalez?

9 MR. PALMER: (Speaking from audience.) No,
10 sir.

11 MR. GOODWIN: So do I hear a motion to approve
12 staff's recommendation?

13 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Move approval.

14 MR. GOODWIN: So moved. Second?

15 MS. RESÉNDIZ: Second.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any
17 discussion?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

20 (A chorus of ayes.)

21 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. So 16354 is approved.

24 Now we move on to 16352.

25 MS. MORALES: Right. And that one is

1 Commissioners' Corner. This one, as you mentioned, was
2 presented at the time we posted 15 days before the Board
3 meeting, still is being presented as a neutral. There is
4 no recommendation one way or the other from staff for this
5 request.

6 Commissioners' Corner, again, is another HACEP
7 application submitted during the 2016 competitive round.
8 They submitted the application under the at-risk set-
9 aside, and it was formerly submitted under a different
10 name, Salazar Park. It's not uncommon for developers to
11 change the name of their developments just to keep staff
12 on their toes and make sure we know which deal we're
13 talking about. But it is now known as Commissioners'
14 Corner.

15 HACEP currently owns several existing public
16 housing developments. Salazar Park is one of those and
17 it's an existing 286-unit public housing development. The
18 application in 2016 for Commissioners' Corner proposed the
19 relocation and the new construction of 185 of those units
20 over to an eleven-acre site that's located about ten miles
21 or so from where the current Salazar Park development
22 exists.

23 The request before the Board today is to
24 materially amend this 9 percent application such that the
25 number of units is reduced by half. They are going from

1 185 units to 93 units. They have also identified other
2 changes that would trigger a material amendment, according
3 to our statute and our rule. In your board book on page
4 485 in the board action request for Commissioners' Corner,
5 you will also see a before and after the application and a
6 picture of the site plan, characteristics of the
7 development that were proposed at the beginning. As you
8 can tell from that, again, 185 units on eleven acres, 20
9 residential buildings. Now at application with the 9
10 percent piece they are proposing to reduce the number of
11 units and the other items that I mentioned.

12 Now, I should note that there is an agenda item
13 later on under item 7(e), I believe, under the Multifamily
14 Finance section, and it is regarding a determination
15 notice for what is referred to as Commissioners' Corner. T
16 that agenda item is for the other half of the original
17 185-unit development. Again, on page 485 in your board
18 book you'll see on the right-hand side under the amended
19 site plan there is a grayed out area of the site plan that
20 isn't there anymore. That shaded area is the piece that
21 the applicant is now proposing under the later agenda item
22 7(e) to do as a 4 percent transaction. They've termed it
23 a hybrid 9 percent/4 percent transaction. And so the
24 other half of the original 185 units, 92 units are
25 proposed to be done through that 4 percent application.

1 And I just wanted to point that out because
2 whatever action you guys take on this amended piece, on
3 the 9 percent piece, will have some impact on whatever
4 action you take on that item. And Marni will come up
5 after I'm done with my presentation to offer some detail
6 on that other piece.

7 So in addition to the physical characteristics
8 of the development that are proposed to be changed by this
9 amendment, the other proposed change is to also add a new
10 partner into this transaction, as they did with Gonzalez.

11 Versa Development, which is owned by Manish Verma, is
12 being added to this transaction.

13 Again, as I mentioned, HACEP has taken on a bit
14 of housing tax credit activity. Just to give the Board
15 some perspective, since 2014, HACEP has been awarded with
16 tax credit allocations for 25 developments total. Six of
17 those have been with competitive housing tax credits, the
18 9 percent tax credits, and the other 20 have been with the
19 4 percent noncompetitive housing tax credits. So they've
20 definitely increased their pipeline in the last two years,
21 and we expect very soon, if they haven't already, to see
22 the first tranche of those come online, submit cost
23 certifications to see at the end of the day what happened,
24 and I think it's the 4 percents that we should be seeing
25 coming online.

1 The amendment request identifies the fact that
2 the equity price dropped since the time of application for
3 this deal, and in fact, attributes the reason for this
4 proposed hybrid structure directly related to the equity
5 adjustments experienced for this transaction. At
6 application the credit pricing for Commissioners' Corner
7 came in \$1.02. Currently on the 9 percent piece, the
8 credit pricing is 88 cents. I believe the credit pricing
9 on the 4 percent piece is at a slightly higher 95 cents.

10 Also, in your board book a study on page 501, I
11 believe, you will see a combined sources and uses
12 comparison that was prepared by our Real Estate Analysis
13 Division as they were re-evaluating the transaction under
14 the proposed amendment. As I mentioned, our board writeup
15 for Commissioners' Corner, similar to Gonzalez, disclosed
16 the significant cost increases that were reflected in this
17 amendment at the end of the day. And I'll say that we've
18 been working with this applicant since March. That's when
19 the original amendment request came in. It's not what
20 ended up ultimately before you today. That original
21 amendment request proposed 185 units on the 9 percent
22 piece, but through their working through, figuring out a
23 way, came up with this proposed hybrid structure, and you
24 have the request before you.

25 So the amendment on the 9 percent piece, which

1 is what I'm speaking to under item 6(a) for Commissioners'
2 Corner, as I mentioned, proposes to reduce the development
3 size in half; however, what doesn't change on the 9
4 percent piece is the amount of the tax credits. In other
5 words, the applicant, when they came in originally in
6 2016, proposed to develop 185 units, requested \$1.5
7 million in annual housing tax credits, and received that
8 award. They are now requesting to keep \$1.5 million in
9 annual housing tax credits to develop half the units, or
10 93 units.

11 In terms of the amount of tax credits on the 9
12 percent piece, \$1.5 million is the maximum amount that an
13 application could have received, similar to a credit cap
14 per applicant that we impose on the tax credit round. The
15 reason that we do that, the reason that we have these caps
16 in the competitive tax credit program is because it
17 provides the Department with an efficient distribution
18 among developers and among the state. This is a limited
19 housing tax credit resource that we have; we don't have an
20 unlimited amount to give to every transaction that
21 requests funds, and so the cap on a per-deal basis and the
22 cap on a per-applicant basis helps the Department to
23 efficiently allocate those credits and spread the wealth,
24 if you will.

25 I think that it's important to note during the

1 discussions that I know I have had with the applicant's
2 representative on Commissioners' Corner as well as the
3 current lender, Citibank, I tried to wrap my head around
4 what is being requested here. As we do with all of the
5 amendments, we work with our owners on these tax credit
6 deals when they come in and they seek to change materially
7 a transaction for whatever reason. And so understanding
8 that in their amendment request they cited the fact well,
9 you know, our equity just fluctuated so much that we had
10 to figure out a way how to make this deal continue to
11 work.

12 One of the things that came through the
13 conversations with the lender was that, while not the only
14 reason -- I will say that for sure -- one of the reasons
15 was that this application came in at the front-end with so
16 much additional basis to support more than the \$1.5
17 million in annual credits, and so one of the reasons that
18 they proposed this structure, this hybrid, is to allow
19 this applicant to access additional credits that they
20 would not otherwise be available to get under the 9
21 percent tax credit program -- again, competitive program.

22 Everybody coming into that program knows that there's a
23 limit, knows that there's a cap, and I'm sure that this
24 applicant and this application wasn't the only application
25 that came in on the front-end demonstrating more basis to

1 support more credits than what the request was or what the
2 cap was.

3 And so, you know, their going about the request
4 in this hybrid structure allows them to, again, keep the
5 \$1.5 million in annual credits on the 9 percent piece,
6 albeit to develop half the units, but then also allows
7 them to access additional equity and additional credits
8 through the 4 percent application. I think it's an
9 additional \$538,000 in annual credits on the 4 percent to
10 do the other half, to do the 92 units, whereas, before
11 they could do the 185 with the \$1.5-.

12 So like I said, this one, from my perspective
13 as director of Easement Management, overseeing the
14 amendments process, working through owners on all sorts of
15 material amendments. We typically bring amendments to you
16 guys with an approval, they're usually on consent, you
17 never really hear me speak in front of you. But this one
18 was a unique situation, it is a unique structure. I get
19 what they're trying to do here and I guess the concern
20 from my perspective, from staff's perspective is the
21 allocation of the original credit, the efficiency that
22 we're going to get out of that original \$1.5 million to
23 develop half the units.

24 I'm sure that the applicant will come up here
25 and plead their case and explain how at the end of the day

1 we're delivering 185 units, we're doing what we said we
2 were going to do. And when you look at it from a 30,000
3 foot level, yep, they are, they are going to deliver 185
4 units. But with the 9 percent piece, with that limited
5 tax credit resource, we're getting half the units that we
6 were originally promised at the front-end.

7 So unless you guys have any questions.

8 MR. GOODWIN: And staff's recommendation is
9 neutral on this issue?

10 MS. MORALES: Yes. It's presented as neutral.

11 MR. VASQUEZ: A question on the 4 percent, is
12 it future 4 percent program, they have to apply for that?

13 MS. MORALES: They did. They actually
14 submitted an application through our 4 percent program,
15 and I don't know if Marni wants to come up and speak to
16 it, but they did submit it subsequent to submitting the
17 amendment request that you guys have on the 9 percent
18 piece. It was, like I said, a structure that they were
19 working through and trying to figure out to see how they
20 could come together. It's the reason why it's being
21 presented at the same Board meeting; it was really
22 important for this applicant to present both pieces.

23 MR. VASQUEZ: If we granted the request, are we
24 approving the additional half million dollars.

25 MS. MORALES: So item 7(e) is also presented as

1 a neutral because of the fact that the 9 percent piece is
2 coming to you as a neutral. So the recommendation from
3 staff on item 6(a) on Commissioners' Corner and on item
4 7(e) with respect to the determination notice for
5 Commissioners' Corner are both neutral.

6 MR. VASQUEZ: So when we total everything
7 together for the project, in order for them to get the
8 same number of units that they had promised in their
9 original application, we need to give them another half
10 million dollars, roughly, in 4 percent tax credits.

11 MS. MORALES: That is what they have presented.
12 That's one of the questions when I picked up the phone
13 initially and talked to Mahesh -- who is going to be here
14 representing Citibank, the current lender -- my question
15 from the beginning was: There's absolutely no way this
16 deal can get done on the 9 percent piece at 185 units? I
17 was looking for that, like this deal dies. And I don't
18 know, maybe they'll be able to come and address that.

19 I think what I've heard during the discussions
20 with Mahesh and Manish both is that, look, we can make a
21 deal work. But his approach was brought before the Board
22 for its consideration because, again, additional equity
23 was there that we couldn't access in the 9 percent and
24 there was also the piece that HACEP originally in the 9
25 percent application provided gap funding, I want to say in

1 the amount of \$2 million. And so combined, they're still
2 providing gap funding, I think that went up to about \$5
3 million, but they were trying to find a way to not have to
4 provide as much gap funding maybe that would be needed if
5 they were to proceed with this 9 percent application, 185
6 units, versus going this route where it wouldn't be so
7 much of their own gap funding that they would need to
8 provide.

9 MR. GOODWIN: And this route is it \$5 million
10 in gap financing?

11 MS. MORALES: I believe so.

12 MR. GOODWIN: I see some people nodding.

13 MS. MORALES: So I'm looking at the combined
14 sources and uses, and it looks, again, at the 9 percent/4
15 percent hybrid combined compared to the original 9 percent
16 application. It looks like from what I'm seeing here the
17 gap funding that HACEP was providing originally in the 9
18 percent was \$2 million, now it's \$5.3 million, strictly on
19 the 4 percent piece, not on the 9 percent, but when you
20 look at it combined, their gap funding has gone up.

21 MR. GOODWIN: I'm also under the impression
22 that the second one, 17431 will not underwrite unless we
23 approve 16352. Is that accurate?

24 MS. MORALES: I will let Brent or Marni come up
25 and discuss the piece on the 4 percent. I know just in

1 having discussions internally -- and Brent, if I'm
2 misstating this, you can come up and correct me -- he has
3 stated that this 4 percent piece could not move forward
4 without the 9 percent piece because you have to drive
5 through that first 9 percent piece to get to the 4 percent
6 piece.

7 Remember, it was all one development; now,
8 technically, as they've presented it now, they're going to
9 have separate legal entities, separate legal descriptions,
10 separate land use restriction agreements. I think there's
11 a plan for them to share the common amenities between the
12 4 percent and the 9 percent. So I believe that the answer
13 to your question is, yes, if the Board decides not to
14 approve the 9 percent amendment, I don't know that the 4
15 percent amendment would be able to stand.

16 MR. GOODWIN: The question in front of us is
17 the material amendment basically gives this project an
18 additional \$500,000 tax credit.

19 MS. MORALES: Through the 4 percent application
20 it does.

21 MR. GOODWIN: Through the 4 percent application
22 to get both projects done and for us to end up with the
23 same number of units.

24 MS. MORALES: Yes.

25 MR. GOODWIN: Other questions? Tim?

1 MR. IRVINE: I actually would frame it at a
2 little higher level, and correct me if I'm wrong. First
3 of all, you've got to understand that this is a public
4 housing authority, and public housing authorities are
5 required when they destroy units of public housing to
6 replace the same number of units of public housing. So
7 regardless of the initial basis surplus situation here,
8 going and applying to build a smaller number of units when
9 you're destroying the entire development is not an option
10 for a public housing authority. So there's the one-for-
11 one replacement issue.

12 Then you look at the 9 percent credits and you
13 deal with the changes in equity pricing and so forth,
14 you've got the available basis, so you create that piece.
15 That certainly addresses the financial piece, it reduces
16 the demand on the housing authority to contribute gap
17 financing from its available cash into that side of the
18 piece. The other thing that it does that is important is
19 it's now September and the cliff of placed in service is
20 approaching, so it enables them to do half the number of
21 units facing that cliff instead of all of the units facing
22 that cliff, then it allows the 4 percent bond side to play
23 out as it would play out.

24 MR. GOODWIN: Additional questions?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. GOODWIN: I see we have a number of people
2 that want to speak, so I would entertain a motion to hear
3 comments.

4 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So moved.

5 MR. GOODWIN: It is moved. Second?

6 MS. THOMASON: Second.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. All in favor
8 say aye.

9 (A chorus of ayes.)

10 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We'll start to hear
13 comments. Again, we're going to keep the three minutes.

14 MR. AIYER: Good morning. Mahesh Aiyer with
15 Citibank, Citi Community Capital, the lender on both
16 pieces of the transaction.

17 Thank you, Mr. Irvine. I think you summarized
18 it well.

19 Thanks, Raquel.

20 Essentially, if you go back to the February
21 Board meeting, what we were looking at -- and I had
22 conversations with staff prior to that Board meeting -- is
23 how do we effectuate -- it was really important for the
24 housing authority to maintain the number of units, it's a
25 RAD development, public housing -- how do we maintain the

1 characteristic of it. It so happens, this is unusual in
2 the sense that there's a lot of excess basis related to
3 this transaction, that if go back through other tax credit
4 transactions, you don't typically see the magnitude of the
5 excess basis.

6 So we've done this in other states, we've done
7 it quite often, and we had an ability here, since the 4
8 percent program is not a competitive program, it's an as
9 of right credit with tax-exempt bonds, it wasn't going to
10 cost -- we weren't going to displace anybody else coming
11 in per se for credits, it's not a competitive program. It
12 was a really equitable way to shift economics over to one
13 area. The reason why you saw the number of units shifted
14 over, when you deal with a tax-exempt bond transaction you
15 need a certain amount of scale within that, so
16 economically, what the housing authority and Versa
17 Development did is said, okay, how do we stay within the
18 characteristics of the 9 percent application -- they still
19 scored as they would have otherwise scored to maintain the
20 award -- and how do we shift the economics structurally
21 over.

22 We worked through and we said, look, I'll do
23 the financing on my own bucks. We're not securitizing,
24 doing anything, it's a Citibank balance sheet loan on both
25 the debt on both pieces and I'm also buying the equity.

1 We're doing it so that we can keep the characteristic in
2 place, shared amenity agreement, same partners on both
3 sides, economically the housing authority is still putting
4 in \$3 million more.

5 There are two things that occurred post-
6 election. One is not only did equity pricing drop, in a
7 market like El Paso, which is not a real large CRA market
8 for bank investors, it dropped further. The other thing
9 was interest rates went up about 70 basis points higher
10 than what they are today. The combination of the two
11 really affected how you would structure economically.

12 Now, could they shift a lower number of units?

13 That's not really practical for what as a housing
14 authority they have to do. But say they kept the same
15 number and they went a different route altogether, they
16 would highly, highly, highly leverage the properties.
17 Even if they could try to get there, I couldn't see a way
18 to get there. And we don't just look at something on how
19 we get in, we look at sustainability over 15 years. So
20 there's more equity in the project, there's sustainable
21 debt. Remember, the tax-exempt portion has a lower
22 interest rate than a taxable, so they were able to keep
23 debt manageable, more equity in the project, they're still
24 putting in \$5 million, and they're sticking with their
25 commitment to build the same number of units.

1 I financed the Tays development across the
2 street from the original Salazar. It's the same thing.
3 They've never gone back to have an amendment to reduce the
4 number of units, maintaining the unit characteristic is
5 really important for them. So that's why we came up with
6 this.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

10 MR. VERMA: Good morning. My name is Manish
11 Verma.

12 As you know, our amendment request is unique in
13 its nature and it's come after months of discussion with
14 our team and the Department, but the premise for our
15 request is to ensure the full development of 185 units as
16 originally contemplated in our application.

17 As Mahesh has said and as Raquel has stated,
18 there's been a fluctuation in the equity markets, I think
19 we all understand that. And over there past few months
20 there have been numerous amendments submitted by other
21 developers for their 2016 applications in order to best
22 account for this loss in equity, and most, if not all of
23 these amendments were for either to modify their design,
24 or two, and most importantly, to reduce the unit count for
25 their proposed development. All these amendments were

1 supported by staff and recommended for approval by the
2 Board.

3 So Commissioners' Corner is very similar but
4 different in one respect in that we are trying to preserve
5 all the units that we originally submitted, and so if
6 you'll look at the 9 percent and the 4 percent together,
7 as stated, there is no change in the number of units,
8 there's no change in the number of affordable units,
9 there's no change in acreage, and there is no change in
10 the net rentable square footage.

11 The other thing I wanted to comment on was the
12 comment about the amount of credits that are being
13 allocated for the 9 percent piece, the million and a half
14 in credits for 93 units. If you look at that metric,
15 credits per unit, it is at a reasonable level compared to
16 what other 2016 awards were granted. Is it higher than
17 average, yes, but there are several applications that have
18 a higher credit per unit allocation. And if you look at
19 it further, if you dig deeper, these are big units, we
20 have two-bedroom, three-bedroom, four-bedroom, five-
21 bedroom and six-bedroom units, so if you look at it from
22 tax credits per net rentable square footage, tax credits
23 per bedroom, and tax credits per households served, we are
24 at average or below average compared to 2016 awardees,
25 making it actually a highly efficient transaction even at

1 93 units.

