- 1	
1	BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
2	AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
3	
4	AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND COMMISSION MEETING
5	
6	(Webex)
7	Tuesday, August 25, 2020
8	BEFORE: DAVID BOWERS, President
9	MEMBERS PRESENT:
10	JALAL GREENE
11	SHANNON SNOW VERNADINE KIMBALL
12	ILETHA JOYNES TISHA GUTHRIE
13	MATT HILL CINDY PLAVIER-TRUITT
14	CINDI I DAVIER INGILI
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Reported by:
21	Roland Thomas Bowman, III
	FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Court Reporting Transcription D.C. Area 301-261-1902

Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

1	<u>Guest Speakers:</u>
2	ALICE KENNEDY, Acting Housing Commissioner
3	BOB CENNAME, Budget Director
4	Also Present:
5	STACY FREED, Senior Advisor to Chief Operations Officer, DHCD
6 7	STEPHANI ESTRADA, Project Coordinator, Affordable Housing Trust Fund, DHCD
8	JIM MAJORS, Assistant Commissioner for Project Finance and Development, DHCD
10	TISHA EDWARDS, Executive Director, Mayor's Office of Children and Family Success
11	JOHN MOBLEY, Program Manager, Affordable Housing Trust Fund, DHCD
12	DANTE FRANKLIN, Human Service Manager, CAP Center
13	CAROLYN WATSON, Community Aide/Admin, Affordable Housing Trust Fund, DHCD
15	EBONY RECTOR, Project coordinator, Affordable Housing Trust Fund, DHCD
16 17	KATIE YORICK, Chief of Policy and Partnerships, Homeless Services
18	KEVIN NASH
19	DOROTHY REED
20	
21	

1	INDEX	
2		Page
3	Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Bowers	4
4	Roll Call	4
5	Comments from Acting Commissioner Kennedy	6
6	Approval of Minutes	7
7	Question and Answer Session:	9
8	Presentation of Mr. Cenname	10
9	Department Updates	41
LO	Public Comments	61
L1	Other Business	63
L2	Adjournment by Chairman Bowers	73
L3		
L 4		
L 5		
16		
L7		
L 8		
L 9		
20		
21		

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (6:04 p.m.) 3 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Good evening everybody. This is David Bowers. It is August 25, 2020, 6:04 p.m., 4 5 Eastern Standard Time. It's the Baltimore City 6 Affordable Housing Trust Fund Commission monthly. I'm 7 David Bowers, the President of the Commission, calling us 8 to order. 9 First order of business will be to do a roll 10 call to determine if we have a quorum. When I call 11 Commission Members' names, I'd ask Commission Members, if 12 you don't mind taking yourself off of mute right now, and 13 I'll call your name. If you could indicate if you're 14 here by saying present. So let me start. 15 Iletha Joynes. 16 MS. JOYNES: Present. 17 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Thank you. Ms. Joynes is 18 present. 19 Ernst Valery. 20 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Okay. Tiara Watkins. 21 Tiara Watkins.

1	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Matt Hill.
2	MR. HILL: Present.
3	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Matt Hill is present.
4	Shannon Snow.
5	MS. SNOW: Present.
6	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Shannon Snow is present.
7	Tisha Guthrie.
8	MS. GUTHRIE: Tisha Guthrie is present.
9	Vernadine Kimball. Vernadine Kimball.
10	Okay. Cindy Plavier-Truitt?
11	MS. PLAVIER-TRUITT: Present.
12	PRESIDENT BOWERS: All right. Cindy Plavier-
13	Truitt is present.
14	Jay Greene.
15	MR. GREENE: Present.
16	MR. GREENE: Present.
17	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Jay Greene is present.
18	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. So seeing seven members
19	present, we do have a quorum established. So thank you
20	all Commission Members for being here this evening.
21	I want to start again by welcoming everyone to

this month's meeting; thanking the Department staff for your work in pulling us together; thank you Commission Members for your time; and thank you to members of the public, who will be listening in.

2.0

We will follow the Agenda as it is printed with one or two minor exceptions. I'm actually going to at this point, before we get into the approval of the July notes, we've been joined by Acting Commissioner Alice Kennedy.

And so, Acting Commissioner Kennedy, I want to offer you an opportunity to bring words, greetings to the Commission Members.

MS. KENNEDY: Thank you, David.

Good evening, Commissioners and the public that is watching us. I just wanted to say thank you very much for the hard work that you're doing on this extremely important issue, and want to also say that from a department standpoint, as well as a personal standpoint, affordable housing is something that we are dedicated to. We are dedicated as an agency. We are dedicated as a city. And I am dedicated also in that work as Acting

Commissioner to keep things moving forward, and build upon the strong work that the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and the Commissioners have been doing since its inception, and to keep that work going.

The staff at DHCD and -- has been working closely with the Commissioners, and we're looking forward to having things keep going, creating opportunities for affordable housing for our residents, which is extremely important to prevent homelessness, to provide opportunities to preserve legacy affordable housing across the City, and so many other things.

So I look forward to working with everyone, and look forward to also being a part of further discussions on all the issues that come up.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Acting Commissioner Kennedy, thank you so much for your words, and thanks for joining us here this evening. We appreciate you showing your support, and engaging with us this evening. So thank you.

To Commission Members, we will now move on in our Agenda to the approval of the July notes, minutes

1	from the July meeting. We will allow members, if you
2	have not already, a moment to review those. If there are
3	any suggested changes or edits, please let us know. And
4	if there aren't any, we will certainly entertain a motion
5	to accept it.
6	MS. KIMBALL: Just wanted to let you guys know
7	I'm here.
8	PRESIDENT BOWERS: That is Ms. Vernadine
9	Kimball.
10	Ms. Kimball, thank you. The record will
11	reflect Ms. Kimball is present. Thank you.
12	MS. KIMBALL: Thank you.
13	(Pause.)
14	MS. SNOW: So this is Shannon Snow. I move to
15	approve the July Meeting Summary.
16	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Shannon Snow has moved to
17	approve the Meeting Summary for July 28, 2020.
18	Is there a second?
19	MS. PLAVIER-TRUITT: This is Cindy Truitt.
20	Second.
21	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Shannon Snow has moved it,

and Cindy Truitt has seconded it. Is there any 1 2 discussion? 3 Okay. All in favor, please indicate by saying 4 aye. 5 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye. 6 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Opposed nay. 7 And any abstentions? 8 Okay. Thank you. The July 28, 2020, Meeting 9 Summary has been approved. Thank you so much for that. 10 Next on our Agenda, we will move on with the 11 question and answer session with Department of Finance, 12 the review of the revenue receipts, and how the surtax is 13 being administered. 14 We are joined this evening, we appreciate his 15 time, Robert Cenname, who is here, the Budget Director, 16 the Bureau of Budget and Management Research. 17 A reminder to Members of the Commission that we 18 sent over a summary document with the questions that were 19 submitted to Mr. Cenname. And I appreciate Members of 20 the Commission, who had submitted some of the questions 2.1 ahead of time for him. So what we asked Mr. Cenname to

come and respond to the questions that were submitted,
and then leave us any time for some dialog at the end of
his presentation.

So, Mr. Cenname, welcome to the Commission meeting, and we will turn it over to you. And, again, Members of the Commission do have the document -- two documents that were sent to you before this meeting.

1.3

2.0

2.1

MR. CENNAME: Okay. Thank you, David, and Members of the Commission. Again, my name is Bob Cenname. I'm the Budget Director for the City. And tonight I'm representing the Department of Finance to try to help answer some of the questions that came through to us about various aspects of the Yield Tax, and certain terms of how it's being administered, and what we're seeing in terms of the data.

This was a joint effort, I want to say, just to make sure folks on the Commission understand how the difference in the roles in Finance and my role as the Budget Director. I play more of a role on the forecasting side. The staff that actually administers the tax does not fall in my particular bureau, but we did

work with the Bureau of Revenue Collections and their team in the Transfer and Recordation Tax Office just to make sure we collectively understood how this is working, and what they're seeing as well.

2.0

So if there's anything tonight, of course, that I can't answer, I'll be happy to take those questions back to the group there as well.

So I think the best way -- I have my notes in front of me, your questions in front of me, and my notes, and perhaps the best way to do it is I'll just go through each of the questions, and kind of touch on some of the points.

And, David, do you want to pause after each question or you want me to get through all of them, and then we can kind of come back to answers at the end?

PRESIDENT BOWERS: What I would ask, if for Commission Members, let's allow Mr. Cenname to work his way through answers to the questions, and if folks can make notes of any questions you have just to make sure we get through all of them. And then we'll save questions, a chunk of time, at the end for questions after you've

1 | had a chance to power through.

2.0

MR. CENNAME: Sure. Okay. Sounds good. So let's jump right into it. So the first question, which is multiple parts, was basically just to walk through how the Yield Tax is assessed and collected.

So, first, in terms of who calculates the tax, it's calculated by, like I said, it's the Bureau of Revenue Collections, and the staff they're called tax transfer clerks. And, Part B, is there a form used for the calculation on this? The answer is, no. Basically, what happens is when the information is brought from the title companies, the clerks have to go through the information, and they do have to calculate the tax manually for lack of a better word using either Excel or a calculator.

The way it works is the clerks are trained first, of course, to flag anything that's over \$1 million, which is the criteria. Their first step is they calculate the, what I'm going to call the base or the General Fund Transfer Recordation Tax first.

So, of course, those rates are the 1.5 percent

1 | for transfer, and 1 percent or the equivalent of 1 2 | percent for Recordation Tax.

Then they multiply the amounts of that tax by the 40 percent and the 15 percent to generate the additional Yield Tax that then gets put into a separate account, and entered into a separate budget account number just to make sure that the funds are not commingled.

If you're looking at the consideration value as a whole, the math, of course, is the 0.6 percent, and then the 0.1 for the transfer, and 0.15 for the recordation. But the way the clerks do it is because they're working off the way the law is written, they first calculate the base Transfer Recordation Tax, and then they apply that percentage of 40 percent and 15 percent.

Part 1D. So the question was that the City had previously relied on the State to collect the City's portion of the recordation tax. And it was June 1, 2011, that we actually started doing that ourselves. And the reason was it was just we paid a service fee to the State

to process those for us. And back in that day we decided to pull it in-house for a little bit of savings on the administrative side.

2.0

2.1

So Question 2 gets more into the -- in terms of the transactions, and what we've seen over the first year or so of this tax. So and the question as I read it was, why was the projection that we had when the bill response was done, why was it higher than what we're seeing so far today? And just to discuss any other trends that are going on with the tax.

So I'd first say, we have seen a decline -- a lower Yield Tax revenues than what were forecast. And the bill response, which our team did a lot of work on, was looking at Fiscal '16, '17 and '18. And what has happened is the decline in I'd say lower Yield Tax revenues, it has coincided with the decline in our overall Transfer and Recordation Tax base. So we collected on average about 90 -- and, again, that's the money that comes directly to the City's General Fund. We collected on average about \$90 million in Fiscal '16, '17, '18 and '19. But what we're seeing in Fiscal '20,

which for us is July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020, is that even in our regular Transfer Recordation Tax revenues for all transactions, we're expecting to end at only about \$78 million for Fiscal '20. So we are much lower in Fiscal '20 than we were in Fiscal '19. That's a decline of about 13 percent versus, again, that average of 90 million over those other -- those previous four years.

1.3

2.0

When we did the bill report for the Council for the bill that passed, it was pretty clear that the years that we were dealing with were better than average. They weren't the best years we've had in terms of receipts and transfer and recordation, but they were a little bit better than average. And so far for Fiscal '20, we've kind of come back down to what looks like an average year.

The Yield Tax in itself, I want to make sure I emphasize this again, is that the Transfer and Recordation Taxes, in my experience from having been here for almost 15 years now, just even the regular Transfer and Recordation Tax is by far one of the hardest revenue

sources to predict. It's because it's based on, of course, real estate transactions. It's very volatile.

We see it drop off very quickly during times when there's issues or fear in the housing market. We see it rebound quickly when there's interest or when interest rates decline, and there's a lot of activity in the market. So it really does change quite a bit, and is largely out of our control.

1.3

2.0

On top of that, the Yield Tax, especially, is on a very narrow subset of transactions. So you're talking about a small subset of the most volatile revenue source, and trying to forecast that. So it is a challenge for us.

When I looked at the Yield Tax estimates that we used in prior years versus what we're seeing so far in Fiscal '20, for the bill report that we had done before, we were averaging about, call it, 300 transactions that qualified for over a million dollars per year in those years between 2016 and '18. That's an average of, call it, 25 or so a month. In Fiscal '20, looking at the data that you had sent over that we all collectively receive

from our system, there were an average of about 19 or 20 transactions per month. So we are lower on the number of transactions, and definitely would acknowledge that is a -- it's almost a 20 percent decline in the number of transactions that we've seen, but it's not necessarily inconsistent with what we're seeing in the broader marketplace in terms of Transfer and Recordation Taxes and transactions overall.

What also can affect the revenues wildly is the dollar value of the transactions. And so on the Yield Tax especially going back to Fiscal '17, for example, we had one transaction that year that was worth -- it was \$142 million, just one transaction. In Fiscal '18, we had one transaction that was \$242 million alone. And so those very high outlier transactions tend to have a pretty big impact on the volume as well. We haven't seen in the data that I looked at for Fiscal '20, we've had a handful that were over 100 million, but nothing that was as high as what we saw in Fiscal '17 and '18.

So I would say general in terms of -- to summarize that question is we have seen a decline in

1.3

general transactions on just Transfer and Recordation

Taxes overall. There has been a similar decline on the

Yield Tax. And there has been, it looks like, just a

lower value, generally, of transactions in Fiscal '20 so

far on the Yield Tax.

I don't know if folks on the call have seen the July data yet, but it looks like, which I'll come back to later, but it looks like July was a much stronger month.

And, again, I don't know if folks have seen that data quite yet, if it's been shared. But it looks like the activity did pick up in July as well, which is good news.

Question 3 was about the Maryland State law that tried to put a control on these transactions that were what they call controlling interest in any company where the primary business is valued over a million dollars. And going back to that law, that was passed in 2008. The thought at the time was that there were some entities that were trying to avoid the Transfer and Recordation Tax. So they would just transfer their interest in an entity, and they would try to avoid the tax. This particular law corrected that. And since

then, we have seen there are very few transactions that go through that particular process.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

The Yield Tax is levied on those transactions. However, those do not show up on the report that you have today. We get a report from the State on those transactions because the State receives the information on any of those transactions that are transferring interest from one entity to another. And then they remit the tax back to the city. And when the Yield Tax passed, we did notify the State that, hey, we were of course still expecting our regular Transfer and Recordation Tax on any transactions, and that there's an additional assessment that would be due on anything that was over \$1 million. But I want to stress that since 2008, when that law passed, we've seen very, very little activity in that particular side of the business. There's a pretty good report, if folks are interested, too. There was a State report of all of the transactions that have -- that qualify here that are taxable they listed. It's on SDAT's website. And it looks like it was last updated a couple of years ago, but there was only about, if I'm

remembering, about 250 or 300 transactions at that point since the law had passed, and that was State-wide. So that just gives you an idea that there's usually -- we see very small amount of revenues and very few transactions that we get from the State that went through that process. And, again, part of that is because the law was intended to clean it up, and to prevent, or at least to disincent people from going through that process to try to get around the tax.