2 And lastly, and going back to HACEP's
3 contribution, as we know, they have a huge RAD commitment,
4 they're looking to develop over 6,000 units by the end of
5 2020, and there's significant financial commitment that
6 HACEP has to develop all of these units. But they are in
7 no way curtailing what they originally intended to provide
8 in the Commissioners' Corner. As Raquel had mentioned, in
9 the original application they were looking to provide \$2
10 million in funding, they are now looking at \$5.3 million
11 in funding for Commissioners', and if you look at Gonzalez
12 where they were not intending to fund any money in
13 Gonzalez, there's more than a million and a half in
14 funding in Gonzalez.

15 So big picture, this amendment is meeting a lot
16 of these tests, we are preserving all of the units, it is
17 actually highly efficient, and we believe this amendment
18 is well submitted.

19 Thank you for your time.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

21 Any questions?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody have anything new they
24 want to bring to the table?

25 MR. DELOYE: Good morning. My name is Tom

1 Deloye. I'm with staff at the Housing Authority of the
2 City of El Paso. Gerry Cichon sends his best; he was not
3 able to be here, he had some prior commitments. So on
4 behalf of Gerry and on behalf of my entire team at the
5 housing authority, we're pleased to have the opportunity
6 to provide just a few more remarks, and I promise you it
7 will be less than three minutes.

8 So like you, our business is housing
9 economically challenged people, these people that look to
10 housing, and favorably, for themselves and for their
11 family. Our work provides and fulfills housing for them.
12 This is a fundamental and foundational need, in my
13 opinion. Our work also is valued by these people in that
14 we provide safe and decent housing to the possibly
15 homeless. So in El Paso we are busy building and
16 renovating in RAD, as previously mentioned. We are
17 committed to the conversion of our entire housing
18 portfolio, over 6,000 units.

19 What's before you with this request is
20 important because you will assist us in this significant
21 conversion and in helping us drive towards this
22 commitment. So your approval today is not only important
23 to the City of El Paso and vital, it's important to the
24 housing authority and vital, but mostly, it's important
25 and vital to the residents, the people today that are in

1 our projects, but also to the people in future years to
2 come. Because why? Because they will have a place to
3 call home.

4 Thank you for your consideration.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

6 Any questions?

7 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Just a comment.

8 Obviously, we've been watching what's going on in El Paso
9 for a while, and I know that it has required tremendous
10 work on all parties' part, including staff's, and I
11 appreciate the commitment that you have to your portfolio.
12 I don't think that's an easy goal and I'm not sure how you
13 inherited it, or maybe you were the one that thought of
14 it, but it's a huge undertaking. We did Blue Flame?
15 Didn't we do Blue Flame last time around? And I'm from
16 the Valley from an area that's similar, and I think that's
17 a huge undertaking, and I commend you for your commitment
18 to that in the housing authority.

19 MR. PALMER: Barry Palmer with Coats Rose.

20 Thank you, Ms. Bingham. It is a huge
21 undertaking. When HUD originally came out about four
22 years ago with the RAD program as a demonstration program
23 of how they could provide a mechanism for housing
24 authorities to get access to private capital to repair and
25 some places replace obsolete public housing, the Housing

1 Authority of the City of El Paso was one of the first to
2 sign up, and they signed up to convert their entire
3 portfolio, 6,000-plus units, which together with San
4 Antonio they're neck and neck as the largest housing
5 authorities in the State of Texas. It's been a massive
6 undertaking, they're about halfway through, they've got 24
7 or so properties under construction, and some completed.

8 When the meltdown in the equity markets came
9 after the election, we all knew in the industry that we
10 had a problem, and Tim was at the leading edge of that and
11 he came to the Board in February and said: All of the
12 2016 tax credit deals are at risk, they all assumed they
13 were going to get pricing of over a dollar and now it's
14 going to be much less, and we need to come up with a game
15 plan of how we can make some for these work and at the
16 same time we don't have a lot of money to put into it.

17 So what was suggested, and the Board approved,
18 was that the agency be a little more flexible in looking
19 at material amendments than it had in the past, and agreed
20 to allow some things that previously would have been
21 somewhat unheard of, like applying for 120 units and then
22 coming back and saying I only have enough money to build
23 80. But that's what a lot of folks have done as a way to
24 make this work.

25 If we look back over the amendments that have

1 come in over the last few months, in many cases people
2 have reduced the number of units. And if this were a
3 private developer, that's what they would be doing on
4 Commissioners' Corner. But when I suggested to HACEP that
5 that was an option, they said, No way, we've got to build
6 the full number of units, we're not going to build less
7 units than we have, we've got to replace all of the units
8 that are going away from the public housing complex.

9 So we looked at other options that would make
10 it work, and this was an innovative idea that we talked to
11 our banker and our developer about to bifurcate the site.

12 I had seen it done in other states, never before here in
13 Texas. But we haven't been using all of our 4 percent
14 bond cap for years, we've been underutilizing the 4
15 percent cap, so here was an opportunity to take an
16 underutilized resource and use that to make up a gap and
17 still build the 185 units and not come back and cut the
18 number of units we were building.

19 So I really think that this has been a good
20 financing plan to achieve that, and would urge the Board
21 to approve it.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions for Barry?

23 MR. IRVINE: I have a comment. Barry is always
24 good at making me sound more articulate than I actually
25 am, and whatever I did or didn't say is well documented in

1 previous transcripts and Board action items, but as I
2 recall, the sentiment, it was that we certainly would
3 encourage people thinking out of the box to save their
4 2016 deal, we would entertain such concepts as value
5 engineering, we would look for the possibility that some
6 of these changes might require material amendments, but I
7 also have to underscore that the material amendments
8 process is embedded in statute, and statute specifically
9 requires the addressing of issues of foreseeability and
10 preventability as a prerequisite to the granting of
11 material amendments, so I think that's the issue before
12 you.

13 MR. ECCLES: And actually, that leads to my
14 question. I was going to offer to Mr. Palmer the
15 opportunity to couch the arguments and the discussion
16 that's been had in terms of the statutory requirements for
17 the Board to look at, namely, Texas Government Code
18 2306.6712. The Board is to make its decision on a
19 material amendment based on a number of factors that
20 include the question: Would this amendment materially
21 alter the development in a negative manner, as well as
22 would this amendment have adversely affected the selection
23 of the application in the application round? There are a
24 couple more after that. If you want to hear it now, you
25 can just run all of the arguments.

1 MR. PALMER: I'll take those two first.

2 MR. ECCLES: Okay, go ahead.

3 MR. PALMER: And I think staff has mentioned in
4 their writeup that there wouldn't have been any point
5 change, there wouldn't be any loss of points, so this
6 application would have gotten selected if they had come in
7 originally at 95 units for a million five in credits, they
8 would have scored the same, they still would have gotten
9 awarded.

10 In terms of the unforeseeability of it, I think
11 it's fair to say not many folks foresaw that President
12 Trump was going to win the election, frankly, and none of
13 us even when that happened realized what an effect it
14 would have on the equity markets when folks started to
15 realize that now that the Republicans control all three
16 branches and they had run on a campaign of reducing taxes
17 and President Trump had spoken of reducing the corporate
18 tax rate from 35 to 15 percent, people started thinking
19 all of a sudden for the first time in November that that
20 was really going to happen. So that certainly wasn't
21 foreseen by any of us or any of the development community
22 when they turned in their applications in March of 2016
23 that credit pricing would take such a serious hit because
24 of the election of a new president.

25 MR. ECCLES: The last one of those factors is

1 the beyond foreseeability, could this amendment have been
2 prevented. In other words, the value engineering, is
3 there a way that it could have been done without this
4 amendment.

5 MR. PALMER: Well, as we said a number of
6 times, the way we could have done this is the way a lot of
7 the previous amendments you've seen come in is they've
8 reduced the number of units. That would have been the
9 other option to complete the project with the credit
10 allocation that we have. But rather than do that, we've
11 come up with another option that's not taking anything
12 away from anybody else, we're not getting any more 9
13 percent credits, we're getting the same 9 percent credits
14 that we already have, we would just be getting additional
15 4 percent credits that for the last number of years have
16 gone underutilized and been turned back in to the Federal
17 Government.

18 MR. ECCLES: Thank you.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Barry.

20 Any other questions?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. GOODWIN: Since we have a neutral
23 recommendation by staff, I suspect Ms. Bingham is going to
24 craft a motion.

25 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So I'd like to recommend

1 that the Board approve the material amendment request from
2 Commissioners' Corner, number 16352, and just in answer to
3 the question, so in support of the applicant's position
4 that the factors that affected credit pricing were
5 unforeseen, that the material amendments don't alter or
6 affect the development in a negative manner, that the
7 staff in the staff writeup stated that the material
8 amendments do not result in selection of threshold
9 criteria that would have affected the application score,
10 and that the alternative which may have been to reduce the
11 number of units is not an option for the Housing Authority
12 of the City of El Paso. How's that?

13 MR. GOODWIN: That's a pretty nice motion.
14 Thank you.

15 Can I have a less winded second?

16 (General laughter.)

17 MS. THOMASON: Second.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Motion has been made and
19 seconded. Any questions? Any additional comments?

20 MR. VASQUEZ: I just would like to make a
21 question and a comment.

22 This motion that we're voting on now
23 effectively says that we're going forward with the 4
24 percent additional amount, because this doesn't work if we
25 don't do that.

1 MR. GOODWIN: I want to clarify that.

2 MR. VASQUEZ: I understand we have to vote on
3 it separately, but we're recognizing that.

4 MR. GOODWIN: The 4 percent doesn't work
5 without this. And Marni, speak to that, if you would.
6 Didn't you say that staff's recommendation, if we approve
7 this material amendment, would be to approve 17431?

8 MS. HOLLOWAY: So item 7(e) which is the 4
9 percent is presented as a neutral based on EARAC and staff
10 not knowing what the Board's decision would be on the
11 first part, on the 9 percent piece. And we can talk about
12 it under that item, but the 4 percent piece would stand
13 alone financially, which would be required in order for
14 the basis to be split, it would not stand alone
15 operationally.

16 MR. VASQUEZ: Operationally, this doesn't work
17 without us operationally doing the 4 percent as well.

18 MS. HOLLOWAY: I believe the 9 percent doesn't
19 have the issues that the 4 percent does because the 4
20 percent piece is in the back of the property and the 9
21 percent piece includes the community center and the
22 leasing office and all of those necessary bits.

23 MR. VASQUEZ: Yes. You answered my question.

24 MR. GOODWIN: Does that answer our question.

25 MR. VASQUEZ: That was my question. Now my

1 comment is that just hearing the applicant talk about
2 cutting the number in half from what was approved on the 9
3 percent, I was ready to start screaming about -- excuse
4 me -- hell, no. But given the fact that they are -- and
5 my understanding I want to clarify -- putting in another
6 \$3 million of equity, or \$3.3- or whatever it is, to get
7 the 4 percent \$500,000. Is that really what I'm hearing?

8 So they're not just asking us to cut it in half, they're
9 putting in a lot more, the \$3 million in equity to get
10 this extra \$500,000. I just want to make sure I
11 understand. Is that correct?

12 MR. AIYER: Mahesh Aiyer, Citibank.

13 That's correct. In order to maintain the full
14 number of units, full intention is we've got the
15 application ready, we've already got deal calls going,
16 we're trying to close as closely together as possible on
17 both pieces. The same number of units, putting in more
18 money, and it's just split into two pieces of financing,
19 but operationally they need to go together.

20 MR. VASQUEZ: Thank you.

21 And again, I just want to say for my opinion on
22 this Board going forward, such a material change as just
23 the 9 percent alone, effectively cutting it in half for
24 the same dollar amount, I just think we should push back
25 hard in the future. However, given that they're putting

1 in more equity, substantially more, I'm comfortable with
2 going along with the motion.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Any other comments or questions?

4 MR. IRVINE: I'd like to just clarify one
5 thing. At present, the 4 percent credits, which are tied
6 to private activity bond cap, are an underutilized
7 resource, but I've got to just point out to everybody that
8 they are picking up steam. Teresa Morales may have some
9 comments on that. And to the extent that the 4 percent
10 program and the bond program continue to grow, this would
11 reduce the amount of bond cap that would be available for
12 carryforward ultimately, hopefully to be re-utilized in a
13 more aggressive program.

14 MR. GOODWIN: No other comments, I'll call for
15 a vote on the question. All in favor say aye.

16 (A chorus of ayes.)

17 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. GOODWIN: It is granted.

20 Raquel, 6(b).

21 MS. MORALES: 6(b) is presentation, discussion
22 and possible action regarding direct loan terms for 2016
23 tax credit and direct HOME awards for 16185 Merritt
24 Heritage and 16210 Merritt Monument. Both of these
25 applications also submitted competitive tax credit

1 applications under the tax credit cycle, as well as
2 competitive applications under the 2016-1 Multifamily
3 Direct Loan Notice of Funding Availability, or 2016-1
4 NOFA, as I'll refer to it moving forward.

5 The 2016-1 NOFA required that all loans, except
6 those awarded under the deferred forgivable loan set-
7 aside, be structured as fully repayable loans at not less
8 than the terms set out in that NOFA. I'll say with both
9 of these items, both of these BARS that were posted in
10 your board book, the recommendation is a neutral, as well,
11 from staff for both Merritt Monument and Merritt Heritage.

12 So I'll take Merritt Heritage first. The Board
13 previously approved the change in terms on our HOME loan
14 for Merritt Heritage back at the May meeting when both of
15 these items were on the agenda. Ultimately, I think
16 Merritt Heritage was the only one that hate Board took
17 action on, and the Board approved to extend the term of
18 our direct HOME loan from 18 years to 40 years to enable
19 the applicant to take advantage of FHA financing.

20 Just as a kind of quick background. When these
21 applications came in originally in 2016, the financing
22 structure proposed by the applicant included a
23 conventional first lien loan, as well as our subordinate
24 \$2 million HOME funds and the tax credit equity. These
25 deals have not closed on the direct HOME loan with the

1 Department, so while it's presented as an amendment, it's
2 not something that's happening post-closing, we're still
3 trying to work through and getting to closing on these
4 transactions.

5 But the financing structure has changed such
6 that the first lien conventional loan is now being
7 substituted with a HUD FHA first lien loan, and as is
8 required by HUD through their Multifamily Accelerated
9 Processing guide, or its MAP guide as we refer to it,
10 whenever they're coming in on a transaction and there are
11 subordinate loans such as our direct HOME loans, HUD
12 requires that any subordinate debt not be structured as
13 hard pay, as a fully repayable loan. We, of course,
14 structure our loans that way so that we can refill our
15 coffers, have that funding available for future affordable
16 housing that people can apply for.

17 However, when it comes to HUD transactions, HUD
18 requires, again, that any subordinate debt, including
19 ours, be structured as a surplus cash flow structure. And
20 then they further restrict in their MAP guide that any
21 subordinate debt get repaid not just from surplus cash but
22 only 75 percent surplus cash, so it places subordinate
23 lenders like us in a riskier position on transactions
24 there first lien financing goes up, the amount of first
25 lien debt goes up on top of our debt, and then asks us to

1 restructure our loans such that we can't get fully repaid
2 and structured as a fully repayable loan, we go from a
3 hard debt to a surplus cash flow loan structure.

4 The amendment request, or the request that was
5 submitted on behalf of the applicant's counsel, suggested
6 that this requirement from HUD has been in the MAP guide
7 since August of 2011, and of course, the Department is
8 fully aware of that requirement, but we have previously
9 and successfully come to an agreement with HUD to be able
10 to close on transactions where we're a subordinate lender
11 and they're the first lien lender and they don't mention
12 this 75 percent surplus cash restriction, or in other
13 words, they've waived that particular requirement.

14 We are willing to accommodate and work with HUD
15 to partner up as a financing partner on these deals and
16 provide that gap financing, but as a lender, in this case
17 we're acting as a lender here, we want to be able to have
18 access to 100 percent of the surplus cash flow to repay
19 our funds, not just the 75 percent, and in previous
20 transactions, HUD has been amenable to that request
21 through a waiver. Now, as I understand it, that waiver
22 has come primarily through our work with the local HUD
23 offices in Fort Worth, San Antonio and so forth.

24 We've tried, I've tried to reach out to our HUD
25 contacts locally at the San Antonio and the Fort Worth

1 offices, as well as the D.C. offices. My understanding
2 is -- and the attorneys in the room that work with HUD
3 lenders can correct me if I'm wrong -- something changed
4 where now the underwriting piece of these transactions
5 don't go maybe to the local HUD offices, they go directly
6 to the D.C. offices, and D.C. is just not providing a
7 waiver for that, or they just changed their position
8 altogether on that piece, on that waiver with respect to
9 their relationship with Texas and not providing waivers on
10 that 75 percent restriction.

11 That being the case, our rules under the direct
12 loan rules, again, provide us to accommodate an FHA first
13 line financing structure, provided that we can come in as
14 a surplus cash, although it's not specific, it doesn't
15 specifically address 100 percent surplus cash, 75 percent
16 surplus cash. The applicant's counsel will come up here,
17 likely, and say: Therefore, your rule gives you the room
18 to make that interpretation. I would say that while it's
19 not specifically laid out that staff meant 100 percent,
20 that is how we have closed on all previous transactions,
21 that is how we enter these transactions and underwrite
22 them when we're looking at them is that we're going to
23 have availability of 100 percent of that surplus cash.

24 And so this is the discussion that I guess is a
25 long-awaited discussion that we've been meaning to have

1 what you, as our Board, to give us direction and why it's
2 a neutral recommendation -- or just a neutral at this
3 point, it's not a recommendation on or the other. Staff
4 would seek your guidance and how you would like us to
5 approach these transactions where applicants are wanting
6 to take advantage of favorable financing, not just through
7 HUD but with us -- we provide favorable terms on our
8 direct loans -- but when it comes to subordinating to
9 HUD's requirement and they're no longer providing a waiver
10 to say that we'll have access to 100 percent of the
11 surplus cash, what would this Board like us to do.

12 Now, we will address this during our rulemaking
13 cycle coming up. I believe the direct loan rules will be
14 coming up for the Board's approval, a draft version in
15 October. This will be an issue that we kind of hash out
16 more fully through that process. In the meantime, and
17 under the rules that we have in place, staff didn't feel
18 like it had the authority, that authority goes to the
19 Board, to approve the change in terms of repayment on our
20 HOME loan for these two specific deals. And we have been
21 bringing these deals on a case-by-case basis to you.

22 I will add that as mitigation that the
23 applicant has offered to the Department for our increased
24 risk and our concern -- we've had various discussions with
25 the owner and the owner's counsel on this matter -- they

1 have offered, the owner has offered a guarantee for full
2 repayment of the direct loan through one of its affiliated
3 LLC entities. The Board has been presented with and has
4 previously accepted a personal guarantee on another
5 request such as this. It was a different scenario, the
6 owner was asking to refinance his first lien debt with an
7 FHA product, but they offered, again, a guarantee knowing
8 that HUD was not providing a waiver on the 75 percent
9 restriction, and the Board accepted that guarantee as
10 mitigation for our increased risk.

11 Staff's writeup talks about that mitigation and
12 appreciate the applicant's intent to help mitigate the
13 Department's risk that we're incurring with this kind of a
14 structure. I would just caution that receiving those
15 guarantees without the Department having any real formal
16 way of evaluating the guarantees, I'm not sure how useful
17 that will be as a mitigation on moving forward, we might
18 want to vet that out a little bit more, but they have
19 provided that in this case for both Merritt Monument and
20 Merritt Heritage.

21 And so, unless you guys have any questions for
22 me.

23 MR. GOODWIN: Raquel, I have a question. Did
24 this applicant refuse to offer a personal guarantee?

25 MS. MORALES: They just didn't offer. I don't

1 know that he refused to, they just offered up in their
2 formal request a guarantee from their LLC.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. And did you say we have
4 information regarding the financial wherewithal of that
5 LLC?

6 MS. MORALES: No. We have no way of evaluating
7 those guarantees.

8 MR. GOODWIN: But we have no information from
9 that LLC either as to whether there's any value to that
10 guarantee.

11 MS. MORALES: That's correct, we do not have
12 that information.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions?

14 MR. IRVINE: Mr. Chairman.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

16 MR. IRVINE: Just a couple of comments. While
17 we would love Board guidance and direction, we cannot have
18 an informal rulemaking, so until and unless the actual
19 rules are changed, we will continue to bring requests such
20 as this to the Board for individual consideration.

21 On the subject of the 75 percent cash flow
22 subordination requirement, I hope HUD is either monitoring
23 this meeting or reads our transcript. Partners don't
24 treat each other that way, partners are on a pari passu
25 basis. We don't try to shift risk from one side to the

1 other.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. GOODWIN: So since we have a neutral, I
5 assume we have people that want to speak to this, we need
6 a motion to hear comments regarding this issue.

7 MR. BRADEN: So moved.

8 MR. GOODWIN: So moved. Second?

9 MS. RESÉNDIZ: Second.

10 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. All in favor
11 say aye.

12 (A chorus of ayes.)

13 MR. GOODWIN: Any opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We'll start to hear
16 comments.

17 MR. DENISON: Hello, Chairman and Board
18 members. Thank you.

19 First, I want to apologize because I've been
20 before you a couple of times on these deals. I closed a
21 nearly identical transaction in November with HOME and
22 221(d)(4) FHA for a project in Dripping Springs and HUD
23 waived this rule, so when we were before you trying to
24 solve some of the gap problems that the people before me
25 came and talked to you about solving with the fancy bond

1 thing, we approached the problem of losing funds with
2 going to FHA financing because it's 40-year amortization
3 and much lower interest rates which helped us fill the gap
4 that we lost when we lost the equity.

5 So when we came before you in May, I didn't
6 know that HUD had changed their tune and didn't do the
7 waivers, but I'm just here to tell you on Monument,
8 Monument's credits came to us at the end of 2016 when I
9 actually had to return the credits on Leisure in Midland
10 the year before because of the oil price collapse and I
11 had too many market units and we lost rent and the ability
12 to source funds and I couldn't make the deal work
13 feasibly, so the credits came to my next deal for the next
14 year of 2016 for a much smaller deal, a majority of which
15 was affordable, and therefore, much more feasible. And so
16 we're coming back with the FHA financing to make the exact
17 same deals work as originally contemplated with the same
18 allocation of tax credits, no change in affordable units,
19 and we did that really quickly with Monument, it took us a
20 little bit longer on Heritage in Georgetown, but both
21 really complicated transactions.

22 And then the last thing I'd like to say is we
23 are submitting our closing application to HUD today on
24 Heritage, so we're literally within 15 to 21 days from
25 closing and breaking ground, so everybody is ready to go.

1 I believe we have all the affordable units spoken for
2 already and we haven't even broken ground, so there's huge
3 demand there. And on Monument, we should be getting our
4 firm commitment next week and we are going to be prepared
5 to immediately submit our closing package, so I think
6 we're within 30 to 45 days of closing and getting under
7 construction. So both deals are completely permitted,
8 completely designed, so just respectfully ask that you
9 accept this.

10 Oh, and on the comment on the financials really
11 quickly, it's a limited partnership that's in every single
12 one of the deals that TDHCA has done under Merritt
13 Communities except for two, and so it is the recipient of
14 all the cash flow on those deals, so you do have the
15 limited partnership agreements, you have the financials on
16 those deals. All of our portfolio at Merritt is nearly
17 100 percent full and very cash flow positive, so I think
18 it's a very strong financial limited partnership for you
19 for the guarantee and I was hoping that that would be
20 something that you could look t.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: So I'll be the one to ask the
25 question. Are you unwilling to do the personal guarantee?

1 MR. DENISON: I'm happy to do the personal
2 guarantee.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Other comments?

4 MS. BAST: Good morning. Cynthia Bast for the
5 developer.

6 We really appreciate the opportunity to come
7 before you again. I feel like I've spoken to you four or
8 five times on this particular topic now, and I'm sorry
9 that it has to be rehashed. Again, what we're trying to
10 do here is solve the loss of credit pricing problem, and
11 this developer chose to solve it not by reducing the
12 number of units, not by reducing the quality, keeping all
13 of those elements, but by finding a way to change the
14 financing structure to make it work, and therefore,
15 shifted to this HUD financing in early 2017.

16 Unfortunately, that was right at the time when
17 HUD central was identifying this issue going on at the
18 local HUD area offices -- as you'll hear perhaps more
19 about from Mr. Shackelford, the lender's counsel -- and so
20 we got caught in that and their position that they wanted
21 to take that they're not going to waive this surplus cash
22 75 percent issue anymore.

23 And I've spoken to you before, I've written
24 multiple letters, I think you all know that I believe that
25 your rules and your statutes do support approval of this.

1 You have statutory authorization that says that your
2 application programs and cycles shall be administered in
3 accordance with federal requirements. You have a rule
4 that does acknowledge that when there's FHA financing, a
5 direct loan can be repayable from surplus cash. All of
6 the elements are there for you to be able to approve this.

7 I do want to emphasize that this is not a last-
8 minute change by a developer. As I mentioned, the HUD
9 financing was first proposed in the early part of this
10 year and we actually came to you with a request in March
11 that was heard in May that addressed complying with the
12 MAP guide in certain respects, and looking back, we
13 probably should have dealt with this issue in full back in
14 May. We got the 40 years on Heritage but we didn't get
15 the 40 years on Monument, and we didn't address the 75
16 percent cash flow back then, and I'm sorry for the cost on
17 your time on that.

18 While we do appreciate staff's concerns about
19 repayment of these HOME loans and their obligation to
20 repay HUD if something goes wrong, I do want to point out
21 to all of you that when HOME funds are layered with tax
22 credits, that's probably the most secure HOME loan you can
23 make. Nationally, the Tax Credit Program has less than a
24 one percent foreclosure rate, and foreclosure and loss of
25 those restrictions is what is going to cause that

1 catastrophic event where the Department would have an
2 obligation to repay HUD. So while I do appreciate the
3 concern about the risk, I just want to point out that this
4 layered transaction actually provides you with some
5 security.

6 So we are ready to close, as Mr. Denison
7 mentioned, we've offered a guarantee, we could offer
8 balance sheets to the extent necessary. Our letter did
9 specifically say, although it suggested a guarantee by
10 this entity, it did say or such other mitigation as the
11 Department may determine is appropriate.

12 So we appreciate your consideration, and hope
13 that you will grant the appeal for both properties. Thank
14 you.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

16 MR. SHACKELFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
17 members of the Board, Mr. Irvine, Mr. Eccles. John
18 Shackelford. In this instance I represent the lender.

19 I've been before you a couple of times on this
20 issue and I think earlier this year with some other Board
21 members, but Ms. Bingham, you probably remember we had
22 another issue like this as well. And I know you're taking
23 these on a case-by-case basis, but essentially, I'll say
24 the same thing that I said earlier this year to the other
25 Board members and yourselves that are still on the Board,

1 and that is I don't have an explanation like Ms. Morales
2 to get to the bottom of why HUD has made a change and why
3 they're no longer granting these waivers in Texas.

4 I can tell you, from representing a couple of
5 lenders, we do deals in other states, the other states
6 don't ask for waivers, they approve these transactions, so
7 I don't know if it's just a matter of in D.C. HUD decided
8 to change their policy and make it's a blanket across the
9 country no longer giving waivers to the State of Texas.
10 I've also gotten a little bit of information that they
11 feel like by having it be 100 percent cash flow, you're
12 taking away the developer from having any kind of
13 incentive because they're not pulling any cash out to put
14 in their pocket, all their money that they're making is
15 going to serve as debt and operating expenses.

16 So whether it's a matter of they feel like they
17 just want to have a blanket rule that covers all states
18 and no longer give Texas a waiver, or what exactly it is,
19 it's just gotten to be where, unfortunately, developers
20 find themselves caught between a rock and a hard place
21 between TDHCA's goals of trying to have it be where
22 they're not taking a subordinate position with HUD on
23 their financing by having only 75 percent financing, but
24 HUD's rule and the MAP guide being a max of 75 percent
25 cash flow for the payment of that subordinate debt.

1 So that's really all I can tell you. Sometimes
2 I represent developers and we have the same issue and it
3 is a difficult position for the developer to be in because
4 what's hard is -- and I agree with Ms. Bast on this -- I
5 think the Board could make a determination that they could
6 instruct staff to interpret the language a little
7 differently than what they do, I think you've got the
8 ability to do that, but it makes it very difficult for the
9 developer at this late point in the game to be coming
10 seeking approval from the Board because if the Board says
11 no, they're out of a lot of money, I mean, we're way down
12 the path. As Mr. Denison said, we're submitting the
13 package to HUD and we're requesting a closing date of
14 September 26, so the deal is teed up, it's ready to go,
15 and the one for Monument is coming right in behind.

16 So if you have any questions, I'll be glad to
17 answer any questions.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody else that was going to
21 comment?

22 MS. McDONALD: Good morning, Chairman Goodwin
23 and Board members. My name is Joyce McDonald, and I am
24 the executive director and founder of Frameworks Community
25 Development Corporation, so thank you for allowing me to

1 stand before you today.

2 I will say that this deal is at the core of
3 Frameworks' mission. Affordable housing, especially for
4 senior housing, is a need and the deficit is growing.

5 We are a nonprofit organization dedicated to
6 serving the low income housing community in Austin and the
7 surrounding areas, so we are thrilled to partner with
8 Merritt Communities on Merritt Heritage in Georgetown
9 because the exemplary reputation of the Merritt team is
10 evidenced by their consistent high compliance scores and
11 beautiful product.

12 This is our first tax credit funded affordable
13 housing community, and as luck would have it, it seems to
14 be immensely challenging. After the election and the
15 subsequent of tax credit syndication market resulting in
16 the loss of 15 percent of the value of the tax credits,
17 the Merritt team immediately pursued the 221(d)(4) FHA
18 financing to source additional funding to fill the gap.
19 As you know, the Austin market is booming and the
20 construction activity is at an all-time high which has
21 caused labor and material costs to skyrocket. As a
22 result, Heritage was impacted by both cost increases and
23 loss of funding sources.

24 A few months back we brought a request for an
25 additional million dollars in HOME funds, and TDHCA staff

1 underwrote the new FHA financing and approved the 40-year
2 term required of the HOME funds by HUD. Somehow the
3 request for HUD mandate at 75 percent cash flow provisions
4 wasn't addressed at that time. We sincerely apologize
5 that we're back seeking this approval now before you.

6 Merritt Heritage is a remarkable project in
7 that it is one of the few projects funded by tax credits
8 where half of its units are not rent-restricted. We
9 believe mixing incomes is so positive on those involved.
10 Heritage is located in Williams Drive in Georgetown, the
11 entrance of the thriving senior community of Sun City and
12 of the major east-west arterial for one of the fastest
13 growing communities in America. There is significant
14 retail and services surrounding this location and much is
15 within walking distance.

16 Heritage is heavily supported by the community,
17 receiving the only support letter from the State
18 Representative Marsha Farney. City council and the
19 Georgetown Affordable Housing Task Force joined the
20 support of multiple local community groups to support our
21 project. We are within 30 days, as they've said, of
22 breaking ground as we are submitting our closing package
23 to HUD today and our interest list is already full for all
24 the affordable units, which we're thrilled about. We hope
25 you will see this tremendous support as significant

1 security for your loan.

2 The Merritt team has additionally agreed to
3 guarantee your loan to mitigate any concerns that you may
4 have, which was mentioned by Mr. Denison.

5 We thank you for your time and devotion to
6 affordable housing and request that you approve our
7 request for the approval of the HUD required cash flow
8 provision for the HOME funds for Merritt Heritage.

9 Thank you for allowing me to speak before you
10 today. If you have any questions, I'd be more than happy
11 to address them.

12 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

13 Any questions?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: I will entertain a motion. I
16 would love for it to include a guarantee from Mr. Denison,
17 as well as the LLC. I'll entertain any motion that anyone
18 would like to make.

19 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Raquel, would the motion
20 be relative to the change in the direct loan terms? Is
21 that what we're either approving or not approving?

22 MS. MORALES: A change in the direct loan terms
23 for Monument because that never got dealt with at the May
24 Board meeting, so they're asking to extend their term to
25 40 years and then asking to change the repayment terms.

1 I do want to just clarify for the Board's
2 consideration, in the board action writeup we did include
3 that in the case that the Board decided to go ahead and
4 approve the request, staff recommended approving that
5 request subject to some conditions that we set out in
6 addition to any other conditions that the Board would like
7 to impose. I'm just going to read through those because I
8 believe it's the same in both cases.

9 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Are they in our board
10 book, Raquel?

11 MS. MORALES: Yes, they're in the board action
12 request for both Merritt Heritage and Merritt Monument.

13 But what staff laid out was that should the
14 Board approve the request, staff recommends making the
15 approval subject to: one, the owner's ability to meet any
16 additional conditions imposed on the 2016 loan commitment
17 as stated in the latest underwriting report performed by
18 our REA Division; and two, that the owner's agreement
19 based on general staff concerns regarding timing for
20 placement in service, that neither force majeure or an
21 extension to the placed in service deadline, or waiver of
22 the carryover agreement provisions, that all units be
23 placed in service by the placed in service deadline.

24 When we've had meetings with the applicant,
25 they've assured us that there would be no problem placing

1 these units in service on time, so we just kind of want to
2 put that out there that if the Board chooses to approve
3 this request that we hope that they can deliver those
4 units timely without a request for an extension.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion?

6 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I have a question. So
7 do those conditions sound good to Colby, those two
8 conditions are acceptable? That would be to meet any
9 other conditions as identified by REA in the underwriting
10 and then to meet the placed in service deadline.

11 MR. DENISON: I don't have any issues with that
12 other than being a little bit scared about what's going to
13 happen to all of us in Texas after this hurricane in
14 materials and labor, and so I'm a little bit nervous about
15 force majeure.

16 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Did you just except
17 force majeure? Included force majeure?

18 MS. MORALES: You mean in our recommendation?
19 We just said that they wouldn't come back and ask for an
20 extension either under force majeure or an extension to
21 placement in service, again, based on our concerns on the
22 timing and their indication that they didn't believe they
23 would have any issues.

24 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I'll move to approve the
25 requested change, the terms for -- should we do Merritt

1 Monument, can we do them together?

2 MR. GOODWIN: We can do them both together, or
3 should we do them separate, Beau?

4 MR. ECCLES: Hang on for a second. Just on the
5 issue of foreclosing the ability for an applicant to claim
6 force majeure, are we talking about for events that have
7 occurred to date or are we talking prospectively?

8 MR. IRVINE: I'm not comfortable foreclosing
9 the possibility of raising a force majeure claim in the
10 future should unanticipated things arise.

11 MS. THOMASON: Me neither.

12 MS. MORALES: That's fine. Whatever you want
13 to do.

14 MS. BAST: If a building burns down, that's
15 what force majeure is supposed to be there for.

16 MR. GOODWIN: We're going to exclude force
17 majeure from this.

18 MS. BAST: Thank you.

19 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So my other question was
20 do we take Heritage and Monument separately, or does the
21 motion can be for both?

22 MS. MORALES: Let me just clarify on that. So
23 for Merritt Heritage, you already extended the term to 40
24 years, this is just the payment structure modification.
25 If you want to take that first separately, you can do

1 that.

2 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So move to approve the
3 applicant's request to change the direct loan terms for
4 Merritt Heritage, to include personal guarantee from
5 applicant for the other 25 percent repayment.

6 MR. GOODWIN: Motion. Second?

7 MR. BRADEN: Second.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any
9 questions? We have a comment?

10 MS. SYLVESTER: Megan Sylvester, Legal.

11 I just wanted to clarify, did your motion mean
12 in addition to the guarantee from the LLP

13 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Yes.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions?

15 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: The LLP guarantee was in
16 the writeup and then the chair asked for the personal
17 guarantee on top of.

18 MR. GOODWIN: And you're comfortable with that,
19 Colby?

20 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So amended.

21 MR. IRVINE: Could I just offer a clarification
22 of what I would contemplate to be the scope of guarantees.

23 If, for reasons we hope never come to pass, the deal is
24 unable to perform in accordance with applicable
25 requirements and that triggers a federal repayment

1 liability, we want the guarantee of that repayment
2 liability. That's the real issue.

3 MR. GOODWIN: You understand that, Colby, and
4 you're comfortable with that?

5 MR. DENISON: (Speaking from audience.) Yes.
6 I don't have a choice.

7 (General laughter.)

8 MR. GOODWIN: I didn't ask that question.

9 MR. DENISON: Yes, sir.

10 MR. GOODWIN: You're comfortable with that.

11 So we'll take that motion and we have a second.
12 Any other discussion?

13 MR. VASQUEZ: Can we add guarantees from the
14 lawyers?

15 (General talking and laughter.)

16 MR. GOODWIN: All those in favor say aye.

17 (A chorus of ayes.)

18 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Now we'll take Monument.

21 MS. MORALES: And Monument is requesting both
22 to extend the term to 40 years to match the first lien FHA
23 term, and the repayment structure of our direct loan.

24 MR. GOODWIN: And again, excluding force
25 majeure from the provision.

1 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Mr. Chair, I would move
2 to accept applicant's request to change the repayment
3 terms for the direct loan from 18 to 40 years on Merritt
4 Monument, and to allow the repayment terms as requested in
5 the prior application, to include meeting the conditions
6 as requested by the Department and a guarantee by the LLC
7 and a personal guarantee by the applicant.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a second?

9 MS. RESÉNDIZ: Second.

10 MR. GOODWIN: So it's been moved and seconded.

11 Any discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

14 (A chorus of ayes.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. GOODWIN: That motion passes as well.

18 Thank you.

19 So I think we had pulled from the agenda 1(p)
20 which we're not going to take up at this time, but also
21 1(q) Palladium Glenn Heights.

22 Andrew, you're going to present?

23 MR. SINNOTT: That's correct.

24 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. So this is item 1(q).

25 MR. SINNOTT: Good morning. Andrew Sinnott,

1 Multifamily Direct Loan Program administrator.

2 So item 1(q) is presentation, discussion and
3 possible action on a determination notice for 4 percent
4 credits with another issuer and an award of direct loan
5 funds.

6 So the reason that this was pulled from the
7 consent agenda was so that we could discuss some unique
8 aspects of the direct loan request for this transaction
9 that we were hoping to get into the BAR but were
10 ultimately unable to due to the continuing conversation we
11 had with the applicant after the BAR was posted.