2.0

But, again, to answer Part 3C, no, they are not on that sheet, and we can follow-up separately when we get information from SDAT on those transactions, and report those separately, but they don't show up in that system.

Question 4 is about how COVID is impacting us on this particular source. And as I said before, this source is very difficult to forecast. What we can tell you at this point is looking at data through the end of Fiscal 2020, April and May for us on residential transactions were lower than the prior April and May.

June was actually higher on -- at least on the

residential side on Transfer and Recordation transactions than the prior June. And July looks like it was also a really strong month.

Now, again, we're only looking so far at residential transactions, which there's very few of those that did apply for this tax. But just to give you a sense of market activity, we have seen things pick up in June and July, and a lot of that, I'm sure, is because interest rates are just rock bottom now. I mean, we're seeing interest rates for like a 30-year mortgage that are under three percent, which is really just insane and really historic when you think about it.

Like I said, you will see some July data come through shortly, if you haven't already, that the activity on the greater than \$1 million transactions did pick up in July, which, again, is consistent with what we're seeing on our base Transfer and Recordation receipts.

Question 5 was can Finance mark on the spreadsheet document in the Yield Tax whether the transaction was recordation only? The answer to that is,

yes. We did talk about that internally. We understand looking at the sheet why there would be a little bit of confusion. The Bureau of Revenue Collections did make a request to our Information Technology Department to add some kind of simple yes or no field when they're actually keying the information into the system. And so they will add that. I don't have a date of when that will be ready, but they are working on that as we speak.

2.0

One way, in the absence of that particular screen or that field, one way to quickly figure out if a transaction is recordation only is if you take the consideration value and -- or divide the final amount tax paid by the consideration value, the only thing that shows up is 0.15 percent is recordation. Anything that's 0.75 percent is transfer plus recordation. Then anything that's different has an explanation behind it.

In Question 6, you had asked me to kind of walk through a couple of the calculations on the Yield Tax to explain why some of them don't line up real nicely with that; either that .15 or that .75.

So the first one was transaction was on Line

 $1 \parallel 207$. The consideration value was \$29.2 million. The

- 2 | Yield Tax was \$43,807. This one was pretty
- 3 | straightforward. It was a Deed of Trust for 112 North
- 4 | Eutaw. It processed for recordation only. So it was
- 5 | taxed on the full amount of the loan. The base
- 6 | Recordation Tax was calculated at 1 percent. So we took
- 7 | the 29.2 million times 1 percent. That gets you to
- 8 | \$292,050. And that amount was multiplied by 15 percent,
- 9 which gets you to 43,807. So that one is a good example
- 10 of a classic recordation only transaction.
- And, by the way, I can send my notes over after
- 12 | this call just so you guys have a record of all these,
- 13 | just if you miss the math as I'm going through it.
- Question 6B, which was Line 248, this one was
- 15 | one that's a little bit trickier. And so this one had a
- 16 | consideration value of 70 million, but the Yield Tax
- 17 | generated was only 23,697. And the reason for that is
- 18 | that when we process these, we can't tax the full loan
- 19 | amount. We can only tax the new money that's been added
- 20 | during the refinance. So if we don't do that, we end up
- 21 | double taxing or taxing something that already came

through the system earlier. So in this particular transaction, the full loan amount was 70 million, but we had to subtract \$54.2 million of unpaid principal balance, which had already come through the system and had been taxed earlier. That left us with a taxable transaction of only \$15.8 million. And doing the math there, if you do the base Recordation Tax at 1 percent, gets you to \$157,980. And then, again, multiplying that times 15 percent per the rules, gets you to the 23,697.

1.3

And then 6C was exactly the same. This was another transaction where we could not double tax or retax something that had already come through the system. So we can only tax the new money on a refinancing. So same situation as -- and here we had to subtract out of the \$24.5 million on the consideration value. We had to take out the unpaid principal balance, which brought us to a taxable transaction of only \$593,000. And, again, doing the math on that, the Yield Tax ended up being only \$891.

So I notice the last question kind of asked about why do some kind of fall outside of the normal what

you would expect? And that's the primary reason is that
not every transaction is the full consideration value of
the taxable amount.

2.0

2.1

We try to put some notes in the system. This has been a -- in the comments section on the right, if you look at those, sometimes you'll see a comment that says taxable amount of X times whatever equals Yield Tax. So we're trying to improve the notes we put in there so that they're clear. But the system does ask you to actually put the full consideration value into the system, and then put a note to say what the taxable amount is.

In terms of -- next question was Number 7. How many transactions have been deemed exempt pursuant to Section 17.1, and what was the lost revenue? So I will send over -- we did pull together a list of those. I'll send those in my written comments today. There have been 21 transactions so far that were exempt, and each of those comes -- per person, per the law, has to sign an affidavit and say this transaction was in the process when this bill was being debated.

The total value of those transactions or the consideration value, at least, is \$32 million. So in terms of what the lost revenue is, if we assume that all of them would have been -- would have had to pay both the Yield Tax on the recordation and the transfer side, that would be about \$240,000 of lost revenue.

1.3

And, again, I'll send a list of those properties so that you can see them and the consideration value. And they're all filed. They have an affidavit on file with revenue collections.

Question 8. In terms of regulations or memoranda or policy statements from Finance, there is a document that we use for training that we use for the public. So we will attach that in my written comments tonight. I can send that over.

Question 9. And, again, Question 8 really just goes through the calculation that I described at the very beginning in terms of how we calculate the tax and how it's done. It mimics that.

Question 9, the Cross Keys Center. So question was it's about to undergo a significant redevelopment.

Do we have an estimate yet on what the revenue looks like 1 2 from that? So in the latest report, you'll see a 3 transaction related to Cross Keys. So we know that, I believe, it was Caves Valley bought the property at Cross 4 5 Keys. It was \$27 million. They bought the assets there. They may have said publicly that they're planning to do 6 7 more redevelopment, but we still don't know exactly what 8 that will look like. But the transaction just to 9 purchase the property was \$27 million. It was recorded 10 on July 31st, and it generated \$202,000 of Yield Tax. 11 You'll see that in the next report that comes through 12 that has the July data.

10th question was during the legislative drafting -- did anybody to our knowledge come through and actually pay the intended amount? The answer to that is no.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

And then the final question was Question 11 about looking at the spreadsheet and the different columns, and trying to figure out why things kind of fell outside of what the normal rates should be. I think I answered that, hopefully, in Question 6, above, that

there are a significant number of transactions that have a taxable amount that differs from the consideration value. And, again, those are usually for refinancing where we can only tax the new money on the transaction.

So I can pause there, and if folks have questions, I'm happy to try to answer here or, as I said, to follow-up, if I can't give you a good answer.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Thank you so much. Very much appreciate that thorough walk-through.

We've got time on the Agenda now for Commission Members, if anyone has questions or comments, observations based on the presentation from Mr. Cenname. Don't forget to take yourself off mute, if you're trying to add in.

MS. SNOW: Hi. This is Shannon Snow. Thanks for the presentation. And I just want to clarify that for those transactions where it's not clearly 15 percent or the 75 percent that that is -- is that always due because -- to a refi, and you're just taxing on the new money? Is there any other situation where that -- those percentages would be off?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

MR. CENNAME: So that -- my understanding is that is the primary scenario. There could be other scenarios. I'm not familiar with any others, but there could be others. We have a representative in our Law Department, who I think has spoken to the Commission before, Jack Meacham (ph.), who goes over and looks at all the transactions, and just checks to make sure that our folks haven't missed anything. But, primarily, if you go through the notes, you'll see that a lot of those ones that are different say that there was a -- that it's a refinancing where there was new money, and we had to subtract that from the unpaid principal balance. So that was just from our conversation. That seems like the primary one. I can't say that there's never another one, but that seems like the bulk of the situation.