12 Specifically, there are two adjustments that
13 need to be made to the terms of the direct loan award.
14 First, regarding the terms of the TCAP repayment fund loan
15 that is recommended to be awarded to Palladium Glenn
16 Heights out of the soft repayment set-aside, the applicant
17 was unaware of the ramifications of receiving the award as
18 a deferred forgivable loan prior to conversations that
19 staff had with the applicant as the underwriting was being
20 finalized this week. So it's an \$800,000 TCAP repayment
21 funds loan, and the applicant was unaware that if it's
22 structured as a deferred forgivable loan, it could
23 potentially be deducted from basis at the time of cost
24 certification and could result in a loss of credits, and
25 therefore, a loss of equity.

1 Having recently discussed this prospect with
2 the applicant, the applicant has requested, and staff is
3 amenable to restructuring the \$800,000 TCAP repayment
4 funds loan to be a deferred payable loan in accordance
5 with 10 TAC 13.4(a)(1)(A). So this is just an allowable
6 structure under the direct loan program. We have deferred
7 forgivable, deferred payable, or surplus cash flow as the
8 available options under this supportive housing soft
9 repayment set-aside.

10 Second, there are two sub issues regarding the
11 FHA insured debt in front of TDHCA's loan, one for staff
12 to resolve with HUD and one for the Board to resolve.
13 Regarding the issue for staff and HUD to resolve, this
14 direct loan award for Palladium Glenn Heights, like the
15 direct loans for the two Merritt transactions that you
16 just heard about, will be subordinate to an FHA insured
17 first lien loan under the 221(d)(4) program, however, the
18 direct loan for Glenn Heights is being made with TCAP
19 repayment funds, whereas the direct loans for the two
20 Merritt transactions were composed of HOME funds.

21 So this will be the first time that a TCAP
22 repayment funds loan, which we're using as HOME match,
23 will be subordinate to an FHA insured loan, so there will
24 have to be conversation with HUD and/or the FHA lender
25 regarding this specific fund source being subordinate to

1 FHA insured debt and an allowance of the HUD rider
2 restrictive covenant agreement to be modified so that
3 TDHCA's TCAP RF LURA is not subordinate to the FHA insured
4 security instrument. Despite having to have this
5 conversation with HUD and/or the FHA lender, staff expects
6 approval of this fund source as subordinate debt and
7 approval of the HUD rider restrictive covenant agreement
8 to be modified within the next few weeks. So we just want
9 to make sure that our LURA cannot be extinguished by
10 foreclosure, the TCAP LURA.

11 Regarding the issue requiring Board approval,
12 as you just heard with the two Merritt transactions, HUD
13 recently began requiring the 75 percent surplus cash flow
14 language to be included in TDHCA's subordinate promissory
15 notes, whereas, in the past TDHCA was able to not specify
16 a percentage of surplus cash flow from which TDHCA's loan
17 would be repaid, resulting in all of surplus cash flow
18 being available to repay TDHCA's loan.

19 Unlike the Merritt transactions, the loan for
20 Palladium Glenn Heights is being made out of the
21 supportive housing soft repayment set-aside, meaning that
22 if there is an annual payment to the loan, the annual
23 payment will not be subject to default. Additionally,
24 unlike the Merritt transactions, the 2017 NOFA that this
25 application was submitted under is still open so these

1 modifications are available to applicants under this 2017
2 NOFA as long as that NOFA is still open.

3 Staff requests explicit authority from the
4 Board to have the 75 percent surplus cash flow language in
5 the note should HUD require that language. Also, staff
6 notes that this decision does not serve as a precedent for
7 future transactions. As Raquel said, we're going to try
8 and get this taken care of in the rewrite of the rule, the
9 Multifamily Direct Loan rule for 2018 so that we don't
10 have to come back here on a case-by-case basis.

11 EARAC met yesterday and recommended approval of
12 this transaction subject to staff working out with HUD the
13 matter discussed within this action item, and subject to
14 an updated underwriting report reflecting the terms of the
15 loan before closing, which potentially will be next month.

16 Staff recommends approval of the \$800,000
17 direct loan funds and issuance of a determination notice
18 for 4 percent credits in the amount of \$1,104,990, with
19 the condition noted herein, as well as any conditions
20 included in the underwriting report. If you have any
21 questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion to hear
25 comments? I see a couple of people want to talk.

1 MS. RESÉNDIZ: So moved.

2 MR. GOODWIN: So moved. Second?

3 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

4 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. All in favor
5 say aye.

6 (A chorus of ayes.)

7 MR. GOODWIN: We'll entertain comments.

8 MR. SHACKELFORD: John Shackelford on behalf of
9 the developer.

10 We don't really have any comments, just
11 available for questions, really, because you're
12 recommending approval and we're good with that. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions for the developer,
15 for John?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. I'll take a motion to
18 approve staff's recommendation.

19 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I'll so move.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

21 MS. RESÉNDIZ: Second.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Any comments or questions?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: If not, all those in favor say
25 aye.

1 (A chorus of ayes.)

2 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. GOODWIN: It is granted.

5 Let's move into Multifamily Finance. Item
6 7(b).

7 MS. HOLLOWAY: Good morning.

8 Item 7(b) is presentation, discussion and
9 possible action regarding the issuance of multifamily
10 housing revenue bonds for the Casa Brendan development and
11 a determination notice of housing tax credits.

12 The Board adopted the inducement resolution on
13 June 28 for this project and a certificate of reservation
14 was issued in August 18 with a bond delivery deadline of
15 January 15, 2018. The applicant has disclosed the
16 presence of undesirable neighborhood characteristics,
17 specifically relating to the poverty rate that exceeds 40
18 percent according to Neighborhood Scout. Staff has
19 visited the site on August 30 and found the neighborhood
20 to be older and established with several small businesses,
21 values in the neighborhood have appreciated in the last
22 year, and in addition, the percentage of households in the
23 census tract with incomes at roughly the county median
24 increased from 32 percent in 2011 to 43 percent in 2015,
25 indicating an upward trend in incomes. Based on this

1 information, staff believes the undesirable neighborhood
2 characteristic related to the poverty rate is not of a
3 nature and severity that should render the site
4 ineligible.

5 Casa Brendan Apartments is located in
6 Stephenville and it proposes the acquisition and
7 rehabilitation of 86 units originally constructed in 1985.

8 The development will serve an elderly population. All of
9 the units will be rent and income restricted at 60 percent
10 of AMI, and the development is covered by a project based
11 Section 8 HAP contract.

12 A public hearing for the proposed development
13 was conducted by staff on August 30 of 2017, and there was
14 no one in attendance. The Department has not received any
15 letters of support or opposition for this development.

16 This transaction involves a Fannie Mae
17 multifamily pass-through mortgage-backed security. The
18 mortgage loan will be originated by the Department to the
19 borrower on the closing date and funded with the bond
20 proceeds. Simultaneously with the closing, the loan will
21 be assigned to the Fannie Mae lender, which is Wells
22 Fargo, and the funds used by the lender by which to
23 acquire the loan will be deposited into a collateral
24 account to secure the bonds. With this structure, the
25 project will be 100 percent cash collateralized at all

1 times, thus offering protection for the bondholders.

2 Payments on the bonds will be guaranteed by Fannie Mae.

3 Staff recommends that the site for Casa Brendan
4 be found eligible under the undesirable neighborhood
5 characteristics rule. Staff further recommends approval
6 of the issuance of up to \$6 million in tax-exempt
7 multifamily housing revenue bonds, and the issuance of a
8 determination notice of \$305,948 in 4 percent housing tax
9 credits for Casa Brendan, of course, subject to any
10 previous participation and underwriting concerns.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Questions?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. GOODWIN: Seeing that nobody wants to
14 comment, I'll entertain a motion to approve staff's
15 recommendation.

16 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Move staff's
17 recommendation.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Moved staff's recommendation.
19 Second?

20 MR. BRADEN: Second.

21 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any
22 discussion?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

25 (A chorus of ayes.)

1 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. 7(c).

4 MS. HOLLOWAY: Item 7(c) is presentation,
5 discussion and possible action regarding the issuance of
6 multifamily housing revenue bonds for the Nuestro Hogar
7 development and a determination notice of housing tax
8 credits. This is the same applicant and moves in the same
9 timeline and has the same structure as the Casa Brendan
10 item that we just approved.

11 The applicant has requested a waiver of one of
12 the mandatory development amenities under the Uniform
13 Multifamily Rules, specifically the requirement that all
14 units must have central heating and air conditioning. The
15 development is three stories tall, includes efficiency
16 units sized at 415 square feet and one-bedroom units sized
17 at 540 square feet. Both unit types currently have
18 packaged terminal air conditioners. PTAC units meet the
19 requirement for central heating and air conditioning for
20 single room occupancy or efficiency units only, so under
21 the rule, the waiver request is really about the one-
22 bedroom units.

23 Given that both rooms are heated and cooled
24 with the PTAC units and the relatively small size of the
25 units, staff believe that the PTAC system would be

1 effective in cooling and heating. Moreover, the scope of
2 the work for the rehabilitation includes replacing the
3 current PTAC units with newer more efficient ones. It has
4 been estimated that the cost to add central HVAC could add
5 as much as \$5,700 per unit, or an increase of
6 approximately \$372,000 to the project cost, with
7 ultimately no positive net effect.

8 Regarding the waiver, in accordance with rule
9 and statute, the Department is to provide for the housing
10 needs of individuals and families of low, very low and
11 extremely low income and families of moderate income, as
12 well as the preservation of government assisted housing.
13 Staff believes the proposed development meets the stated
14 purpose. Additionally, considering the structural
15 challenges and estimates cost associated with installing a
16 central HVAC system, staff believes an economic and
17 practical approach would be to upgrade the current
18 systems, and therefore, recommends that the waiver be
19 granted.

20 Nuestro Hogar is an existing development
21 located in Arlington. The project will acquire and
22 rehabilitate 65 units originally constructed in 1986. It
23 is serving an elderly population. All of the units will
24 be rent and income restricted to 60 percent of AMI, and
25 they are covered by a project based Section 8 HAP

1 contract.

2 A public hearing for the proposed development
3 was conducted by staff on August 30 of 2017, and there was
4 no one in attendance. The Department has not received
5 any letters of support or opposition for this development.

6 Staff recommends waiver of the mandatory
7 community amenities rule as described be granted and that
8 the issuance of up to \$6 million in tax-exempt multifamily
9 housing revenue bonds be approved, along with a
10 determination notice of \$194,510 in 4 percent housing tax
11 credits, subject to previous participation conditions and
12 underwriting conditions.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion to approve
16 staff's recommendation?

17 MR. VASQUEZ: Move to approve staff's
18 recommendation.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

20 MS. THOMASON: Second.

21 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. All those in
22 favor say aye.

23 (A chorus of ayes.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. 7(c) passes. Now we can
2 go to 7(d).

3 MS. HOLLOWAY: This is the third of the
4 applications that we're taking up today from the same
5 applicant, so this will have the same timeline and
6 financial structure as Casa Brendan and Nuestro Hogar that
7 we just discussed. This is presentation, discussion and
8 possible action regarding the issuance of multifamily
9 housing revenue bonds and a determination notice of
10 housing tax credits for Casa, Inc.

11 Casa, Inc. Apartments is located in Fort Worth
12 and proposes the acquisition and rehabilitation of 200
13 units serving an elderly population. All of the units
14 will be rent and income restricted at 60 percent of AMI,
15 with one employee occupied unit. Currently all of the
16 units are covered by a project based Section 8 contract.

17 This application also requests a waiver
18 regarding the PTAC units, and similarly, they are
19 replacing current existing PTAC units with newer more
20 energy efficient PTACs. The architect and engineer on
21 this project have estimated the cost to install central
22 heat and air conditioning into these units could be as
23 much as \$5,100 a unit, or an increase of approximately a
24 million dollars on the project cost. Staff believes the
25 waiver is warranted under the same rule and statute as the

1 Nuestro Hogar project which was our previous agenda item.

2 A public hearing for the proposed development
3 was conducted by staff on August 30 of 2017, and there was
4 no one in attendance. The Department has not received any
5 letters of support or opposition for this development.

6 Staff recommends that the waiver of the
7 mandatory community amenities rule be granted and that the
8 issuance of up to \$25 million in tax exempt multifamily
9 housing revenue bonds be approved, along with the issuance
10 of a determination notice of \$993,773 in 4 percent housing
11 tax credits, subject to any previous participation
12 conditions or underwriting conditions.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion for staff's
16 approval?

17 MR. BRADEN: I'll make a motion to approve.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

19 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any
21 discussion?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. GOODWIN: Hearing none, all those in favor
24 say aye.

25 (A chorus of ayes.)

1 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. GOODWIN: 7(e).

4 MS. HOLLOWAY: 7(e) follows on the
5 Commissioners' Corner item that we discussed earlier on
6 the 9 percent amendment. This is presentation, discussion
7 and possible action on a determination notice for housing
8 tax credits with another issuer. The proposed issuer for
9 the bonds in this transaction is Alameda Public Facilities
10 Corporation which has partnered with HACEP on a number of
11 transactions.

12 As I mentioned, this application is part of the
13 reconfiguration of an application that received 2016
14 competitive allocation into two developments, one with the
15 9 percent, the other with the 4 percent. Commissioners'
16 Corner Phase II involves the new construction of 92 units,
17 of which 62 will be rent and income restricted at 60
18 percent of AMI, 20 will be restricted at 50 percent, and
19 the remaining ten units will be restricted at 30 percent.

20 Based on various deadlines, staff has
21 identified the need for a waiver of application
22 requirements. The application was submitted in a time
23 frame that adhered to our 75-day deadline which allowed
24 staff the time it needed for evaluation, however, it was
25 submitted without evidence that the request for bond

1 volume cap had been approved by the issuer. Staff was
2 aware of the intent to submit the application and was
3 aware that the request had been placed on the issuer's
4 board agenda for consideration shortly after the
5 application was submitted. Considering the continuing
6 partnership of the applicant and the issuer, staff
7 believes the constraints in obtaining the inducement
8 resolution were primarily related to posting requirements
9 and the Board's meeting schedule, and that waiver of that
10 application requirement is appropriate.

11 We earlier discussed Board action in March of
12 2017 regarding the 2016 applications. This particular
13 transaction seems to step outside of that sort of broad
14 approval that was granted to us at that time, so of
15 course, staff has had some concerns with it. EARAC
16 considered the proposed application and concluded that
17 they could neither recommend approval nor denial of the
18 proposed development without prior Board action on the
19 related amendment request on this agenda as 6(a) which
20 directly impacts the feasibility of this development.

21 Based on the earlier action regarding the 9
22 percent application, staff recommends that the issuance of
23 a determination notice of \$538,417 in 4 percent housing
24 tax credits, including necessary waivers of existing rules
25 pursuant to the Board's prior action at the March 2017

1 meeting, be approved, subject to the previous
2 participation and underwriting conditions.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion to approve
6 staff's recommendation?

7 MR. BRADEN: I'll make that motion.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

9 MS. RESÉNDIZ: Second.

10 MR. GOODWIN: It's been moved and seconded.

11 Any discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody want to speak? No?

14 Thought you might feel that way?

15 All those in favor say aye.

16 (A chorus of ayes.)

17 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. That's passed.

20 MS. HOLLOWAY: 7(f) is presentation, discussion
21 and possible action regarding alternative financing
22 structures under the 2017-1 Multifamily Direct Loan Notice
23 of Funding Availability. We're not asking you to take
24 action on a particular application, we are presenting an
25 idea and saying is this something that you as the Board

1 believe we should pursue.

2 So the 2017-1 NOFA was approved on December 15
3 and has been amended several times to add funds, adjust
4 set-asides or timelines. The Department has typically
5 awarded direct loan funds as construction to perm through
6 which a borrower closes on the loan, draws on funds over
7 the course of construction, and then the entirety of the
8 loan converts to a permanent loan, generally amortizing or
9 it may be a deferred forgivable loan.

10 A current applicant has requested that the
11 Department consider the use of direct loan funds as a
12 construction loan only. The applicant has proposed
13 drawing down the entirety of the direct loan funds at
14 closing and paying a nominal interest rate over a 24 to 36
15 month course of construction. The loan would be paid off
16 in full upon rent stabilization or closing of the
17 permanent financing. Using the direct loan funds as a
18 bridge or construction loan would allow some of the equity
19 contributions to be deferred until later in construction,
20 thereby increasing the equity price.

21 In order to achieve the applicant's request,
22 the Board would have to waive requirements in the direct
23 loan rule which require no more than 50 percent of the
24 direct loan award be drawn in the first draw and that the
25 remaining 50 percent be drawn at an even level with

1 construction completion. We are not asking you to waive
2 that today, we're just saying that's part of what would be
3 included as we move forward if we take this path.

4 While not explicitly prohibited by the NOFA or
5 rule, this type of loan structure is different enough from
6 previous direct loan structures that staff believes its
7 departure from the normal course of business deserves
8 Board consideration. Staff recommends approval of a plan
9 to continue to explore this loan structure, including
10 evaluation and underwriting of applications so long as the
11 construction loan structure does not expose the Department
12 to undue risk and in such a way that all necessary federal
13 and state requirements continue to be met. Of course, any
14 applications would come back to you for approval and with
15 that request for waiver of those requirements in rule.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Questions?

17 MR. VASQUEZ: Question. Marni, so you say
18 we're trying to structure it where we loan them all the
19 construction costs?

20 MS. HOLLOWAY: A portion. I don't know for
21 sure what the numbers are. At this point what we're
22 looking for is is this okay with the Board for us to
23 continue to look at, and if we spend some time on this
24 application and in this underwriting and bring it back to
25 you, is that okay. I have no specifics about the

1 applicant at this time.

2 MR. VASQUEZ: I would just want the Department
3 staff to just ensure if you continue down this path, we
4 have to ensure that the equity is in the deal up front to
5 match the loan amount. I just don't know how they're
6 going to put together -- it sounds like they're just
7 trying to say, well, if we get it almost done, it will be
8 easier to get the equity, which is on any deal.

9 MS. HOLLOWAY: So just a question for clarity
10 so we know moving forward, are you looking for equity
11 contribution to match ours, or are you looking for equity
12 commitment?

13 MR. VASQUEZ: As close to contribution as
14 possible.

15 MS. HOLLOWAY: Okay.

16 MR. GOODWIN: My question when you brought this
17 up is why are we getting in the interim construction
18 business. Are these deals having trouble getting interim
19 construction lending?

20 MS. HOLLOWAY: Potentially. Part of the
21 attraction for us is it turns those funds over for us that
22 much more quickly, so we're receiving that program income
23 back in and we can put it back out into another project,
24 whether it's a construction loan or a longer term loan, it
25 kind of turns the dollars over more.

1 Part of it, if the applicant is able to achieve
2 a better equity price through this structure, one would
3 hope that we would be able to prove through the
4 underwriting process that this creates a healthier
5 development in the long run, which can only serve to
6 benefit everyone involved.

7 The other important piece to keep in mind is
8 that our affordability period, our LURA would be
9 continuing on beyond that loan repayment.

10 MR. VASQUEZ: And so on each of these then
11 would we be expected to then be putting in the permanent
12 finance and take out the construction loan?

13 MS. HOLLOWAY: So the current structure for
14 most of our direct loan transactions is construction to
15 permanent. So we're coming in at construction with a
16 portion of the financing that's limited by the direct loan
17 rule, and then we roll over to permanent financing. In
18 this instance, they're staying we just need you at the
19 front-end and then we'll pay you off.