MS. SNOW: Okay. Thanks.

MR. HILL: Bob, this is Matt Hill. Thank you for such a thorough presentation. I really appreciate it. It's really helpful to see that level of detail.

And I think this is still a -- you may not have an answer for this. I think it's still kind of the question that

1

19

2.0

2.1

keeps me puzzled. And it's just the decline -- going 2 back to the -- you said that there was a -- essentially a 3 13 percent decline in FY 2020 in projected Transfer and Recordation Tax. And that certainly with the pandemic 4 5 and a slowdown in real estate transactions from March 6 through June at the very least, I'm sure that accounts 7 for some of that. But I think over that same period you're looking at like a 35 percent decrease in the Yield 9 Tax. And I hear what you're saying about being a more 10 volatile tax, but it just seems like a significant 11 decline from prior years, which were somewhat consistent 12 over three years in terms of what you all had said would 1.3 be the projected revenue. 14 So I wanted to know if you have any speculations as to why that discrepancy between the 15 16 reduction? 17 MR. CENNAME: Yes. So, thanks, Matt, for the 18 question. So, I'll tell you, as much as it's bugging you

> FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Court Reporting Transcription D.C. Area 301-261-1902 Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

Fund revenue as well. So that's something that we spend

guys, it's bugging me too because remember that those

huge multi-million dollar transactions that's General

a lot of time looking at.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

I think there are -- just on the data there are two things that we notice, and that I can speculate a little bit about what I think might have happened. terms of the number of transactions on transfer recordation as a whole, yes, there was about a 13 percent decline in the transactions from Fiscal '20 for versus that average of the last couple years. If you just look at the Yield Tax transactions, we were using an average of, like I said, about 25 per month for -- again, 300 for the year or so, divide that by 12, about 25 per month. When I look at Fiscal 2020, there were 232 transactions. That turns out -- that's an average of about 19 or 20 a month. So, yes, there was a decline, and that's a little bit more than a 20 percent decline, a little bit more than what we would have expected just based on overall Transfer and Recordation Tax. But, again, I would say they kind of usually they're actually going in the same direction, but the commercial, the high value commercial stuff is a whole another ballgame, and doesn't -- isn't necessarily completely consistent with what we see on the

1 | normal residential market.

20

21

2 The other thing is those high value 3 transactions do make quite a difference. So if you go back and look at the data from, like, 2017, again, there 4 5 were some, like, just really, really large transactions. 6 The one -- was in Fiscal 2018. The \$242 million one was 7 the transfer of a building in northwest Baltimore. was the Social Security Administration Building. 9 Building changed hands. And so you do get some 10 occasionally that were in those years that were -- we got 11 some really big transactions in those years. We haven't 12 seen anything match that yet in Fiscal 2020. So I hope 1.3 we do. We don't really get much, we don't really get 14 much notice on those. We often learn about those probably the same time most others do. Some of them are 15 16 private sales. We look at MRIS data and CoStar data to 17 try to get a handle on what's going on in the market. 18 But those are really outlier transactions that are just kind of the luck of the draw. 19

In terms of speculating, I have no -- I've asked a lot of people this because our team has been like

is there something going on? I -- one theory I had and, again, this has no evidence to back it up to be very clear, but one of our theories at one point was interest rates have been low for a really long time. So you think that if somebody was going to refinance something maybe they just have refinanced it already, and maybe the market for that has kind of dried up. Because interest rates have been historically -- even before the pandemic and what we're seeing now, interest rates have been pretty low for a long period of time, making it definitely advantageous for people to potentially refinance. The thought I had was maybe that has just dried up. Maybe it was like if you were going to refinance one of those big projects, you've already done it. And, of course, two months later here we are, and interest rates are like two percent lower than they were even at that historic low level. So I'm not sure if that is a potential answer, but if that is the case, we're hopeful that the really extraordinarily low interest rates will get people back into the market. And, like I said, we've kind of seen that happen in -- so far in June

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

and July. So but I've asked a lot of, like, way smarter 1 2 people than me that are in the real estate -- people that 3 we kind of contact, and when do our projections, and a lot of them are kind of puzzled too. So but I, again, 4 5 when I look at the data it's not like we're way off. 6 It's not like we're in half. I mean, the transactions 7 were a little bit lower this year, but not way off. And I think those high dollar transactions do, of course, 9 have something to do with it, which are almost impossible to forecast. 10 11 Does that help answer or get you closer? 12 MR. HILL: Yes. Thank you. 13 MR. CENNAME: Sure. 14 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Any other Commission Members 15 with comments or questions? 16 MS. GUTHRIE: Hi. This is Tisha Guthrie again. 17 I just wanted to echo Shannon Snow and Matt Hill with

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

really just offering my thank you for the presentation.

I'm beyond a lay person, and sometimes the numbers can be

a little intimidating. And trying to fulfill my function

as a -- Commissioner, trying to really understand as much

18

19

2.0

21

1 as possible. So this was very, very helpful. And, 2 again, thank you very much. 3 MR. CENNAME: Sure. PRESIDENT BOWERS: And a reminder to Commission 4 5 The July report, revenue report, was sent out Members. 6 with some of the go-ahead materials from Ms. Estrada. So 7 we do have that as well. 8 Oh, go ahead. 9 MR. CENNAME: I think you'll be pleased --10 because the activity was pretty strong in July. So we 11 were, we were definitely excited to see the activity pick 12 up. 13 PRESIDENT BOWERS: So last call. 14 questions, comments for Bob before we move on? 15 MR. GREENE: I have. This is Jay Greene. 16 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Yes. 17 MR. GREENE: One topic that I'd like for you to 18 touch upon, Bob, and we just recently approved a spending 19 plan for '20 and '21. And the Department kind of made a 20 rough estimate of what we thought revenues may be in FY

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

'21, and it was based not on any sophisticated

21

information, but just basically kind of a math formula 1 that we looked at the revenues from the previous year, 2 3 and applied a discount factor. 4 MR. CENNAME: Right. 5 MR. GREENE: And so I just -- if you can just 6 kind of give your view of what you -- if you think that 7 estimate is reasonable for next year, and that we based our spending plan on. If you think we need to revise it 9 in any way. Thank you. 10 MR. CENNAME: Can you remind me, Jay, what was 11 -- what did you guys land on in terms of the spending 12 plan in terms of total dollar amount? 13 MR. GREENE: John, are you on the line? John 14 Mobley I think it was 15 (Phone interference.) 16 MR. MOBLEY: -- and it was essentially -- the 17 prior year and discounted it by 25 percent.

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

from the perspective of the volatility of the source.

It's the same thing when we're trying to budget in the

MR. CENNAME: Okay. So I can comment on that

So I think one rule you might use as you

18

19

2.0

21

General Fund.

build up some more data. So just as an example, in the General Fund for Transfer and Recordation Tax, we budget the next year's number based on a moving average of the last five years. And the reason we do that is because there is so much volatility in the market that we don't want to get ahead of it. Like, we don't want to over budget that revenue source, and be relying on that revenue source or be budgeting for that revenue source to have to pay for some City service that we can't support. So I think what you're describing to me sound like a good first kind of crack at something to kind of take what you expect, and just kind of take it down a notch to make sure that you don't have a spending plan that's not able to be supported. Of course, all the revenues are going to go into the Fund. If you do better, they're going to go into the Fund anyway, and you're going to be able to spend them eventually. But I think that sounds reasonable in terms of how to kind of develop your spending plans.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

over the next couple years with this, you could shift to

As you build more data, as we build more data

some kind of model where you use a moving average with a little bit of conservatism built in just to make sure that you don't over-shoot.

2.1

But for you guys, all the money that goes directly to the Fund eventually. So if there is excess revenues that come in beyond your spending plan, it's still going to you for affordable housing.

On the General Fund side, we're a little bit more conservative because, again, we don't want to have a service that we have to support that's supported by transfer recordation, and see a rapid drop-off. And just for perspective, even over the last 15 years we had one year where the General Fund amount was only about 42 or 43 million. Then we had one year where it got up to as high as like 116. And then the years we just talked about, we had four straight years, which was 90 million. And it's pretty unusual for us to have four consecutive years that are right at the same amount really. If you look at the history, it was really all over the place. So generally our budget amounts have been a little bit lower than what our last year spending was because we

used that moving average to make sure that our budget is
a little bit lower, especially in times of rising
receipts that we don't get ahead of ourselves.

But I think that's kind of one way to do it.

And what you're describing is to kind of take the average and look at them, and just take it down a notch, and be conservative is a perfectly reasonable approach. And what we use in our forecasting is really not that sophisticated, frankly, again, because this is just so hard to predict.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Bob.

2.0

2.1

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Thank you, Bob. I appreciate that.

Great. Well, we want to thank Bob Cenname from Finance for coming in, and sharing with us. And, again, I want to echo what other Commission Members have said again around great appreciation for your thoroughness in responding to all the questions that were sent to you ahead of time. And want to again thank my fellow Commission Members. Matt Hill and Shannon Snow, I think, had submitted questions ahead of time. So thank them for

1	their input, and thank you, Bob, for your response.
2	MR. CENNAME: Sure. Sure. Happy to be here,
3	David. What I'll do is I'll send the written answers to
4	these as a follow-up with the attachments just so you
5	guys have them, and you can feel free to circulate that.
6	And I just want to emphasize that we're continually
7	trying to improve the training of our folks so that we
8	get those notes and those comments right so that it's a
9	little clearer about how if there's a difference from
10	what you would expect, that it's a little bit easier to
11	discern from the report. So that's kind of an ongoing
12	issue, but we'll do our best on that.
13	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Appreciate it. And from my
14	notes I saw it looks like the report from the SDAT as
15	well?
16	MR. CENNAME: Yes. Yeah, the reports from
17	SDAT. So they those transactions are not in the
18	report that you got because we get them separately from
19	SDAT. So there's going to be
20	(Telephonic interference.)

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Great. Thank you. Thanks,

21

1 | Bob. Appreciate it.

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2 MR. CENNAME: Thanks, guys. Take care.

3 PRESIDENT BOWERS: You too.

MR. CENNAME: Bye-bye.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: We will move on in the Agenda to next our Departmental Updates where we've got a few items listed out the -- any updates on the NOFAs, the pandemic, homelessness prevention, any updates from that piece. And we've got some carry-over, I know, from our last meeting. Updates on filling the two empty

Commission slots, and updates on the Annual Report.

So I will turn it over now to departmental staff to allow them to work their way through responses to these updates.

MS. GUTHRIE: Excuse me, David. I'm sorry.

Before we move on, I'd just like to -- just for a brief

moment just want to make sure we have some time toward

the end of the meeting to discuss the resolution that

circulated among the Commissioners. I just want to make

sure we don't run out of time to have a health discussion

about that resolution.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Yes. In the other business portion of the Agenda tonight we'll pick up on that and any other items that may be out there for sure.

MS. GUTHRIE: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Yep. Absolutely.

Okay. So I'll turn it over to departmental staff for the --

MR. MAJORS: Thank you, David. This is Jim I will speak tonight on the NOFA and where we Majors. are. As everyone knows, the deadline for the submission of the applications was July 31st. We received approximately 10 applications with a total development cost of \$204 million roughly. Of that, the total number of units in all 10 of the applications was 754 units, of which 107 were at 30 percent AMI, and 318 were at 50 percent AMI. The total amount requested in trust funds for this current NOFA was 5.4 million, which was in excess of what we had put out on the street earlier. Ιf everyone will recall, in the NOFA we said up to \$2 million in this current round.

Based on the number of submissions and the

dollar amount requested, we will have a second round sometime in late fall, I believe, and it will again be for the new construction, preservation of existing rental housing.

1.3

2.0

2.1

We have put together a Review Committee, who has begun to review the applications. We have come up -- we're working on coming up with follow-up questions to the developers. We hope to have that wrapped up. And I will have more to report on that at next month's Commission meeting.

In addition to that, the other thing that I want to announce to the Committee tonight, concerns the Community Land Trust, the RFP for a consultant to assist with us, to assist us in working on the Community Land Trust. I am pleased to announce that we have made a selection, and the selection, the winner was Grounded Solutions Network. We are currently working with the organization on their scope of work. Once we have the scope of work revolved, and we've come to an agreement — the negotiations, the next step will be to prepare a recommendation memo, and then also an award letter. Once

the award letter is finalized and sent out, the recipient will sign it. And then when we get the letter back, we have to then start working on a contract, and getting it approved by the Board of Estimates.

That is it for what I have to report on the community -- I mean on the NOFAs that I'm working on.

Stacy, are you there?

1.3

2.0

MS. FREED: Yes. I'm here. Sorry

MR. MAJORS: Okay. So can you update as to where you are on the CLT NOFA that you're working on?

MS. FREED: Yep. Of course. Today we posted the public comments and questions that were -- and suggestions that we received for the draft NOFA for making funding available to Community Land Trust for single-family home ownership. Just by way of summary, a number of the comments requested technical changes, which we are -- which are to be reflected in the final NOFA. There were three or four requests for us to make some policy shifts, which are under consideration. Our plan is still to post a final NOFA for submission right around Labor Day.

45

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Great. Stacy and Jim, thank 1 2 We'll pause here and see if there are questions or 3 comments on the NOFAs before we move on with the updates. 4 Any questions on the NOFAs? 5 MS. SNOW: Hey, Jim. I had a question for you. 6 You had said about the -- that they -- you expected there 7 to be a second NOFA in the late fall for new construction and preservation. I'm just -- if you guys got 10 9 applications that requested a total of 5.4 million, and 10 there's only 2 million available, why would you be doing 11 another NOFA? 12 MR. MAJORS: The reason why is if you take a 13 look at the amended spending plan, we have money 14 available. 15 John Mobley, are you there, John? 16 MR. MOBLEY: Yep. I'm here. 17 MR. MAJORS: All right. In the line item for 18 preservation of existing rental housing, how much money 19 do we have in the line item? 20 MR. MOBLEY: Oh, well, we have two line items 21 for it. Total out to \$3.7 million.

1	MR. MAJORS: Okay. 3.7 million.
2	MR. MOBLEY: Um-hmm.
3	MR. MAJORS: So, Shannon, in response to your
4	question, we do have the money. We will come out with a
5	second NOFA probably in the range of about 1.7 million,
6	roughly. 1.5 to 1.7 is my best guesstimate.
7	The original NOFA draft was created before we
8	had made the budget adjustment. So that's why there's
9	the \$2 million number that was outstanding originally on
10	the NOFA. So just further info.
11	MS. SNOW: Right. Got it. Okay. Thanks.
12	MR. MAJORS: Shannon, does that answer your
13	question? You good?
14	MS. SNOW: Yeah, it does. Thanks.
15	MR. MAJORS: Okay. Good. Are there any other
16	questions from any of the Commission Members regarding
17	the NOFAs?
18	MR. HILL: This is Matt Hill. Just real quick.
19	I think that if the revenues continue to increase, like,
20	July was a very strong month more along the lines of
21	what was originally projected for the Trust Fund. I

would just encourage the Department to consider whether
or not that extra, that second NOFA in the fall should be
for more than 1.7 million, given the hit that in

particular new construction, preservation took in the
revision. But maybe that's something that you'll be
addressing, I guess, as we move forward.