20 MR. VASQUEZ: So under this scenario, we would
21 not be doing the permanent lending.

22 MS. HOLLOWAY: A permanent lender. No.

23 MR. VASQUEZ: Just to add on to my parameters
24 that I think we should examine, if we have a commitment
25 from one of Citibank or whatever as a permanent lender, if

1 they have that in place up front, that commitment, I'd be
2 more open to exploring providing the construction finance.

3 If we're providing all the construction finance and the
4 permanent finance and then we hope they get their equity,
5 I mean, we're being the developer at that point.

6 MS. HOLLOWAY: So you're looking for more
7 solidity at the front-end before we commit to the
8 transaction.

9 MR. VASQUEZ: Ideally, yes.

10 MR. GOODWIN: Other questions? I've got a
11 couple more questions. Do we have a department that does
12 interim construction lending now?

13 MS. HOLLOWAY: We have done construction, like
14 draws, five draws on single family, that kind of thing.
15 We have done that kind of financing in the past, and
16 again, currently we're set up for construction to perm, so
17 we are, in fact, receiving those interim draws through the
18 construction process. In this instance we're just not
19 rolling over to the permanent financing when the
20 construction is completed. So we absolutely are set up
21 for receiving, evaluating, inspections, going through that
22 whole process of drawing construction funds.

23 MR. GOODWIN: If as a Board we gave you
24 guidance and said go forward, would you be developing
25 interim construction rules for these types of loans and

1 how they may be granted?

2 MS. HOLLOWAY: It's something we would be
3 rolling into the updated Chapter 13 rules that we're going
4 to bring back to you in draft next month.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Brent, any comments you
6 want to make, being a former multifamily developer, on how
7 you see this?

8 MR. STEWART: Sure. Brent Stewart, Real
9 Estate Analysis.

10 I think what happens here is we're bridging the
11 equity. The repayment for our loan comes from an equity
12 payment once the project is completed, not so much the
13 permanent lender, which is a way better place to be. By
14 bridging that equity, the equity comes in later, the pay-
15 in schedule gets protracted you over the construction
16 period. That creates a higher yield for the equity which
17 then allows that to translate into a higher credit price
18 going up front. Some of the repayment would potentially
19 come from perm debt. My bet is most of it would come from
20 kind of that last capital contribution that comes into the
21 partnership.

22 And then on the other piece, we effectively do
23 this now. Actually, this can be done now because there's
24 nothing that says that somebody can't pay us off at the
25 end of 24 months now. I think this is just a program that

1 helps the equity guys understand that it's a true program,
2 it's something that we're looking to do and they can bank
3 on that in terms of committing to those equity prices.

4 MR. IRVINE: The way I look at it is by
5 bridging the equity, you provide a more stable,
6 predictable, long-term equity structure, therefore, your
7 HOME repayment risk that you created on the front-end is
8 operating in a more stable environment.

9 MR. GOODWIN: What are you looking for from us?

10 MS. HOLLOWAY: We are looking for Board
11 approval of our plan to continue to explore this loan
12 structure, of course, with an understanding that any of
13 these awards we would be bringing back to you for approval
14 individually.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion?

16 MR. BRADEN: Move to approve.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Move to approve. Second?

18 MS. RESÉNDIZ: Second.

19 MR. GOODWIN: It's been moved and seconded.

20 Any discussion?

21 MR. PALMER: Brent covered most of the points I
22 was going to make. One of my clients is the one who
23 proposed this. It would result in a number of positive
24 things for the Department, including being able to touch a
25 lot more deals. Rather than having your money in for 30

1 years, you would be in for two, two and a half years.
2 Bridging the equity from the investor will allow more
3 equity proceeds, they can pay more for the credits if they
4 pay their money in later.

5 And to Mr. Vasquez's point on protection on the
6 construction side, the construction lender will be in
7 there also along with your money, and typically the
8 construction lender will require and you can require that
9 a certain amount of the equity come in at closing, 15
10 percent or whatever amount of the equity has to come in at
11 closing, so it's not like the equity investor is not
12 putting in any money at closing.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Any other comments or questions?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. GOODWIN: If not, I'll call for a vote on
16 the motion. All in favor say aye.

17 (A chorus of ayes.)

18 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: Motion passes.

21 Before we move on, we're going to end up having
22 to take about a 30- to 45-minute recess for Beau to visit
23 with staff over some issues, and then we'll come back and
24 cover item 1(q) and item 8(a) and 8(b). So I think right
25 now it is 12:15. Let's reconvene back at 1:00 p.m.

1 (Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., a brief recess was
2 taken.)

3 MR. GOODWIN: We'll reconvene, and we'll start
4 with item 1(p) that we pulled off the consent agenda, 1(p)
5 Flora Lofts.

6 MS. HOLLOWAY: Item 1(p) is presentation,
7 discussion and possible action on a determination notice
8 for housing tax credits with another issuer, so this is a
9 4 percent deal. The application was submitted to the
10 Department on May 8, the reservation from the Bond Review
11 Board was issued on the 26th, and will expire on the 23rd.
12 The proposed issuer of the bonds is the Dallas Housing
13 Finance Corporation.

14 The applicant disclosed the presence of
15 undesirable neighborhood characteristics, specifically
16 that the proposed site is located in a census tract or
17 within a thousand feet of a census tract in an urban area
18 where Part 1 violent crime rate exceeds 18 per 1,000,
19 according to Neighborhood Scout. Local police beat data
20 indicates that the Part 1 violent crime rate within the
21 census tract is lower and that it continues to drop such
22 that staff believes the site should be found eligible.

23 A little bit about the project. Flora Lofts is
24 proposed to be constructed in downtown Dallas. It
25 involves the new construction of 52 units, of which five

1 will be rent an income restricted at 50 percent of AMI, 38
2 will be rent and income restricted at 60 percent of AMI,
3 the remaining nine units will be market rate with no rent
4 and income restrictions. The proposed development will be
5 a condominium structure part of the larger high-rise
6 development, which is a separate condominium from our tax
7 credit development, in a larger high-rise development in
8 the arts district in downtown Dallas. It is anticipated
9 that other floors within the high-rise will contain retail
10 and residential uses as well as structured parking.

11 While the development will serve the general
12 population, the units are planned to be offered as living
13 space for local artists. The lofts will have common areas
14 throughout each of the residential floors for resident
15 use. The proposed development is in an area that's
16 heavily developed with a variety of uses and has easy
17 access to public transportation, including the Dallas Area
18 Rapid Transit, as well as large employment hubs.

19 Adjacent to the property to the north is the
20 Museum Tower which is luxury development. The subject
21 property is unique in that it has a generally high
22 proportion of apartment complexes or high-rise apartments,
23 while others tend to have more of a mix of housing types
24 and real estate. The subject census tract has multiple
25 market rate properties. The only other affordable

1 property within that census tract was completed in 2009.

2 The applicant's portfolio through PPR is
3 considered to be a small category one and previous
4 participation was deemed acceptable by EARAC without
5 further review or discussion. The applicant provided a
6 letter of support dated March 29, 2013 from Senator Royce
7 West. The letter was submitted previously as part of the
8 competitive housing tax credit application in 2013. That
9 application was awarded and those credits were returned
10 later.

11 Staff recommends issuance of a determination
12 notice for 4 percent tax credits in the amount of
13 \$673,756, subject to underwriting conditions, including
14 receipt and acceptance before the determination notice of
15 a possible structure of the units and buildings that
16 conform to Section 42 with respect to minimum set-aside
17 requirements and any other related building designation
18 issues, and receipt and acceptance by cost certification
19 is an executed 40-year parking agreement for the 31 spaces
20 designated for our development.

21 I'll be happy to answer any questions.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. GOODWIN: I see that we have some people
25 that want to speak. Do we have a motion to hear comments?

1 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So moved.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

3 MS. THOMASON: Second.

4 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. All in favor
5 say aye.

6 (A chorus of ayes.)

7 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

8 MR. GEHEB: Phil Geheb from Munsch Hardt.
9 We're only here to answer any questions you may have, so
10 just let us know.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody have any questions?

12 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Question. Are you
13 comfortable with the conditions that staff is recommending
14 in terms of submitting some kind of proof that the
15 structure conforms and the other building designation
16 issues and then the commitment to the parking?

17 MR. GEHEB: We are comfortable with those
18 conditions.

19 MR. GOODWIN: I'll entertain a motion for
20 staff's approval.

21 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I'll move staff's
22 recommendation.

23 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

24 MS. THOMASON: Second.

25 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any

1 discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

4 (A chorus of ayes.)

5 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

8 MS. HOLLOWAY: Item 8(a) is presentation,
9 discussion and possible action on the proposed amendment
10 of 10 TAC Chapter 11 concerning the Housing Tax Credit
11 Program Qualified Allocation Plan and directing its
12 publication for public comment in the *Texas Register*.

13 The Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules
14 Committee met yesterday to discuss the staff draft of the
15 QAP. We discussed how we arrived at the draft QAP under
16 consideration, the timeline for rulemaking and walked
17 through all of the changes proposed for 2018. It was a
18 3-1/2 hour long got through it all meeting. There weren't
19 any changes directed out of the committee meeting that
20 require changes to the draft posted in the board
21 materials. That said, some small fine-tuning changes will
22 be presented in the final rule and committee members may
23 have changes to propose to the Board based on the input we
24 received yesterday.

25 I'd like to thank Representative Collier for

1 attending our meeting yesterday. She's the author of
2 House Bill 3574 that removed educational quality from
3 scoring. She attended the meeting to discuss those
4 changes and some of her suggestions for mitigation
5 measures on the threshold.

6 So during 2017 staff met six times with
7 stakeholders to discuss the 2018 QAP through our QAP
8 project. Most of the meeting topics were identified
9 during the initial planning meeting in December of 2016,
10 and this is a process we plan to continue in the coming
11 year as we look forward to the 2019 rules. Beyond the QAP
12 project meetings, several times were posted to the
13 Department's online forum so that stakeholders could
14 comment on aspects of new proposals from staff. We also
15 met with stakeholder groups, including TAAHP and the Rural
16 Rental Housing Association, to gain their input.

17 I would also add that we will be continuing, as
18 part of this project in the coming year, we have regular
19 meetings scheduled with rural development which is the
20 USDA side. They're officed up in Temple and we'll all be
21 meeting on a regular basis to make sure that we're all
22 meshing well in rules, and that's something that I think
23 we're all looking forward to.

24 We published an initial staff draft of the QAP
25 on August 11, and a second draft on August 29. The

1 proposed 2018 QAP is presented today for acceptance and
2 publication for comment. We've tried to limit changes to
3 only those that are necessary to clarify issues from this
4 past round. There are a couple of new items that
5 generated quite a bit of discussion yesterday and even
6 those on ones that we've considered in the past.

7 As I mentioned, we have removed educational
8 quality scoring and tiebreaker items as a result of
9 legislative action. Requirements for disclosure and
10 mitigation for schools that don't have a Met Standard
11 rating remain in the undesirable neighborhood
12 characteristics section of Chapter 10.

13 So for the rulemaking timeline, on your
14 approval the proposed 2018 QAP will be posted to the
15 Department's website and published in the *Texas Register*.

16 Public comment will be accepted between September 22 and
17 October 12. The final QAP will be presented to the Board
18 in November for approval, followed by the statutorily
19 mandated submission to the governor by November 15. Upon
20 the governor's approval or approval with modifications, no
21 later than December 1 the adopted QAP will be published in
22 the *Register*.

23 During the course of yesterday's meeting
24 several items rose to the top as concerns for committee
25 members and stakeholders, so rather than going through the

1 whole thing, I thought I would just cover the highlights
2 from the meeting yesterday and save us all a couple of
3 hours at least.

4 The program calendar has been modified to
5 reflect dates for 2018. The only significant change is
6 that staff is proposing an earlier third party request for
7 administrative deficiency deadline of May 1. You'll recall
8 that last year it was June 1 and we received more than 40
9 RFADs on June 1, and that led to a great deal of
10 uncertainty as we were headed into awards, and we're
11 trying to prevent that.

12 Under Section 11.4 on the tax credit request
13 and award limits, we've added language in subsection (a)
14 that proposes that applicants must limit their total
15 credit request to \$3 million by June 29. Without this
16 change, staff is concerned that an applicant with multiple
17 applications totaling more than the \$3 million cap will
18 use the waiting list as a means of insurance to buy time
19 and hedge against risks or error.

20 We've also removed the 10 percent developer fee
21 as an allowance. Previously, if a developer received 10
22 percent or less of the fee, it was not considered in
23 calculating the cap. Some groups of individuals have used
24 this allowance to exceed the \$3 million cap, a clear
25 violation of the spirit of the rule.

1 We initially removed the \$150,000 cap on
2 consultant fees with an eye toward the market limiting
3 those costs, but have received comment that without that
4 limitation some parties may seek to gain the cap through
5 the consultant fee. So a couple of comments that were
6 received during the committee meeting that I think are
7 important, requesting that the applicant tell us which
8 applications to pull out by June 29. For us, it ties to
9 our statutory requirement to bring the list of eligible
10 application to you by the end of the month, so that's how
11 those two tick and tie. A suggestion was made that that
12 date should be later in the process, perhaps at
13 commitment, and I think that that's a change that could be
14 made through the public comment process if, in fact, we
15 receive that comment.

16 The other concern that was raised was that the
17 \$150,000 cap on consultant fees, this is just the number
18 that's been there. If the number needs to change, that's
19 absolutely something that we can change, again, through
20 that comment period with some substantiation. I mean, I
21 think if we just get a comment that says it should be half
22 a million dollars, you are going to need a little more
23 information behind that to make that change, but that's
24 absolutely something that can come through public comment.

25 MR. VASQUEZ: Marni, to clarify, that was per

1 project, not across the board.

2 MS. HOLLOWAY: Right, not across the board.
3 There was a concern that we were capping consultants at
4 \$150,000 for all projects. If a single consultant did all
5 the applications, that would be fine.

6 Moving to 11.7 on tiebreakers, staff has
7 removed two previous tiebreakers and added a new one, and
8 we've provided some clarification regarding measurement by
9 adding language that better describes the boundaries of a
10 development for this purpose. Tiebreakers regarding the
11 menu items of opportunity index, so the extra opportunity
12 index items, has come out simply because it created
13 such -- and the bulk of our RFADs last year was on those.
14 And the ratings, of course, for elementary, middle and
15 high school have been removed due to legislative action.

16 A new tiebreaker regarding underserved places
17 or if located outside of a place, counties has been
18 proposed as the third item. This item would count the
19 total number of tax credit units and divide that number by
20 the total population, which is something that we already
21 do for our site demographics reporting. The proposed
22 development with the lowest score for this calculation
23 will win the tiebreaker. Staff believes this tiebreaker
24 methodology will be an effective means of dispersion.

25 There was quite a bit of conversation about

1 some of the other tiebreaker items that we have not
2 changed. Urban core is one that some folks like and other
3 folks don't like. There were some suggestions around
4 reordering them and moving for this distance, which is the
5 last one, up the list of the tiebreakers. My concern with
6 doing that, with moving distance up is that that will
7 always be the first one, and so these other items that are
8 in the list that we have decided as a group have value,
9 like the lowest concentration, we would never get there if
10 distance was up at the top.

11 Also, on section 11.9, so headed into the
12 competitive criteria, under general information at
13 subsection (a) we've added language clarifying boundaries
14 and measurements. Mr. Braden had concerns with some of
15 our language, both here and in the tiebreaker section,
16 that we need to try to clarify a little bit, and I think
17 that we can get there.

18 In underserved area, the requirement that a
19 census tract fall entirely within the boundaries of an
20 incorporated area remains true for subparagraph (e). This
21 is the five-point scoring item which staff refers to as
22 the flower. In 2017 that paragraph (e) item was limited
23 to places with populations of 300,000 or more, but for the
24 2018 cycle, staff has lowered the population floor to
25 150,000. This will increase the number of eligible cities

1 from eight to eighteen. So this five-point scoring item
2 for underserved area, your site is in this census tract
3 and then every census tract around it does not have a
4 development in it.

5 We've received some question about
6 rehabilitation deals and how those are considered. We
7 will be inserting language into this item that says if
8 you're a rehab deal, you don't count against yourself
9 because you're already there, so we're not going to make
10 you say, well, I'm already here so I can't get this five-
11 point item.

12 Tenant populations with special housing needs,
13 participation in the Section 811 Project rental assistance
14 program is back in the QAP as a scoring item rather than
15 threshold as it was last year. The specific requirements
16 of the 811 Program are in the proposed 10 TAC Chapter 8,
17 which was approved on the consent agenda today.

18 On proximity to urban core, we have lowered the
19 population threshold that qualifies a city for points from
20 300,000 minimum to 200,000. This increases the number of
21 qualifying cities from eight to thirteen. We focused on
22 three criteria to determine where to set the population
23 threshold: that would be population and population
24 growth, so growing cities; the presence of low to moderate
25 income jobs; and the physical attributes of those cities'

1 cores. That scoring item is still worth five points.

2 On commitment of development funding by local
3 political subdivisions, there was a change in the last
4 couple years QAP based on Senate Bill 1316 from the 84th
5 Legislature. That bill included language that made the
6 commitment of funding amount de minimis only for 2016 and
7 2017. So while Texas Government Code reads that the
8 subsection will expire September 1, 2019, subsection (e)
9 states that this de minimis provision applies for the 2016
10 and 2017 qualified allocation plans.

11 Because over the last two years many
12 applications have included local political subdivisions
13 providing something of value equal to ten dollars or even
14 a dollar, staff has proposed \$500 for urban developments
15 and \$250 for rural developments. Mr. Vasquez thinks the
16 numbers should be much higher.

17 On concerted revitalization plan, other types
18 of urban revitalization plans which may not be called a
19 concerted revitalization plan but fit the description in
20 the rule will now be allowed. We are requiring that the
21 plan be current at the time of application and continuing
22 for three more years. We've also added language that
23 allows plans with cities that cover more than one distinct
24 area to submit resolutions for each plan or area rather
25 than limiting the city to one per year.

1 Under readiness to proceed, we have been trying
2 to get to a readiness to proceed item for some time, but
3 have struggled with finding a structure that isn't
4 punitive if an applicant is not able to begin construction
5 by the deadline. Staff has proposed the addition of a
6 scoring item that will not necessarily affect applications
7 in the 2018 competitive round but will affect the scoring
8 of apps in the 2019. If an application that receives an
9 allocation can commence construction by the last business
10 day of the calendar year, then an individual associated
11 with that application can add a point to any one
12 application they are involved in for the 2019 cycle.

13 This was not a real popular item. As Ms.
14 Bingham said, people don't seem to like carrots. We were
15 looking for a carrot and it was not real popular. I would
16 imagine we'll receive comment on requesting that it be
17 removed.

18 Adaptive reuse or rehabilitation cost per
19 square foot. Staff has proposed removing the cost of
20 acquisition on a cost per square foot basis from this
21 scoring item. Instead, applicants will provide hard costs
22 per square foot for the purposes of this item in
23 subparagraph (e), thus the numbers are lower, but again,
24 this is because we've removed acquisition costs. This
25 change came out of a concern that our amounts are not

1 indicative of real costs at the request of the Rural
2 Rental Housing Association.

3 There was a good deal of comment about this
4 yesterday. Our numbers may not be where they should be,
5 so the dollars per square foot or the measurement about
6 the size of the unit. These are things that can be
7 adjusted through public comment, so I would expect that we
8 would receive some comment on those.

9 Staff recommends that the proposed amendments
10 to the 10 TAC Chapter 11, the Qualified Allocation Plan,
11 be approved for publication in the *Texas Register* for
12 public comment.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion to forward
14 staff's recommendation?

15 MS. HOLLOWAY: I'm sure that there are people
16 who have things to say.

17 MR. GOODWIN: I know we're going to have
18 comments, but I'll look for a motion to approve staff's
19 recommendation before we start listening to comments.

20 MR. ECCLES: Well, and to that end, if there
21 are Board members who would like to move to change staff's
22 recommended like in any provision before it goes out for
23 publication, this would be their opportunity. Again, that
24 would just be to change the draft that's going to the
25 *Register* and put out for public comment. Rather than

1 moving to accept staff's draft.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Then let's move for a motion to
3 hear comments.

4 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So moved.

5 MR. GOODWIN: So moved. Second?

6 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

7 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

8 (A chorus of ayes.)

9 MR. GOODWIN: Before we start with public
10 comments, are there any Board members who want to make
11 comments?

12 MR. BRADEN: Well, I had a couple of things
13 that I was going to mention, and no doubt it's going to
14 come out as part of some of this.

15 So on Section 11.9 I guess where maybe it's
16 going to come up, and it's page 19, I think, of this
17 report where the new language was added. So we're adding
18 new language now that when we're measuring these locations
19 it's from boundary line to boundary line, and I think
20 there was some discussion of whether that was an
21 appropriate measurement. And there was some discussion
22 yesterday about whether should there be a designated point
23 on the site that the measurements move from. I think
24 that's open to discussion and we can talk about that.

25 But I do think that the language as written is

1 somewhat self-contradictory and I have some edits to that
2 first sentence of the language, but I think at a more
3 substantive level, we ought to make sure that the Board is
4 comfortable the way we're going to measure these things is
5 from boundary line to boundary line as opposed to a point
6 on the site for accessibility purposes and measured along
7 that. That's one question or comment I had.

8 And then on the readiness to proceed, and maybe
9 we can wait until we get comments as part of the
10 rulemaking process, but I'd probably advocate for deleting
11 that now. I think that's a fairly hard thing to police
12 and work, and I agree with the idea, but in terms of
13 giving somebody a point in next year's allocation, I don't
14 know if that's the right carrot. I understand it's kind
15 of hard to reward or penalize that behavior and so I
16 commend the staff's looking for something, but I'm not
17 sure that's the right solution.

18 Those are the two general comments that I had.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Other Board comments?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. GOODWIN: Public comments?

22 MS. SISAK: Yes. Good afternoon, Board, Board
23 Chair. My name is Janine Sisak. I'm here today on behalf
24 of the TAAHP QAP Committee. I just want to take a quick
25 opportunity to thank staff and Marni and Patrick in

1 particular for all their efforts in getting a draft posted
2 to the board book last week that didn't have a huge amount
3 of surprises. If some of you remember from last year,
4 there was a little consternation when the board book was
5 posted before this meeting and there were a lot of kind of
6 new concepts. So we really appreciate staff's working
7 through the summer and working through a heavy load of
8 RFADs, as they call it, while also getting a draft out to
9 us slightly earlier than before, which was an interest
10 expressed by a lot of our stakeholders. So let me take an
11 opportunity to thank staff on that.

12 And additionally, I look forward to working
13 with staff in the coming year on some more kind of broader
14 policy issues. The two things that I would like to work
15 on that I mentioned yesterday were coming up with a new
16 scoring concept to go into the scoring for next year that
17 creates another opportunity for the scoring of
18 applications not to be so flat. I think that's really
19 important at this stage, especially in light of the
20 educational quality points coming out of the QAP.

21 Additionally, I don't know, I had to leave
22 early yesterday, I don't know if you talked about the
23 Multifamily rules, but I really would like to visit
24 undesirable neighborhood characteristics again. Marni has
25 said several times that it hasn't really stopped any

1 developments going forward, which is great, but it is kind
2 of eating up a lot of staff and applicant time and money
3 in slashing through that, and if everybody kind of gets
4 through it anyway, why are we spending valuable resources
5 through that process.

6 Those are the two things I'd like to work with
7 staff on in the coming year. Thank you.

8 MS. MEYER: Board, thank you for the
9 opportunity. My name is Robbye Meyer, I'm with Arx
10 Advantage Consulting.

11 Just two things. One, to address Mr. Vasquez
12 from yesterday, in your comment about the big stick, and I
13 understand that. Part of one of the questions that you
14 had about the local political subdivision funding and
15 having skin in the game, I started to speak yesterday and
16 I thought I'm just going to let it go, but when that was
17 first put in the QAP, or in statute, actually, back in
18 2001, the agency was under fire, and the advocates in the
19 development community came forth and that was put in so
20 that there would be some local control.

21 Since that time we've also had added in local
22 resolution for support of the application, QCP is now in
23 there, support from your state rep and state senator at
24 one time, the senators have come out. So a lot of things
25 have gone in the QAP or in statute that are required, so

1 that's one of the reasons why the state legislature made
2 that a little less a priority in the last legislative
3 session and so it went down to a de minimis amount because
4 there are other things in the QAP or in statute that make
5 local control a little bit more important. So I'd just
6 kind of give you a little bit of background.

7 One thing that I just want to introduce, and
8 I'm not really a strong advocate of forward commitments,
9 but in 2012 our language for forward commitments was
10 struck, and this is a prime opportunity to ask the
11 governor to be able to put that language back in. And Ms.
12 Bingham will remember the forward commitments. Like I
13 said, I'm not a supporter of forward commitments and when
14 I was with the agency I didn't like it then and I don't
15 like it now. However, this past year I had a 2016 deal
16 that my client also had deals in Mississippi and
17 Mississippi had the ability to forward commit additional
18 credits for the three deals in Mississippi, and had my
19 client not been able to get the additional on the
20 Mississippi deal, we would have lost our Texas deal
21 because we could negotiate with our syndicator on pricing
22 with those Mississippi deals.

23 So I ask that we consider putting language back
24 in the QAP and asking the governor to allow that language
25 under special circumstances and not give the Board willy-

1 nilly, let's pull something from the bottom of the list to
2 put it up to be awarded. But in catastrophic events like
3 Harvey, we haven't felt the full effects of Harvey yet,
4 but I can guarantee you they're coming and we're going to
5 have construction costs and things that are going to
6 skyrocket, and it would be nice for the Board to have the
7 ability to rescue some of the deals that are going to come
8 before you later on.

9 Thank you very much.

10 MR. COMBS: Ryan Combs with Palladium.

11 I did want to mention just very briefly on Mr.
12 Vasquez's comment about local political subdivision
13 funding. You know, I work for Palladium USA and we're a
14 developer and we work primarily in Urban Region 3, Dallas-
15 Fort Worth and a lot of those areas, and we have been a
16 market rate developer and now we are doing affordable and
17 we've been doing that for five-six years now and have had
18 a lot of success. And we know that in North Texas there's
19 just a dramatic need for housing, for workforce, for aging
20 people, I mean, tax credit housing, there's just an
21 incredible need all over North Texas.

22 One of the things that we fight constantly is
23 we first, all of us developers in this room, look for good
24 real estate and so we're looking for the path of growth.

25 We have to hit these rules, we have to do these things to

1 be competitive, but bottom line is we're looking for good
2 real estate, and so we're going to places that people want
3 to be, people want to live, where they want to work. And
4 one of the big challenges that we have is not in my
5 backyard, we're here but we don't want those people here
6 kind of thing. And when we go and we ask for resolutions
7 of support from a city, that's a big ask and it puts the
8 elected officials in the hot seat to potentially do
9 something that is politically volatile.

10 A lot of times when you go to high opportunity
11 areas and you say I need a resolution of support, and oh,
12 by the way, I need you to give me a whole bunch of money.

13 The city wants to support it but then that becomes such a
14 political hot potato that it's very, very difficult to
15 overcome that.

16 And so I just want to put that out there that I
17 do think that having that in the QAP is good, I don't
18 think it being so large that it becomes such a political
19 hot potato that you can't go to a lot of places that need
20 it just because the NIMBY and the political issues that it
21 brings out.

22 The other issue that I wanted to bring up very
23 briefly is I completely understand and am fully on board
24 with Brent Stewart and staff's desire to want there to be
25 a readiness to proceed. I would love for our

1 applications, and I'm sure every developer in this room
2 would agree that we would all love for our applications to
3 be more fully vetted, more fully baked when we turn in our
4 full applications March 1. As mentioned yesterday in the
5 work session, there are just countless reasons as to why
6 applications get delayed and are not able to close within
7 30 days after you get the award. You can't name all of
8 those reasons, it's too many, but what we can do is we can
9 incentivize, taking some of those roadblocks out in front.

10 I mentioned yesterday on the readiness to
11 proceed, instead of taking it out, instead of forward
12 committing points, if we were to rewrite that rule to say
13 something like one point given to applications that can
14 prove a level of readiness to proceed by demonstrating
15 that appropriate zoning for the proposed use in place at
16 the time of the full app, what that would do is that would
17 incentivize me and every other developer to go work on
18 sites earlier, spend some money and time and effort to go
19 put zoning in place that can take months and months and
20 months, I can do that, I can justify doing that if I know
21 there's a reward for that to happen. So that's just a
22 proposal.

23 Thank you so much.

24 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

25 MS. RICKENBACKER: Hi. Donna Rickenbacker.

1 Mine is a followup to what Ryan said with
2 respect to the readiness to proceed. This is if
3 everything holds in accordance with our current draft
4 that's going out for publication it's another year of flat
5 scoring, very unfortunate. That being said, this
6 readiness to proceed provision, as drafted, nobody likes.

7 So this is the time to come up with some draft language
8 that we can put in the QAP that's going to go for
9 publication to get comments on that will provide a scoring
10 for deals that are more cooked and ready to proceed to go
11 forward. Of all times, we really do need a provision like
12 this, not only because of the flat scoring but because of
13 the hurricane. We need to be in a position to incentivize
14 people that can get the units on the ground sooner than
15 later.

16 And I do encourage the Board to consider
17 redrafting this provision such that you can seek comments
18 in a format that then would become a logical outgrowth of
19 the provision so that we can incorporate a ready to
20 proceed provision into the QAP for 2018.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

23 MR. BOWLING: Hi. I'm Bobby Bowling. I
24 represent TAAHP, I'm the immediate past president. Our
25 president, Nicole Asarch could not be here today, so I'm

1 in her stead.

2 I'm speaking to support what Robbye Meyer spoke
3 to you all about is to put the forward commitment tool
4 back into the draft. I think what she's talking about is
5 all relatively new, it's only been a week since the
6 hurricane hit, but I think you all are hamstringing
7 yourselves by not putting that tool out there in the QAP.

8 It doesn't say you have to award forward commitments.

9 I'm actually going to speak on the open forum
10 about a discussion item that I'm going to request that you
11 place on for your next month's agenda to talk more
12 specifically about some of the things that are going to
13 happen with our price increases. Even to me like in El
14 Paso, like for example, I got a letter from my concrete
15 supplier telling me that his price is going up \$30 per
16 yard effectively immediately. I know that's because he's
17 worried about his cement supplier in Mexico filling orders
18 to rebuild Houston and the Gulf Coast. So we're all going
19 to see on our awarded deals tremendous price shocks in
20 both labor and materials and delays. Again, I'll speak to
21 that at open forum and ask you to place an agenda item
22 specific to that next month.

23 But for now, this QAP draft, I agree with Ms.
24 Meyer, what she said, please place back in the ability for
25 you all to forward commit in this draft. It doesn't

1 finalize it today but at least we can have the discussion,
2 you can have the discussion with the Governor's Office and
3 you can have your internal kind of thought process as to
4 whether that's a good idea or not. But I'm asking you,
5 again, to please put that in the draft so you can have
6 that discussion.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

9 Comment?

10 MR. ECCLES: Bobby, my just off-the-cuff, legal
11 reaction to that is that which the governor removes, the
12 governor is going to have to put back in. I think that
13 putting it back into our rules, despite the fact that it
14 was directed by the governor to come out of the rules, I'm
15 not really sure that that would be an appropriate use of
16 this.

17 MR. BOWLING: Could we call his office and ask
18 him if it's okay?

19 (General talking and laughter.)

20 MR. BOWLING: Just something to consider.

21 Beau, let me ask you a question, a legal
22 opinion, if it's not in there, can it not be placed in
23 when you vote on the final QAP?

24 MR. ECCLES: The unique rulemaking process that
25 the QAP goes through makes it so that once it goes to the

1 Governor's Office, he can remove or add stuff, so that's
2 how that would work.

3 MR. BOWLING: Okay. I understand what you're
4 saying. Thank you.

5 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Bobby, and I really
6 appreciate that from you and Robbye both, but if that were
7 off the table, is it worth it for you guys and staff to
8 put your heads together and see if there's any other
9 language or solution? I appreciate this and there are
10 people in this room that know that we used to administer
11 the disaster relief related housing which, I think
12 everybody would agree is horrendous and bureaucratic and
13 heartbreaking to see areas that are in need go a long
14 time, and then the ripple effect that that has for the
15 rest of the housing market, dealing with what's mentioned
16 today, supply shortage issues and labor issues and that
17 kind of thing.

18 But I mean, my gut reaction is no way is
19 forward going to come back, but I don't know, I can't
20 predict the future, and maybe somebody will decide that's
21 a vehicle. But in the vacuum of that as a vehicle to
22 accomplish what I think what you guys have is a noble and
23 shared priority, maybe it's worth putting our heads
24 together and seeing if we can figure out some other
25 language.

1 MR. BOWLING: Yes, ma'am. And I appreciate
2 you've been on this Board for a long time, so you remember
3 what your Board did, the TDHCA Board back in -- I actually
4 did some research on Katrina and Ike -- in '04, '05 and
5 '06, you took credits from '07, '08 and '09 to supplement
6 those deals because they had tremendous price shocks. It
7 wasn't just hurricanes back then, it was also the housing
8 bubble, and so from application to the time we started
9 construction, prices were increasing easily 10 percent
10 into that twelve-month period over that period of time.

11 So I do have some ideas that I'm going to talk
12 about in open forum that aren't posted here in addition
13 to, but I just was presenting this and I jumped to come
14 speak to this because I think you should have as many
15 tools as possible available to you. But without a forward
16 commitment, we have another idea too.

17 So thank you.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions?

19 MS. BOWYER: My name is Teresa Bowyer. I'm
20 with Herman & Kittle Properties.

21 I just wanted to respectfully disagree with
22 what Donna said earlier. I think the readiness to proceed
23 item has the potential to be really detrimental to a
24 variety of different types of projects and disincentivize
25 things with a mix of sources. And Houston, it's great to

1 say that because, of course, there's no zoning, you don't
2 have to work through that in the same respect that you do
3 in Austin. And so I think doing that is really going to
4 box in what type of projects you're going to see and
5 you're not going to have as much diversity.

6 And I think Sarah André was the one yesterday
7 who said there's already a big stick, there's already a
8 mechanism, we lose our credits if we don't get it placed
9 in service by a certain date. It behooves us all to get
10 it funded, closed and constructed as soon as possible. So
11 I just urge you to take that language out, that language
12 out. I think it has the potential to go the opposite way
13 of what it's intended to.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

16 Any other comments?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. GOODWIN: Paul, did you want to make some
19 motions as it related to the two items or any of the
20 additional items that were brought up?

21 MR. BRADEN: And maybe let me ask Marni
22 something. I haven't heard anybody come up and propose
23 this points thing that we talked about yesterday, so let's
24 assume we leave boundary to boundary in place in 11.9, my
25 edits end up being deleting four words from one sentence

1 and changing the order.

2 MS. HOLLOWAY: The entire site, that language?

3 MR. BRADEN: Yes. Can I just give you my
4 suggestion? I guess we should do that. Should I give my
5 suggestions here? Let me find the page again. So it's in
6 Section 11.9. What I would suggest is that new language
7 that's added in 11.9(a), that first sentence that
8 currently reads: "All measurements will include the
9 entire site, including ingress/egress requirements and any
10 easements, regardless of how they would be held." My
11 understanding of what that's supposed to address, I think,
12 is more clear if we delete the words "entire site,
13 including" so it reads: "All measurements will include
14 ingress/egress requirements and any easements, regardless
15 of how they will be held." And then I would move that
16 sentence to after the sentence to where you have "distance
17 to be measured from the nearest boundary of the
18 development site to the nearest boundary of the property
19 easement" so it comes after that. Because I think that's
20 at least the clarifying sentence where you talk about
21 distances are to be measured from the nearest boundary to
22 the nearest boundary, and then you have that sentence
23 where it talks about including driveways and other things
24 too.

25 MS. HOLLOWAY: And if you'll accept a change to

1 that and something we talked about yesterday was adding
2 language that says "For purposes of this section."

3 MR. BRADEN: In 11.9?

4 MS. HOLLOWAY: We talked about it in tiebreaker
5 also.

6 MR. BRADEN: That's fine.

7 And in terms of readiness to proceed, I'll
8 defer to the Board. It sounds like we're going to get
9 input from that section and I think, again, everybody
10 seems like it's a good idea, it's just not the right stick
11 or the right carrot. So maybe it's easier if we leave
12 something in place and we can get input, but I'm flexible
13 either way in terms of removing that or leaving that.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Why don't we take the measurement
15 issue first and do a motion to change the measurement
16 language to your proposed language.

17 MR. BRADEN: I make a motion to change the
18 language in 11.9 to what I just described.

19 MR. GOODWIN: And a second?

20 MR. ECCLES: Including the for purposes of this
21 rule only?

22 MS. HOLLOWAY: For purposes of this section.

23 MR. ECCLES: This section.

24 MR. BRADEN: Yes.

25 MR. GOODWIN: And a second?

1 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I'll second that.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Any discussion about that?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. GOODWIN: Hearing none, all in favor say
5 aye.

6 (A chorus of ayes.)

7 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Now, what about readiness,
10 do you want to strike readiness to proceed, Paul, or leave
11 it in?

12 MR. BRADEN: I'll ask the other committee
13 members who listened to the whole discussion yesterday. I
14 don't know if you guys have a feeling for it.

15 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I think I lean towards
16 striking. I do appreciate, who was it, Ryan, that
17 suggested zoning in place, but then what I just heard from
18 Teresa is then there's going to be some markets that
19 that's not even applicable, right, the whole zoning thing.

20 So I think if you're asking my impression after feedback
21 yesterday, I would lean toward striking it. I think it's
22 a good goal, I think everybody would like some kind of
23 incentive and believe that there are plenty of
24 disincentives already in place, I just don't know that
25 we've landed on the correct one yet.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Other opinions from Board
2 members?

3 MR. VASQUEZ: I could see striking it, but also
4 leaving it as we're going to expect a lot of public
5 comment on it to incorporate some of these ideas.