MR. MAJORS: Correct. As we move forward.

MR. MAJORS: Correct. As we move forward.

Yes, I will look at it, and give it fair consideration.

1.3

MR. GREENE: And this is Jay. I mean, I agree with what Jim said, and we'll -- if we want to change the -- the way we've been functioning, we'll probably make a recommendation to the Commission for whatever additional amount we want to include in the next NOFA.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Jay and Jim, this is David.

A question I have. Does the Department actually have the flexibility once the NOFA is issued, in this case for the 2 million, if you had --

(Telephonic interference.)

PRESIDENT BOWERS: -- that seem to meet threshold and seem to be good quality projects. Could you actually go above and beyond the 2 million that you

1	had posted as being in the NOFA or are you prohibited
2	from doing that
3	(Telephonic interference.)
4	PRESIDENT BOWERS: or do you have to stick
5	to the amount that was posted?
6	MR. MAJORS: All right. I'll start
7	(indiscernible) follow behind me. So right now this
8	current NOFA is for approximately \$2 million
9	(indiscernible). However, if there are some strong
10	projects that are very strong, very competitive, I could
11	see a decision being made to go over by a slight amount
12	original \$2 million. Would you agree, Jay?
13	MR. GREENE: Yeah. We can't fund half of a
14	project. So we can we would look at the quality
15	projects, and the amount they requested, and if we had to
16	make a slight adjustment in amount whether it's 2.2 or
17	2.3, again, we would make that recommendation
18	(indiscernible) the amount and look to the Commission.
19	It's a guideline we want to respect, but at the same
20	time, we want to choose the best projects.
21	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Understood. Thank you.

All right. Anything else on the NOFA before we go on to the pandemic homeless prevention update?

Okay. Back to the Department staff for those updates or City staff.

I think we're looking for the pandemic homelessness prevention updates.

1.3

2.0

2.1

MR. FRANKLIN: I'm Dante Franklin. I'm actually a Human Service Manager with the CAP Center.

I'm speaking for our Director, Angela Whitaker, today with the update on the pandemic homeless project. We have a tentative September start date. We had a meeting today where we discussed the -- the application is completed. It just needs to be reviewed for clients. We currently have almost 900 inquiries from customers in our eviction prevention inquiry e-mail address. And then we're currently working on workflow for staff at the CAP Centers.

MS. EDWARDS: Mr. Bowers, this is Tisha Edwards from the Mayor's Office of Children and Family Success, and also the Interim Director of the Mayor's Office of Homeless Services.

Thank you, Dante, for stepping up and providing the programmatic update.

2.0

2.1

Mr. Bowers, I also wanted to let you know that we have provided a response to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund recommendations that were submitted to our agencies, I think, it's been two meetings ago. So we have provided detailed responses that have been reviewed by our Legal Committee, by our Legal Office, that will inform our partnership with DHCD, the Mayor's Office of Homeless Services, the Mayor's Office of Children and Family Success, and the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. So that information has been provided or it was provided earlier today. I don't know if that has been distributed to the other Commission Members, but we did provide written responses to the Commission's recommendations.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Ms. Edwards, thank you.

And just we'll confirm did that go to -- kind of look back on e-mail here. So did -- could someone let us know who sent that to whom? Would that have gone to all Commission Members or just to me? And who would that have come from? Just so we're looking at the right

1 ||place.

2 MR. HILL: This is Matt Hill. I received it
3 earlier this afternoon, and that's something I just
4 forwarded, I believe, to Commission Members. I attempted
5 to shortly before the meeting started.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Matt, thank you. I do see it. Yes. So for Commission Members, if you check from an e-mail from Matt Hill. It looks like it was sent at 6 p.m. You should see it in your inbox.

Thank you, Matt. Thank you, Ms. Edwards. And thank you, Mr. Franklin.

Any other comments, Ms. Edwards or

Mr. Franklin or any questions, comments from Commission

Members for them on the updates?

MR. HILL: This is Matt Hill. So thank you, first, for this update, and for the very detailed written responses. I really appreciate it. I can tell that you all took a significant amount of time to address a lot of the concerns, and I really do appreciate that.

Real quick just on the first thing that I believe Mr. Franklin said. The start date, you said

2.0

September. Do you have a sense about when in September the program might be operational? I just, only because I know that we're going to start to seeing the failure to pay rent eviction cases starting August 31st.

MS. EDWARDS: We are working towards September

1. Part of the issue, Matt, is cash flow. So our
dollars, the Mayor's Office of Children and Family

Success, which is the State CSBG dollars, are the first
dollars in. So we are providing the first million. And
so part of it is getting the State to release our million
dollar contribution. And they have to go through a

similar -- our grant has been approved, but it has to
move through the desk of the various folks working at the
State.

The MOH money, MOHS money, the three million that is coming from the Mayor's Office of Homeless

Services is reimbursable. So that cannot be -- we have to, you know, we have to actually pay landlords, and then submit reimbursement through the Mayor's Office of Homeless Services. And then the Affordable Housing Trust Fund money is last money in, right? So we have said that

we want to use the Affordable Housing Trust Fund dollars.

It's the most flexible dollars in the pool. So those are

dollars for specific types of clients that federal

So our goal is September 1. From a staffing
perspective, we're ready. From an infrastructure
perspective that we are ready. The MOU between all the
parties is scheduled to go to the Board of Estimates on

dollars cannot meet those clients need.

4

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

September 2nd.

And, again, we could begin accepting applications on September 1st, but we are working with the State to make sure that we have at least a million in the bank day one to be able to start processing those checks. So that is something the State understands the urgency. They've been a great partner. Every day we're talking about how we can get this money moved as quickly as possible. But the goal is September 1 or very soon thereafter. It's really just making sure that we have money in the bank so we can write checks immediately for folks who qualify for the program.

MR. HILL: Thank you. And just real quick to

54

(indiscernible) a little bit. The CDBG CV funds that I 1 2 understand that the Department was using for the 3 temporary rent support, is that in addition to the funds you mentioned, you mentioned about three million from 4 5 MOHS, three million from the Trust Fund, one million from 6 the State. Is there an additional amount from the CDBG 7 CV that's anticipated? 8 MS. EDWARDS: So we are still -- remember the what I would call the DHCD's Temporary Assistance Program 9 10 was kind of the first program. There are still 11 applications in that queue. I think that there are about 12 a thousand applications that are working through that 13 process, which is very -- which is separate from ours. 14 Once they clear that pipeline, then there is an 15 opportunity for any reserves to be moved to the more 16 formal sustainable program. But because they have not 17 gone through all of those applications yet, we don't have 18 a clear calculation of whether there will be dollars that

MR. HILL: Great. Thank you. And I just had a couple of quick comments on the written response. I

we will be able to move into the more permanent program.

19

20

21

don't want to dominate the agenda, if other folks want to jump in.

2.0

2.1

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Any other Commission Members with comments, questions, before we go back to Matt on this?

Okay, Matt, keep going my friend.

MR. HILL: Sure. And this is mostly just to let folks, who may be listening or watching, I don't know if there are any people out there, but assuming that there are, I want to say just thank you, and make people aware of the fact that the CAP Centers are going to have significant language access for this application in English, Spanish, French, and then using language lines to be able to assist with whatever language needs.

Having a paper application option is fantastic. And so thank you. That's great. Because of the vulnerable populations they're working with.