6 MS. HOLLOWAY: And that's true. If we strike
7 it, because this is an amendment, what we publish for
8 comment wouldn't include that language at all, there
9 wouldn't be a readiness to proceed at all, so there
10 wouldn't be any comment received about potential readiness
11 to proceed measures.

12 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: My concern was would it
13 be considered a material change if you had a lot of public
14 comment that said this isn't a workable solution.

15 MS. HOLLOWAY: Then we absolutely would strike
16 it.

17 MR. ECCLES: We can delete it. I think we kind
18 of talked about the options. If you remove it here and
19 then put it out for publication, you can't add a readiness
20 to proceed rule back in. Further, though, if you put it
21 out as it currently exists, you are generating about a
22 million comments on how bad it is and then probably some
23 will say what it should be is a carrot in a different way,
24 for the current cycle it should be one point and making it
25 for zoning, and I'm not really sure that that really

1 naturally grows out of this language. So if there is a
2 proposal for a readiness to proceed that is more likable
3 by the Board at this point, that might be the only way
4 that you could get to something that resembles the
5 mechanism on a ready to proceed that could naturally grow
6 out of it and then be adopted as a final rule.

7 How's that for nebulous lawyer advice?

8 MR. BRADEN: And sadly, I understood what you
9 said.

10 (General laughter.)

11 MR. BRADEN: So after yesterday's committee
12 meeting, and actually I read Donna's comments again
13 because she has sent in written comments dealing with this
14 section, and there were some components of it that I like,
15 but the problem is the zoning issue that was just brought
16 up, Donna also brought up. If you added something in
17 place that you get a certain amount of points at the time
18 of adoption, the development site is zoned to allow for
19 the proposed development, what do you do with those
20 entities that don't have zoning. And we had somebody
21 yesterday that came in and said zoning takes a year,
22 that's just the way it is in Austin, or whatever city
23 they're talking about.

24 I guess my inclination is I think everybody
25 recognizes it's a problem or it's something we'd like to

1 see addressed, so maybe we should leave it in, but I guess
2 the result is we're not going to find the right carrot
3 because really the carrot right now is what's in there.
4 You could probably change the point to something else but
5 you're kind of dealing with it right then.

6 MR. ECCLES: And I'll add to that another
7 scenario that I've certainly seen over the years, folks
8 say, well, look, this is a great site but I don't have the
9 ability to change zoning on it yet, I don't have that
10 amount of control over the site, and before you close on
11 it, they don't want it changed over to multifamily. And
12 if you happen to fortuitously find a site that is already
13 zoned multifamily, it may be a totally different deal, but
14 does that warrant excluding the other site from the
15 ability to get that point just because they happened
16 across a site that doesn't just happen to have the right
17 zoning yet.

18 MS. HOLLOWAY: So if I may, the suggestion that
19 Brent just whispered in my ear is add the zoning item here
20 under the readiness to proceed, maybe add something else
21 that we think of, and then use the public comment period
22 to sort of winnow out what is acceptable and what will
23 work and what won't. And ultimately, what we're trying to
24 get to is receiving really good strong applications in
25 this program that's oversubscribed by double.

1 And so Beau, what is your lawyerly thought on
2 that?

3 MR. ECCLES: Are you saying add a second
4 readiness to proceed?

5 MS. HOLLOWAY: Like a B that's about the
6 zoning.

7 MR. BRADEN: Have a laundry list, we have
8 several things, and then if we end up editing some out,
9 would it still be in the nature of the rule that we could
10 edit it down.

11 MR. ECCLES: You could do that, yes. So should
12 we just like have an open mic riff of readiness to
13 proceed? Marni, if you could lay down a fat B for us,
14 that would be great.

15 (General laughter.)

16 MS. HOLLOWAY: I got nothing left in me right
17 now.

18 But it's a potential, and the other potential
19 is if the Board believes that this is something that staff
20 should devote some time to, then we absolutely can do that
21 over the coming year and come in for 2019 with something
22 that hopefully there's a little more buy-in on it. We can
23 put this one and we can put the zoning thing and anything
24 else up on forum and we could go that route, but that
25 means that the 2018 applications aren't going to be

1 subject to that measurement.

2 MR. IRVINE: I apologize. I was across the
3 hall testifying to Urban Affairs and I'm kind of jumping
4 in late to this discussion.

5 I've long been a big proponent of finding a way
6 to craft incentives for readiness to proceed, but I'm a
7 little nervous about the concept of having a laundry list
8 to be winnowed down, because reality is folks are already
9 looking for sites and the less uncertainty we can inject
10 in this process, the easier it will be for them.

11 MS. HOLLOWAY: True.

12 MR. IRVINE: I do think that having your zoning
13 in place is a really great thing and that to me makes a
14 ton of sense.

15 MS. HOLLOWAY: The conversation that we were
16 having, part of it was Houston there's no zoning, Austin
17 takes forever to get zoning, so how to sort of normalize
18 that zoning measurement or what's an alternative to
19 zoning, is it zoning or something else.

20 MR. VASQUEZ: And just to be fair, in Houston
21 there's no zoning per se but there's all kinds of permit
22 issues that effectively is zoning control.

23 MS. HOLLOWAY: True.

24 MR. GOODWIN: What are the readiness issues
25 that you're running into with applications?

1 MS. HOLLOWAY: So today you took up major
2 issues on three 2016 awards that haven't hit the dirt yet.
3 So here we are, September of 2017 and they're still
4 working out their deals.

5 MR. BRADEN: But wasn't that associated with
6 the collapse of the tax credit market? I mean, we're
7 talking about more normal things. We want readiness to
8 proceed barring hurricanes and collapses of the tax
9 market.

10 MS. HOLLOWAY: I think that there were issues
11 in the equity markets, yes. I also think that there are a
12 number of applicants that timely started.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Do you want to leave readiness in
14 this draft of the QAP? We need a motion to take it out.

15 MR. BRADEN: I guess we'll leave it in for
16 discussion.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Are there any other items that
18 you want to modify, Board members?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: I see we have somebody else who
21 wants to comment.

22 MR. BRADEN:

23 MR. SCHMIDTBERGER: Thank you. Russ Michael
24 Schmidtberger. I'm a real estate attorney were in Austin
25 and also down in Houston, I represent some developers down

1 there.

2 My biggest concern -- Beau, I hear you, I
3 tracked with you, as a lawyer, everything that came out of
4 your mouth, I really liked it -- the outgrowth is what my
5 fear is because the moment this stays in, I'm just curious
6 if there's a way for the point to change after this.
7 Because if we carry a point going into next year, I think
8 that's where that's going to cause problems down the road.
9 If the normal outgrowth of this does not include keeping
10 the point when we start to redraft it, I'm worried that if
11 we keep it in here that we're going to get a lot of
12 different versions of this and then the point is going to
13 stay there, and then we're going to be in situations where
14 this particular sentence isn't cleaned up: "The
15 application must include designation of the individual who
16 will use the point in the next competitive cycle and the
17 additional point may be transferred to other applicants."

18 I don't know who that's going to be. It's like
19 go give this point to your other application down in the
20 Valley, give it to the one up in Urban 3, give it to the
21 guy that's down there in Houston trying to get his deal
22 done because of hurricane funding now. I mean, I just see
23 a lot of outgrowth from this that's problematic, and what
24 I would suggest, humbly suggest, at least, is if we strike
25 it now, we don't have to worry too much about it, we can

1 bring it up on public comment like for the next year and
2 the following year and really hone in on it. If it stays
3 now, the outgrowth may not be what we want, and if the
4 point stays in there, then the outgrowth might even be
5 more problematic.

6 I don't know if you guys could address that, if
7 the point could come out and be changed to a fee waiver or
8 something along those lines, that might be something that
9 you think about. Thank you.

10 MR. ECCLES: I can say the fee waiver is not
11 going to work because that's statutorily linked to the
12 amount of efforts and refunds, and that's too intertwined
13 within the system to be waived, as the carrot, the new
14 carrot.

15 MR. SCHMIDTBERGER: Could the carrot not be a
16 point, I guess is what I'm saying .

17 MR. ECCLES: You're talking steak knives, we
18 give out steak knives now.

19 MR. SCHMIDTBERGER: That's what I'm saying,
20 because if the normal outgrowth of this is not to get it
21 out of scoring or to not make it be a point category, does
22 that mean the whole thing has to be struck or does that
23 mean that the point could be struck out of this and then
24 it be replaced with something that makes sense as opposed
25 to a point.

1 MR. ECCLES: Lacking what the tortured analogy
2 of a carrot would be, it's theoretically possible that
3 that would be a natural outgrowth. Beyond a point, and
4 since we can't talk fee waivers, I just don't know what
5 that incentive would look like.

6 MR. SCHMIDTBERGER: So just to clarify, my fear
7 is that if we keep it in and we don't strike --

8 MR. ECCLES: Four minutes of public comment,
9 how about that?

10 (General laughter.)

11 MR. SCHMIDTBERGER: Exactly. Or like I said
12 yesterday, a \$500 fee for RFADs. The only thing is that
13 if it gets truck today, then it comes out and we can keep
14 talking about. And I think everybody agrees that it's a
15 great idea; I do too, I think it's a great idea. If we
16 strike it today, it can become a long-term conversation;
17 if it stays in, we may have outgrowth that makes it a
18 scoring item this year. That might be problematic because
19 people will come up with ideas as to how this one point
20 will benefit it, and then we may not have a really good
21 definition of what that means.

22 So I'm just suggesting in order to avoid all
23 the comment on this, we strike it today and possibly
24 revisit the issue going into next year and the following
25 year. I think it's a great idea but I feel like the one

1 point scoring item in here and keeping it in scoring is
2 going to show up as problematic in terms of outgrowth
3 going forward.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

6 MR. IRVINE: If it goes in the draft as a
7 scoring item, it would stay a scoring item, and that means
8 that you could tinker with the criteria to get the score,
9 but you would still have a scoring item, or pull it out in
10 its entirety, and either one of those approaches would
11 have to be supported by specific public comment.

12 MR. SCHMIDTBERGER: Okay. Thank you.

13 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Mr. Chair?

14 MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

15 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: May I make a motion to
16 strike the readiness to proceed language?

17 MR. GOODWIN: You may. Do I hear a second?

18 MR. BRADEN: Second.

19 MR. GOODWIN: So we have a motion and its
20 seconded. Comments? Comments about striking readiness?

21 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I know I always talk
22 about work groups, and you are probably drowning in work
23 groups, but really, almost as soon as you're finished with
24 this, you'll start brainstorming the 2019 QAP. Right?

25 MS. HOLLOWAY: We'll start for 2019.

1 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So maybe the Board just
2 goes on record as saying that it sounds like this is
3 universally the concept is supported by everyone in the
4 community or by the majority, and that it is worth some
5 extra time brainstorming in the community some opportunity
6 to Incentivized readiness.

7 MS. HOLLOWAY: We certainly would accept and
8 welcome direction that we, moving into 2019 and as part of
9 our 2019 QAP project planning, include readiness to
10 proceed as one of the topics we take up.

11 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: I think it will pay huge
12 dividends to everybody, you know what I mean, in terms of
13 just everybody, to the state, to the great use of
14 resources. I don't think we've quite hit on something
15 that we have a level of confidence will make it through
16 the draft and public comment.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Any other comments or
18 suggestions? If not, all in favor say aye.

19 (A chorus of ayes.)

20 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. GOODWIN: We will strike readiness.

23 Any other changes you want to make?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. GOODWIN: So we need a motion with those

1 changes to accept to publish into the *Texas Register* the
2 QAP as modified.

3 MR. BRADEN: So moved.

4 MR. GOODWIN: So moved. Second?

5 MR. VASQUEZ: Second.

6 MR. GOODWIN: Moved and seconded. Any
7 discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor say aye.

10 (A chorus of ayes.)

11 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Marni, for a great
14 job.

15 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: Great job.

16 MR. ECCLES: And I want to point out that
17 drowning in work groups is the working title of Marni's
18 biography.

19 (General laughter.)

20 MS. HOLLOWAY: But I have all these great folks
21 that can be volun-told to man the work groups. That's why
22 we've got Patrick, and we're very happy to have him.

23 MR. IRVINE: Comment about readiness to
24 proceed?

25 MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes.

1 MR. IRVINE: I think that in our meetings over
2 the course of the year everybody has said, yeah, it would
3 be really great if everybody were really ready to proceed,
4 but they have gotten prickly when you talked about things
5 that involved significant additional investment. And I
6 honestly do not believe there is a way to make a deal
7 ready to proceed short of spending a fair amount of money
8 to get it ready to proceed, so I don't see a lot of reason
9 to have an extended discussion about developing that. To
10 me, the more useful concept to approach is how do you
11 sharpen the line and say this is what you said you were
12 going to do, can you do that, and if you can't do that,
13 give us the credits back.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

15 8(b).

16 MS. HOLLOWAY: Item 8(b) is presentation,
17 discussion and possible action on proposed amendments of
18 10 TAC Chapter 10, Subchapter A concerning general
19 information and definitions, Subchapter B concerning site
20 and development requirements and restrictions, Subchapter
21 C concerning application submission requirements,
22 ineligibility criteria, board decisions and waiver of
23 rules for applications, and Subchapter G concerning fee
24 schedule, appeals and other provisions, and directing
25 their publication for public comment in the *Texas*

1 *Register.*

2 You'll note that there are a couple of
3 subchapters here that are missing. One of them is asset
4 management, the other is real estate analysis, those will
5 follow next month. The real estate analysis rule,
6 Subchapter D, is in your board book, but it's published as
7 part of the National Housing Trust Fund allocation plan,
8 so while that subchapter is in the book, it's in the book
9 for a different purpose and there are no amendments or
10 anything, it's just part of that trust fund plan.

11 And also following, next month, I hope I
12 mentioned, Chapter 12 which is our bond rule and Chapter
13 13 which is our multifamily direct loan rule, we'll be
14 talking about all of those next month, to give you
15 something to look forward to.

16 The uniform multifamily rules contain
17 eligibility, threshold and procedural requirements
18 relating to applications requesting multifamily funding or
19 tax credits. Staff has proposed changes to improve the
20 efficiency of the funding sources involved and enhance
21 their effectiveness in achieving policy objectives. The
22 rulemaking timeline for these subchapters will follow the
23 QAP.

24 So an important thing to keep in mind as we're
25 talking about Chapter 10 is that this applies to all of

1 our fund sources. There are some places in Chapter 10
2 where we say for a 4 percent application or for a direct
3 loan application, but these are the basic requirements for
4 all of the fund sources come out of Chapter 10.

5 So in Subchapter A we've made changes to a
6 couple of definitions. We've modified the administrative
7 deficiency definition to reflect how staff will evaluate
8 information. And the supportive housing definition has
9 been modified to better define how the Department will
10 evaluate these developments. That supportive housing
11 definition change was made by a group of people actually
12 in TAAHP and folks who work on supportive housing, and
13 staff, that's something that we've spent some time on.

14 Subchapter B outlines the site and development
15 requirement and restrictions. Under undesirable site
16 features, language has been added to underscore that even
17 if an exemption is being requested, mitigation may still
18 be required. We've also added language to reflect that if
19 a state or federal agency has minimum separation distances
20 to the site features listed, then the Department will
21 defer to that agency and require the same. The list has
22 been modified to add illegal dumping sites as an
23 undesirable site feature.

24 So part of what's going on here and what we all
25 learned in this last year with our concrete crushing plant

1 is that TCEQ has this body of regulation that says you
2 can't put this undesirable thing next to a house or you
3 have to be this distance away, so we will be adopting
4 those distances because they're the experts about how far
5 away is a safe distance. And so by adding that language,
6 we're adopting those larger bodies of regulation.

7 Under mandatory development amenities in
8 10.101, we're modifying the requirement that all units be
9 wired with phone and data cabling to reflect that it has
10 to be current technology. And modifications are also made
11 to the requirement that all units have air conditioning
12 and heating, and that speaks to the bond transactions that
13 we approved earlier and the PTACs. We're seeing more and
14 more deals come in with PTACs and the PTACs improving, so
15 we are changing up that section.

16 Common amenities. Some of the common amenities
17 listed in the section have been modified to provide
18 clarification based on the Department's expectations.

19 Under accessibility requirements, our
20 requirement regarding visitability has been modified to
21 reflect the specific features that a unit must have. This
22 is something that we've been working on for several
23 months, started from our old rule that was difficult to
24 administer, and basically what it did, it said if you were
25 a townhouse development, at least 20 percent of your units

1 of each type had to have a bedroom and a bathroom on the
2 first floor, which led to all sorts of waivers and floor
3 plan changes and other issues.

4 What we've done now is basically said there are
5 no exempt units, everything that is accessible, has an
6 accessible path to it per the Fair Housing Design Manual,
7 must be visitable. So it has to have wide enough
8 doorways, it has to have a bathroom that fits the Fair
9 Housing design requirements. This is not about creating
10 additional accessible units, it's just, I think, a way to
11 get us to a better end product, and actually the
12 disability community, the folks that I've spoke to are
13 very much in support of this change and I think it will be
14 much easier for us moving forward.

15 Subchapter C includes procedural requirements
16 for submitting an application, including the
17 documentation, the criteria that would render an applicant
18 or an application ineligible, how applications will be
19 prioritized for review, information about Board decisions
20 and the waiver process. There is a list of things that
21 we've changed here. We've allowed a certification process
22 for 4 percent applications where the application has
23 changed but the changes do not have a material effect on
24 original underwriting. We've clarified how staff may
25 initiate withdrawal of a 4 percent application. We have

1 described how traditional carryforward applications will
2 be treated as it relates to deconcentration and capture
3 rate provisions. We describe how 4 percent and direct
4 loan applications with outstanding deficiency items will
5 be suspended from review.

6 Also included is the time frame by which
7 outstanding items need to be resolved once the funding
8 source becomes oversubscribed. We modified the
9 ineligibility criteria associated with applicants and
10 applications to include false certifications contained in
11 the application. And we are requiring building and unit
12 floor plans to be submitted on rehabilitation and adaptive
13 reuse developments and that they indicate the accessible
14 units. We've added language regarding the information
15 that must be submitted and the case that must be made when
16 requesting a waiver be granted by the Board.

17 In Subchapter G, this subchapter contains
18 information regarding Department fees and other general
19 requirements, including the appeals process, adherence to
20 obligations, and alternative dispute resolution. We have
21 changed this section by removing the administrative
22 deficiency notice late fee to be consistent with revisions
23 in other sections of the rule. And a provision that
24 building inspection fees paid may be refunded if the
25 development does not move forward, so if you've paid

1 inspection fees and you're not moving forward, we can
2 refund.

3 Staff recommends that the proposed amendments
4 of 10 TAC Chapter 10, Subchapter A, General information
5 and definitions, Subchapter B, Site and development
6 requirements and restrictions, Subchapter C, Application
7 submission requirements, ineligibility criteria, board
8 decisions and waiver of rules for applications, and
9 Subchapter G, Fee schedule, appeals and other provisions,
10 be approved for publication in the *Texas Register* for
11 public comment.

12 MR. GOODWIN: Do I hear a motion?

13 MR. BRADEN: Move to approve.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Move to approve. Second?

15 MS. THOMASON: Second.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Questions for Marni? Public
17 comment?

18 MR. VASQUEZ: Is this the public comment period
19 or on 8(b)?

20 MR. GOODWIN: This is comment about 8(b).

21 MR. BOWLING: So I'm Bobby Bowling again, and
22 I'm representing TAAHP. I'm speaking to the development
23 accessibility requirements on page 20 of 21 on Subchapter
24 B, Site and development requirements and restrictions.