One thing that maybe we could come back to at some point. I don't know if it's tonight. But financial assistance for folks in tenant holding over and breach of lease cases. I know we've talked a little bit about this

before, but I know just in my practice right now because
of the unique circumstances of the pandemic in particular
we're seeing a lot of tenant holding over eviction cases
where the real reason that the landlord is attempting to
terminate the tenancy is because of the lack of payment
and because of the way Governor Hogan's Executive Order
is structured, and other the lack of defenses in
tenant holding over cases, landlords are using this as
kind of a loophole for what are really essentially
failure to pay rent cases. And I know in the response I
see here that that's not something that the CAP Centers
are prepared to work on at the moment. But I would just
like to say that if possible, for instance, if a tenant
was able to negotiate some sort of payment or a plan
where the CAP Centers could provide some amount of money
provide some amount of money if the landlord would
drop the case, that to me would be a workable way to
address these issues.

So I just wanted to throw that out there. I think that making it clear that the money from the Trust Fund could be used for folks who are not necessarily

57

documented is really important, and I really appreciate 1 2 that. Providing for relocation assistance when necessary 3 is incredibly important. Being more flexible with the licensing requirement as you all agreed to do is 4 5 fantastic, and would be good news to many of my clients. 6 I'd love to come back and revisit the discussion of how 7 these funds could work out of an escrow context because I do think that's important, but I don't want to belabor 9 the point right now. Providing a tentative cap of up to 10 \$8,250 is very helpful. And I can already think of a few 11 clients, who are really facing the end of the rope, and 12 that's going to be fantastic. 13 So I don't want to belabor these points, but 14 just I really want to thank you for taking the feedback, and addressing some of these concerns, and I hope to 15 16 continue working on a few of these other issues going 17 forward.

MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Matt. And the thing I would like to say to you is that we're in this for the long term. The reason that we have offered the CAP Centers as the program manager because of the

18

19

2.0

21

1 infrastructure and the ability for us to create a long-2 term solution for addressing these types of situations.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

So to your point, I think that we're going to learn a lot. I appreciate your feedback and advocacy. We consider the Commission to be a partner. And one of the things that's required in the MOU is that we do have to establish an oversight committee. We will be providing regular data updates to all of our funders, including the Commission. And as we learn more about what the need is, and as long as the dollars are there, and that we can operate within the parameters of the grantor, and as you know the State, the federal and the Affordable Housing Trust all have different rules. as long as the dollars are there, and we can meet the parameters that we have to operate in, we want to continue to -- for this program to evolve, and we want it to meet the needs of the City. And so I -- we're very excited about it. We think this is a great thing for Baltimore. The Mayor is actively looking for other resources to contribute to this program. So I anticipate that we will be in lots of conversations, Matt, where we

will continue to grow this program out, learn from it, and meet the needs that you are identifying.

1.3

2.0

2.1

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Ms. Edwards, thank you so much. Really appreciate it, and echo the thanks very much for the spirit in which you all have been working with us and folks on the Commission and other stakeholders in the community. So thank you for that.

We'll go back to departmental staff. I think now is for any updates on the filling of the two empty Commission slots. I think we had some update last meeting. Want to see if there is any update on that.

MS. FREED: So we're working on Mr. Jones' nomination. He's -- we're taking the first steps this evening. There is a packet of information that I'll be e-mailing him that he needs to return to the Mayor's Office. Following the Mayor's review of that information, the Mayor makes a determination whether to send a formal nomination letter. And the formal nomination letter is what starts the process. Following that nomination letter, the executive appointment nomination would be introduced at City Council, and then

1	approved by the Council as just the same way everybody
2	else on the Commission was.
3	PRESIDENT BOWERS: And, Stacy, can you remind
4	us for which slot that Mr. Jones
5	MS. FREED: The Homeless Services Board
6	representative.
7	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Thank you. Okay. And for
8	the other position, any update on the other slot?
9	MS. FREED: Jay, do you want me to do that or
10	do you?
11	MR. GREENE: Right now we have no real
12	movement. We'll have a discussion with Acting
13	Commissioner Kennedy. And it's a real estate slot that
14	should be filled. And so we'll have a conversation with
15	her, and be forwarding a nomination, a recommendation for
16	the nomination shortly.
17	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Great. Thank you all.
18	Appreciate that.
19	And, finally, just the updates on the Annual
20	Report. I think that may have been coming from Jim. Any

21 | news there?

1	MR. MAJORS: There is I will say that I
2	think we have come to a resolution as to how we're going
3	to handle it. Without going into all of the back story
4	on this, it we will be contracting with an outside
5	firm to prepare the report. We've been in conversations
6	with our Budget Department, and also the Department of
7	Audits. We should have more to report on this at next
8	month's meeting.
9	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Thank you, Jim. Appreciate
10	it.
11	Before we move on, any Commissioners have any
12	questions, comments on the last two items that we've
13	talked about, the slots or the Annual Report?
14	Okay. We've come to the point where are there
15	any Stephani, I think may be the one I'm calling on
16	here, public comment? Are there any questions or
17	comments that have come through on the chat function for
18	tonight's meeting?
19	MS. ESTRADA: I do not see any. No.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Okay.

MS. ESTRADA: Well, hold on.

20

21

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) have all organizations that were FY 2019 NOFA recipients received their budgeted funds? Is there any transparent method to guarantee the smooth transfer of funds?

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Sounds like there may be a question for department staff.

MR. MAJORS: Stephani, could you repeat that question again for me?

MS. ESTRADA: Um-hmm. Have all organizations that were FY 2019 NOFA recipients received their budgeted funds? Is there any transparent method to guarantee the smooth transfer of funds?

MR. MAJORS: So in response to this question, we are currently reviewing the NOFA applications that

2.0

we are currently reviewing the NOFA applications that were submitted. As I mentioned earlier in my presentation, we received 10 applications. The Committee has met and gone through the applications. We have come up with follow-up questions that will be sent out to those who have submitted requests for funding. Once we receive the responses back, we will then get together as a committee, rank the applications, and then make a

recommendation to Acting Commissioner Kennedy as to which 1 ones will get funded for this current round. 2 3 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Thank you. I don't see any more right now. 4 MS. ESTRADA: 5 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Thank you, Stephani. 6 Appreciate it. 7 So we'll move on in the Agenda then to other 8 business. Is there any other business Commission Members have? The floor is now open. 10 MS. GUTHRIE: Yes. This is Tisha Guthrie, and 11 I would like to reiterate, initiate a conversation around 12 the resolution -- proposed resolution that was circulated 1.3 and submitted to the fellow Commissioners around 14 transparency and transitioning and termination of the --15 of Michael Braverman. I'm hoping that all received the 16 document, and had an opportunity to review it. 17 PRESIDENT BOWERS: And, one comment. 18 Ms. Guthrie, thank you for flagging that for folks that 19 you had sent that out. I think, hopefully, people got 2.0 versions to make sure they could actually read it. I

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

think there has been some comment before. I'm going to

2.1

ask if department staff has something about the ability to do formal resolutions or not. Is there someone from the department, and whether there's a different path?

And then before we even get into the substance of the actual document itself secondly. First, just wanted to ask are we allowed to do formal resolutions or does it have to take some other form?

2.0

2.1

MS. FREED: Jay, do you want to take that or do you want -- who do you -- Jay, do you want me to take that or do you want to answer?

MR. GREENE: Please answer, Stacy.

MS. FREED: So we did. We've had conversations with the City Law Department, and the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, like all other City boards and commissions, are considered parts of an agency. Agencies in and of themselves are not able to issue resolutions. That's a function only available to the Mayor and City Council. You can get a letter of support to the Mayor. You can ask to meet with the Mayor. But the Mayor in and of itself the Commission cannot pass a formal resolution.

MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. Thank you for that

information and clarification. I would like to move forward with proposing that the Commission ask in whatever form we deem appropriate for a clarification for transparency, and also detailed plan as to moving forward. I am very clear and -- for myself, and quite certain that the rest of the Commission is very welcoming of the Acting Commissioner Kennedy, and I'm quite sure that the seats taken will be appropriately utilized, will be working forward in the hard work that we have all dedicated to, to ensure that the money that has been fought for will be optimized to prayerfully secure sustainable affordable housing for those who are most at What I do think we also need to be mindful of is need. that the positions we hold, we are here to speak and to stand for those who are most vulnerable, and for the Baltimore City residents. Decisions that are made that affect this level of leadership should not be made I believe that we are deserving of an haphazardly. explanation and, again, a detailed plan as to how we are to move forward. If (indiscernible) will be in a different direction, I believe that we are deserving of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

an explanation there. So whether we coalesce and put
together a letter that will be submitted to the Mayor,
however we -- whatever that looks like, I submit to the
Commission that we do so, and we do so in a very timely
fashion.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: And, Ms. Guthrie, are you

PRESIDENT BOWERS: And, Ms. Guthrie, are you making a formal motion on that request?

MS. GUTHRIE: Yes, I am.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Okay. So the motion has been made by Ms. Guthrie. Is there a second on that motion?

MS. JOYNES: I second.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: That's Ms. Joynes. So it's been moved by Ms. Guthrie and seconded by Ms. Joynes.

Is there a discussion? The floor is open now for a discussion on the motion.

MR. HILL: Yeah, I do. This is Matt. I support the motion. I am very concerned. I think that any time you have a -- first off let me just say I'm very, I'm excited that Acting Commissioner Kennedy is taking this role. Welcome her. Look forward to working

with her. This is no reflection on her whatsoever. I've
heard nothing but excellent things from my colleagues.

And so I want to make that very, very clear.

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

At the same time, there is the -- the problem here is the process, and the lack of transparency with the sudden termination of the Commissioner Braverman in the middle of a pandemic, following on the heels of the termination of Jerry and Anthony from the Mayor's Office of Homeless Services in the middle of pandemic. addition, to the termination of the Director of the Office of Civil Rights and Equity in the middle of a pandemic. All without explanation; all very suddenly. And I think it's difficult for any organization to endure and function well with that kind of upheaval in leadership. And so I am very concerned, and I think just as my role as a Commission Member, I feel obligated to say that we need some transparency around this, and we need some understanding about how these departments are going to be able to function at the level that we've all planned and advised, and helped them with; particularly again because we are in the middle of such a crisis.

1 | And so I support the motion.

2 PRESIDENT BOWERS: Other Commission Members,

3 | comments, questions, issues, discussion?

4 MS. KIMBALL: I'd like to say this. I'd like

5 | to support this issue as well. I stand with them because

6 | we do need to know exactly what happened.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Other -- thank you,

8 | Ms. Kimball.

7

9 Other Members of the Commission, comments,

10 | observations, questions, concerns, issues, support or

11 | otherwise?

12 MS. KIMBALL: By the way, welcome, Ms. Kennedy.

13 | You are welcomed.

14 PRESIDENT BOWERS: In light of -- so a couple

15 of thoughts that I have. One, the -- appreciate the

16 | update from Stacy Freed about the -- kind of the form it

17 | might have to take. And so, Ms. Guthrie, I heard in your

18 | motion the notion of the letter from the Commission in

19 | terms of the form. In terms of the what might be the

20 | substance of the letter, I'm assuming, but I don't want

21 | to assume, so tell me if I'm right just so we're all

clear, that the substance of the letter would be recommending in your motion would be the language that was in the resolution that was circulated?

MS. GUTHRIE: Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

PRESIDENT BOWERS: And one thing. So one thing I would suggest that if there were a letter that were going to go to the Mayor on this that when I read it, number one, seems to me it would be -- resonate with three and four in particular. Number one seems to be problematic because I'm assuming that it's a personnel issue in that folks at that level serve at the pleasure of. So while -- and I want to be clear. So while I was surprised and shocked at the news, disappointed, and also echo my welcome to Ms. Kennedy, and feel sure she will do a good job, I think number one being in the letter may not serve as appropriate given that folks at that level serve at the pleasure, and that it's a -- would be described as a personnel issue. So I don't know that we have standing to demand an explanation for why a personnel decision was made.

But feel comfortable in terms of three and

four, and even I think two, which we've heard some speaking to number two, but certainly (indiscernible) by even by Ms. Kennedy, but could certainly include that as well. But those are some thoughts I have in terms of -- in terms of it.

1.3

2.0

Are there other thoughts that anyone else has on this pro or in favor of or against or clarifying that anyone wants to bring before we keep moving forward on this discussion?

So Ms. Guthrie, before we take a vote on your -- let me ask if you would -- would you accept or not that as a friendly amendment that if we -- if the Commission decides to do the letter, that we include 2, 3 and 4, but not number 1?

MS. GUTHRIE: Sure. I'm definitely willing to take that advice. The whole purpose of the letter would be, again, for transparency, and to get the information that I think we as a Commission and the population at large deserves. So however we can fashion it to come across as diplomatic as possible, that's fine.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: May I suggest then, and I'm

1	thinking this out loud to the full Commission, that the
2	vote of the Commission, that the what Ms. Guthrie is
3	moving would be a letter from the Commission to the Mayor
4	that would in a material way reflect the language that
5	she sent with the exception of number 1 being removed,
6	but 2, 3 and 4 being included, and the language in a way
7	that drafted in a letter from the Commission.
8	Ms. Guthrie, if you're okay with that being
9	what we vote on, are you okay with that?
10	MS. GUTHRIE: Yes, I am.
11	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Okay. So it's been moved by
12	Ms. Guthrie, seconded by Ms. Joynes. And Ms. Guthrie
13	accepting kind of the friendly amendment of suggestion
14	of the language.
15	Is there any other discussion?
16	Okay. All in favor, please indicate by saying
17	aye.
18	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
19	PRESIDENT BOWERS: Are there any opposed?
20	Are there any abstentions.
21	MR. GREENE: This is Commissioner Greene. I
	FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.

1 | abstain.

1.3

2.0

PRESIDENT BOWERS: So the motion passes to do a letter -- what was indicated. And what we'll do is if Commissioners -- Ms. Guthrie, what I'll do is be in touch with you to work with you to work with you to put this in a letter form that would come from the Commission per what we've reflected, and work to get that out this week to the Mayor.

MS. GUTHRIE: Absolutely.

PRESIDENT BOWERS: Great.

Any other business -- thank you for that,
Ms. Guthrie and other Commission Members for the
discussion.

Any other business that anyone wants to bring forward before we close?

Okay. It is 7:28 p.m. I want to again thank the staff for the Department; want to thank in particular also Acting Commissioner Alice Kennedy for coming and sharing words, and I echo again the support for her that was mentioned by several of the Members of the Commission. Want to thank all of our presenters again

1	tonight, Mr. Cenname and Ms. Edwards, Mr. Franklin as
2	well.
3	So we are at 7:28 p.m. officially adjourned.
4	(Whereupon, at 7:28 p.m., on August 25, 2020,
5	the meeting was adjourned.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	This is to certify that the foregoing
3	transcript in the matter of:
4	AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND COMMISSION
5	BEFORE: David Bowers, President
6	DATE: August 25, 2020
7	PLACE: (Webex)
8	Represents the full and complete proceedings of the
9	aforementioned matter as reported and reduced to
10	typewriting by Free State Reporting, Inc.
11	
12	Poland Thomas Down
13	Roland Thomas Bowman, III, Reporter Free State Reporting, Inc.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	