25 And we have unanimous consent on this item that

1 we still object to unit types that are exempt from federal
2 accessibility standards having that exemption removed in
3 our rules. This is the first time we're doing this. The
4 building type in section (8)(b) where it says regardless
5 of building types, all units accessed by the ground floor
6 or elevator, this is not what's in the Fair Housing Act,
7 this is not what's in UFAS. There is a unit type and a
8 building type that is exempt.

9 And like Marni stated to you, you are in this
10 draft making that requirement more restrictive than the
11 Federal Government's requirement for the State of Texas.
12 And with deference to what she said, I have not seen -- I
13 come to most of these Board meetings and I have not see
14 this outcry from the disabled community who is saying that
15 this is creating a burden or hardship or this is unfair or
16 this is a problem. I have almost 3,000 units in El Paso
17 County in the Tax Credit Program in 9 percent credit
18 awards, we have a tremendously hard time filling up the
19 units we have now that we've set aside for accessible at
20 some point, they're the last units we rent.

21 I just don't, as a practitioner, see there's
22 this outcry or this urgent need to make Texas's rules more
23 stringent than the Federal Government's rules with regard
24 to accessibility. I don't know why we just don't adopt
25 federal accessibility requirements. And we voiced this

1 concern when the draft first came out, and not everything
2 does TAAHP wholeheartedly agree upon because we have 324
3 members of our association, and we're 100 percent
4 unanimous on this one. I don't know of one practitioner
5 that thinks this is a good idea or that there's a need for
6 this.

7 MR. IRVINE: I would respectfully ask if TAAHP
8 really understands what we're proposing. I agree that if
9 a federal exemption for accessibility applies, that one
10 would call into question why would you impose an
11 accessibility requirement on it, and it's not an
12 accessibility requirement, it's a visitability
13 requirement. So if you were building an exempt unit, if
14 you were building a multi-story unit --

15 MR. BOWLING: Townhome.

16 MR. IRVINE: -- a townhome, first of all, the
17 route to the townhome would already be covered by existing
18 laws and design manuals which have numerous exceptions for
19 steeply graded lots and all those kinds of things, so
20 we're talking about from the threshold in. And what we're
21 basically talking about is a no-step entrance, which
22 doesn't seem like a problem, having a bathroom on the
23 ground floor. Wouldn't you typically build a bathroom on
24 the ground floor of a townhome?

25 MR. BOWLING: Right.

1 MR. IRVINE: And heights for switches, and
2 that's pretty much it, isn't it?

3 MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes.

4 MR. IRVINE: That's it.

5 MR. BOWLING: The route --

6 MR. IRVINE: The route is covered by something
7 completely different. It relates to the design of your
8 development and the requirements for external routes to be
9 accessible in accordance with the design manual which
10 provides for exemptions.

11 MS. HOLLOWAY: Which you're already doing, I'm
12 sure.

13 MR. BOWLING: But you're removing the
14 exemptions for grade.

15 MR. IRVINE: No.

16 MS. HOLLOWAY: May I?

17 MR. IRVINE: I don't think we're asking you to
18 do anything that you would not already be doing.

19 MR. BOWLING: But we still struggle with
20 understanding why we're changing language that is pretty
21 clear in the federal standard that provides exemption for
22 building type.

23 MR. IRVINE: I think that we have identified
24 that you do not understand the Fair Housing Design Manual
25 as relates to external routes, this exercise was worth its

1 weight in gold.

2 MR. BOWLING: Well, again, we hire
3 professionals, we hire architects and engineers to make
4 sure that our plans are compliant with Fair Housing.

5 MR. IRVINE: And they probably are.

6 MR. BOWLING: And so I can tell you with
7 absolutely certainty, once it's permitted it has met those
8 requirements. And I just see this as more restrictive,
9 and when I compare the language in the federal law to this
10 language, there's an exempt building type.

11 MR. IRVINE: Apples and oranges. I think we're
12 actually giving you the opportunity to take credit for
13 doing what you're already doing.

14 MS. STEPHENS: Lisa Stephens.

15 We build quite a bit of townhome product. The
16 difference between what we're doing in the townhome
17 product is that the half bath that's on the ground floor
18 does not meet the accessible turning radiuses for
19 visitability, it just doesn't, it doesn't have to, it's
20 exempt. So under the new 2010 guidelines, a bathroom
21 that's going to meet your accessibility requirements
22 requires a five-foot turning radius. That means I can no
23 longer build it under the stairwell.

24 Now, I'm going to caveat all of this with
25 saying I haven't looked at the change in this to see if

1 that half bath has to be a fully accessible bath or if it
2 can be the same half bath that we're building regardless
3 if it is not an accessible bath, then I think you're
4 correct, that half bath under the stairwell still works.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Marni.

6 MS. HOLLOWAY: We've had this conversation with
7 a number of people. This change is coming about because
8 our previous requirement was actually more than federal
9 law regarding those exempt units and what it required was
10 that 20 percent of those townhouses have a bedroom and
11 bathroom on the first floor. That's every unit size,
12 every unit type. It created I don't know how many issues.
13 It's difficult to administer and the sense is that it
14 wasn't getting us to something useful.

15 This is not about accessibility, this is not
16 about making anything accessible that isn't required to be
17 accessible already. This is about can my friend in a
18 walker, and my sidewalk is already flat --

19 MR. IRVINE: Or exempt.

20 MS. HOLLOWAY: Or exempt. But can my friend
21 with a walker get through my front door, comfortably use
22 the bathroom, comfortably come visit me. It's not about
23 turning radiuses, it's about the bare minimums that are in
24 the Fair Housing Design Manual. Turning radiuses are
25 about accessibility. So the Fair Housing Design Manual

1 includes 20 pages of exemptions just for difficult to
2 develop sites. What we are doing is saying the ground
3 floor of your townhouse, if you can get there on an
4 accessible route per the Fair Housing Design Manual, has
5 to be one that someone can get into with a walker or small
6 wheelchair. That's what we're looking for.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Other comments? Questions from
8 Board members?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. GOODWIN: Did you have a comment?

11 MS. ANDERSON: Yes, sir. Good afternoon.

12 Terri Anderson, Anderson Development and Construction.

13 I would respectfully maybe request that staff
14 discuss with architects just to make sure that there are
15 no additional requirements and criteria and maybe report
16 back before the rules become final, even though they're
17 going out for a draft.

18 Thank you, sir.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Additional comments?

20 MR. ECCLES: And of course, this is perfect
21 fodder as well for public comment. Bring forward that
22 here's the law, here's this rule, that's good stuff for
23 public comment.

24 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.

25 MR. SCHMIDTBERGER: Russ Michael Schmidtberger,

1 real estate attorney in Houston and Austin.

2 This is also under Subchapter B, it kind of
3 takes us in a different direction. I commented a little
4 bit on it yesterday, it has to do with undesirable site
5 features, specifically the radius distances or the
6 distances between undesirable site features and how it
7 might affect development down in areas that are close to
8 refineries, specifically those that have been hit because
9 of Hurricane Harvey.

10 From Corpus Christi all the way up to Beaumont,
11 everybody knows -- I don't know if you guys have been
12 there or not, I know I've driven quite a bit of Houston
13 myself, because I went to law school there, I've got a ton
14 of family and friends down there too -- a lot of these
15 places that were hit are in areas that refineries were at,
16 things of that nature, from Beaumont, Port Arthur, through
17 Deer Park, down to LaPorte, League City, Texas City, all
18 the way down to Corpus.

19 Right now inside undesirable site features we
20 have distances from certain things that we don't want to
21 be close to, for example, 300 feet of junkyards, 300 feet
22 of solid waste sanitary landfills, 300 feet of sexually
23 oriented business, 100 feet of the nearest power line
24 structure, 500 feet from active railroads, 500 feet from
25 heavy industry, but for some reason, refineries are carved

1 out to be two miles at this point, and I think at this
2 point without doing too much changing, we could
3 potentially change that two miles down to maybe 1,000 feet
4 or a half mile today and send the right message to the
5 places that are actually affected by the hurricane.

6 And so that's what I would suggest that we do
7 today is that we take out the two miles and that we
8 replace it with either 1,000 feet or perhaps half a mile.

9 It has been that way in the past, I'm not sure how many
10 years it's been two miles, but I know it hasn't been that
11 long. For some reason the policy around making it two
12 miles extended it and I'm not really sure why. I've
13 worked with personal injury attorneys down in League City
14 and Texas City and Friendswood, and I understand that
15 Texas City might blow up every ten years and there might
16 be a benzene plume that reaches 1,000 feet or something
17 along those lines, but two miles seems pretty big,
18 especially the way it's affecting Hurricane Harvey now.

19 So if you guys could take issue with that or
20 maybe explain a little bit about why the policy is at two
21 miles and why we can't narrow it, at least as the TDHCA
22 Board and staff, I think it sends the right message to the
23 cities that they don't have to pass a resolution or an
24 ordinance to actually narrow it themselves, which is also
25 included in this. It allows us to come to them first and

1 say we believe that we can narrow it first for you, and
2 then if you want to narrow it from there, you can do that.

3 Thank you. I can take any questions too, if
4 you have any.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

8 Any additional comments?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. GOODWIN: Any Board members want to strike
11 anything from these rules before they're put in the
12 *Register*?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. GOODWIN: We have a motion and a second.
15 All in favor say aye.

16 (A chorus of ayes.)

17 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. GOODWIN: It passes.

20 Thank you, Marni.

21 MS. HOLLOWAY: I believe we have some public
22 comment.

23 MR. GOODWIN: We are at that stage where we
24 take public comment for developing agenda items in the
25 future. I would remind everyone that we cannot get into a

1 debate here but we'll be glad to listen to your comments.

2 MR. BOWLING: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and
3 members of the Board. I'm Bobby Bowling, I'm representing
4 TAAHP.

5 I have a few comments that might take a little
6 more than three minutes.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Three minutes.

8 MR. BOWLING: I'll do the best I can, Mr.
9 Chair, but I might ask for your deference to give me
10 another minute or so.

11 So again, I'm speaking for TAAHP. We have over
12 300 members, we represent most of the tax credit industry
13 in the State of Texas. I'm going to ask you for two
14 things to be placed on agenda items for further
15 consideration.

16 One is to take -- and I don't know if this is
17 an agenda item actually, but we want to plead with you all
18 to do everything you can, in light of Hurricane Harvey, to
19 ask the Federal Government to please provide proper
20 relief, including additional tax credits for our state.
21 It's what we've gotten in past disasters with Hurricane
22 Ike and Hurricane Katrina, we got a sizable addition to
23 our tax credit pool. And we just want to reach out to all
24 of you and any stroke that you have with the Governor's
25 Office and any representatives, any Congress people and

1 for TDHCA staff to please do everything within your power
2 to ask the Federal Government to send more tax credits our
3 way.

4 The next thing that I wanted you to consider
5 placing on a future agenda item is to consider the effects
6 of the price increases and supply delays and labor
7 shortages that we're going to be facing really on the
8 awards that you just made for the 2017 year. In the
9 past -- and I did some research, I've been in this program
10 since our first awards were in 2001, and like I said
11 earlier in my testimony, in 2004, 2005 and 2006 deals, you
12 took money from '07, '08 and '09 pools up to 10 percent if
13 the developer could demonstrate the cost increases to
14 supplement and make sure that those deals got placed in
15 service in time.

16 And I just want to implore upon you all -- I
17 gave you my testimony earlier that I've already heard from
18 my concrete supplier that we're getting a \$30 per yard
19 increase, really no explanation, but I know it's because
20 of the rebuilding efforts that he sees coming and he's
21 going to try to sell his product of have a shortage for
22 demand in Houston and the Gulf areas. This is going to be
23 a real problem, and you're going to have a situation where
24 you're going to be faced with providing additional credits
25 to see that some of these deals get constructed, or these

1 deals are going to get turned back.

2 And you might say, well, so what if these deals
3 will get turned back, the money will go into the next
4 pool, but you're going to lose a year on that, so if a
5 2017 deal gets put back into the pool you can re-award it
6 in 2018 but you've lost a year on that deal. And I don't
7 really think that that necessarily is a forward
8 commitment, so I'm asking that you put this on the agenda
9 to consider.

10 And then the last thing that I wanted to ask
11 you about is I don't know if there's some kind of blanket
12 motion that you could all take to declare that a force
13 majeure event has taken place with this storm but it's the
14 biggest rainfall event, from what I read, in the history
15 of the contiguous United States. So I think you're going
16 to have some deadline and some placed in service issues.
17 You have the ability in Section 42 from the Federal
18 Government to extend placed in service up to a year if a
19 force majeure event has occurred. Definitely along the
20 coast you're going to be seeing requests from our members,
21 but I think it's going to affect our entire state.

22 So my ask, in wrapping up, is that you place an
23 agenda item to consider this in October. Thank you.

24 MR. BROWN: I'm Jed Brown, Brownstone
25 Affordable Housing.

1 I'm glad we're talking about the 2018 QAP.
2 Some of us are still hung up on 2017. The QAP and the
3 rule are what we as developers and applicants are required
4 to work under and we do so, but it's a two-way street.
5 The rules must be administered by staff according to how
6 they're laid out.

7 We need to bring up an issue today that
8 occurred with the tax credit collapse at the July 27 Board
9 meeting. The collapse did not follow the award
10 recommendation methodology outlined in 11.63 of the QAP.
11 Step 5 of the methodology states that any remaining credit
12 after rural collapse will be used to award the highest
13 scoring application not selected in a prior step in the
14 most underserved subregion in the state compared to the
15 amount originally made available in each subregion.

16 On July 27, the tax credit ceiling accounting
17 summary showed that Region 11 Urban was the third most
18 underserved subregion in the state at 17.39 percent. This
19 did not include Baxter Lofts, as it should have. With
20 Baxter Lofts, Region 11 Urban would have been 11.23
21 underfunded on the day of the awards. Despite being more
22 underfunded, Region 11 Urban was bypassed in the collapse
23 and their credits were instead awarded to the fourth most
24 underfunded region which would be Urban 2 which was 11.05
25 percent underfunded.

1 Since the July 27 Board meeting, the two
2 recommended applications which were still under review by
3 staff have lost tiebreaker points and are no longer
4 competitive. While this affects its underfunded
5 percentage, Region 11's position in the statewide
6 collapse, more underserved than Region Urban 1. Region 11
7 Urban is now 15.39 percent underfunded and did not receive
8 an allocation in the statewide collapse. Region 2 is
9 11.05 percent underfunded and did receive an allocation in
10 the collapse.

11 This, unfortunately, creates a math problem as
12 the statewide collapse is approximately \$240,000 short,
13 making both 11 Urban and 2 Urban whole. Being that our
14 application is the next on the wait list in Region 11
15 Urban, we request that the Board ask staff to work with us
16 to find a proper solution to the situation.

17 I've been involved in the Tax Credit Program
18 for the last ten years, our firm has participated as a
19 developer and general contractor on 30 different tax
20 credit applications, approximately, across Texas. This is
21 the second time in ten years you've seen me come before
22 the Board, so this is a big deal to us. We believe we
23 earned an allocation of credits and we'd like to receive
24 it.

25 Thank you very much. Have a good day.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

2 MR. PADILLA: Arnold Padilla, McAllen Housing
3 Authority.

4 Jed just came up here to give you the
5 unfortunate situation of what occurred this past July 27.

6 McAllen Housing Authority is the application that we're
7 talking about that should be getting funding.

8 Unfortunately, errors occur, we're not here to blame
9 anybody other than when errors occur what we normally do
10 is we go back and fix the error, we take care of things
11 correctly. And what I'm up here to do is to ask you to
12 please put on the next agenda an item -- unless we're able
13 to fix it before the October 12 meeting -- is put an item
14 on the agenda to take care of this award correctly, as the
15 QAP states it should be done as the rules apply, and as
16 McAllen Housing Authority's application has been done
17 correctly, and is the next application that should be
18 awarded. Without you going back to correct the issue, you
19 are at a \$240,000 shortage of funds to be able to fund our
20 application.

21 And I will tell you ours already has the
22 zoning, something that everybody keeps talking about.
23 Zoning is a problem and I bring it up from the previous
24 matter about how to give incentive points. Zoning is not
25 going to resolve your issue, unfortunately. I think

1 there's too many variables that play a role as to why
2 people don't get started on time. For example, why I'm up
3 here today, here we are at the end of September, we still
4 can't get an award, it may be October before we get our
5 award, by the time we get our commitment it may be the end
6 of the year. There are too many facets that affect the
7 entire process of how and when people actually get to
8 construction.

9 But in our case what we'd like to do is let's
10 go back and correct unfortunately what has occurred, let's
11 award the credits properly to McAllen Housing Authority's
12 application, Las Palomas, as we should. We are, again,
13 already zoned. We'll do everything we can to expedite the
14 process and get our construction started on time.

15 Thank you very much.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

17 MS. STEPHENS: I'm Lisa Stephens and I'm
18 actually speaking on behalf of the Texas Coalition of
19 Affordable Developers. We were glad to work with TAAHP
20 this year on the proposals that Bobby actually brought to
21 you a few minutes ago.

22 I want to point out that the extensions on
23 placed in service deadlines may actually be consideration
24 for areas outside of the impacted counties because on
25 sites that are under construction currently that may have

1 12/31/17 placed in service deadlines and those that are
2 trying to get underway, we're seeing issues with getting
3 both materials and labor on those jobs right now. It's
4 going to have a direct impact on particularly the next
5 30-60-90 days as we're looking for materials that may have
6 been flooded out in warehouses and/or labor, businesses
7 that are flooded out that they need some time to get back
8 before they can show back up on the job.

9 So I'd like for you to take that into
10 consideration under the force majeure provisions. It may
11 be outside of the impacted counties, it may affect both
12 '15 and '16 allocations that are under construction
13 currently that are going to see issues as a result of
14 Harvey.

15 And then secondarily, TexCAD unanimously also
16 supported the request for some allocation from future year
17 cycle, perhaps 10 percent out of 2018, to be set aside if
18 there is in fact cost increases on the 2017 awards.
19 Certainly getting those units on the ground sooner rather
20 than later, I think, is preferred by everyone, in
21 particular given the amount of disaster we've had
22 recently.

23 So thank you for your consideration of those.

24 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

25 Any additional public comment?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. GOODWIN: Staff, anybody on staff have
3 anything they want to say? Any Board members?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. GOODWIN: If not, I'll entertain a motion
6 to adjourn.

7 MS. BINGHAM ESCAREÑO: So moved.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Moved. Seconded?

9 MR. BRADEN: Second.

10 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor?

11 (A chorus of ayes.)

12 MR. GOODWIN: We're adjourned.

13 (Whereupon, at 2:45 p.m., the meeting was
14 adjourned.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

C E R T I F I C A T E

MEETING OF: TDHCA Board
LOCATION: Austin, Texas
DATE: September 7, 2017

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 217, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs.

9/14/2017

(Transcriber) (Date)

On the Record Reporting
3636 Executive Cntr Dr., G22
Austin, Texas 78731