TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

HOUSING AND HEALTH SERVICES

COORDINATION COUNCIL MEETING

Room 1104A
Stephen F. Austin Building
1700 Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas

October 19, 2016
10:00 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

TIM IRVINE, Chair
SUZANNE BARNARD
RICHARD DE LOS SANTOS
REV. KENNETH DARDEN
ELEWOHI NDUKWE
MICHAEL GOODWIN
DONI GREEN, Vice Chair
MICHAEL WILT

I N D E X

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM	3
Approval of Meeting Summary from July 20, 2016	--
Overview of HSP Academy Evaluation and Technical Assistance	3
Update on the National Housing Trust Fund	14
Discussion of Section 811 Project Rental Assistance	21
Overview of Multifamily Tax-Exempt Housing Bonds Program	33
Discussion of Monthly Notifications and Funding Opportunities	45
Discussion of 4% and 10% reductions in State General Revenue	51
Public Comment	none
General Updates/Next Steps/Staff Assignments(s)	58
ADJOURN	58

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. IRVINE: We have plenty of room at the table since our quorum has not shown up. And since we do not have a quorum, this is not an official meeting. We cannot and will not take any action, but we'll provide updates and discuss stuff and if we get out here a little bit early.

So first of all, Kelly would you like to kick us off with an update on what's going on in the Academy and --

MS. OPOT: Sure, I'd love to.

So we finished off the -- oh look, here comes everybody.

(General laughter.)

MR. IRVINE: Okay.

MS. OPOT: So this is Kelly Opot with CSH. And I have been working with the Council on the HSP Academy and wanted to give you an update of what we did last year and then we've renewed our contract to provide more training and technical assistance this year.

And so part of our contracts last year was to do an evaluation of the work that we've done through the Training and the Technical Assistance Program. And just as a reminder, we had nine teams from across the state who came to the HSP Academy for a day and a half in

February of this year. And then each team was able to access onsite and remote technical assistance from CSH to really help them implement and think through ideas of the plan that they began when they were at the HSP Academy.

So it was really working with communities trying to help them understand how to get more service in each housing and what kind of strategies they could use. So it ranged widely on what people decided to do, who they decided to target, and how they decided to implement some of their planning.

But overall it was really successful, and both from the impact that some of the teams had but also the evaluation and how they received the technical assistance. So very positive overall outcomes, and we're really pleased with what came out of that.

So we created an evaluation report, which I believe is in each of your packets that you can peruse, but just wanted to give a couple of high-level highlights from some of that, including the work that we did, you know, some of it was -- and we talked about this a little bit throughout the year, but some of it was working with our Dallas team to help submit comments to their new Affordable Housing Plan that the City Council is putting together, which is supposed to come out any day now.

Also helping some of the teams come up with strategies for how they could create a preference for service-enriched housing. And there was one team that actually should have a development coming online in Coleman in the next couple of years, so really helping them think about the financing structure that they wanted to put together and what they could pull together for services and really helping them think through that actual development process.

And so overall, as I said, really positive along the -- that we met the objectives that we were trying to achieve through the evaluation and that our overall performance measures around technical assistance were high, averages scores in the 3s and 4s out of 4. So like I said, really positive.

Everybody felt really happy with the work that we did, but we also went back to them and said, you know, what were some things that you would like to see next year? What are some -- what did we miss? What could we do to improve this? And so used some of that information to help develop the Training and Technical Assistance Program for this year.

Another thing that we measured were these indicators of change. So part of the evaluation, it's a really short time period to be able to do an evaluation. We'd only worked with them for about seven months, and so we're not going to see long-term outcomes necessarily yet with, you know, units on the ground or something like that, or true behavior change within a community, but we can see the steps of that coming together.

And so part of our -- you know, everybody put together a plan, which it was our big goal, but some of the communities implemented policy changes that will help them create more service-enriched housing. Others are creating special projects, so that includes Corpus Christi and Central Texas. And then some of them also put together a group; they've maintained a group together. So they continue to meet and they're working together to try to continue to implement their plan and really put together some strategies for that.

And just to pull out one of the quotes, you know, one of my favorite ones -- and I think I said this the last time I presented. The Alamo area group, which is San Antonio, started a training series which they have continued and they've -- you know, I get regular notifications of it. And it's all about service-enriched housing.

The Corpus Christi group really helped support a big conference that they had there that was built off of the first academy. You know, these were big events that were coming together, but one of the quotes from the

Alamo area group was, The training helped us improve knowledge about the need for affordable housing in our city and directly led to the creation of important partnerships that will help us achieve this goal.

Like the conversations now between local developers and banks is real and new and really exciting. So you know, they're really feeling some momentum in a lot of these areas.

So thinking about this year and what we've proposed and where we're going with our work, what we heard from a lot of people is we'd really like some deeper dives into the training, really more technical assistance around development and really understanding how we do development a little bit better including financing and how you put deals together. And that's something that CSH has some expertise in, so we've heard that and said we can help you with that.

But also wanting to think about how you can do more landlord engagement with existing units. So how we can go out and find units on the ground, because as we all know, development takes a while and it can be challenging, especially if you're a new developer.

So you know, beyond just teaching about partnerships, we're saying this is how you can go in and approach landlords with all of the resources that you have. So we've developed two distinct tracts for -- the groups invited everyone who was a member of the Academy teams last year to participate. So there were nine teams last year. There will be five this year. Five.

(General laughter.)

MS. OPOT: I thought there were -- five this year that will be participating. And they will all have access to three webinars around either of those tracts, so the landlord engagement or development or they could do all of them if they wanted to.

But we also decided to add in there something that's called an all-access pass through CSH. So CSH has an online training center that has a variety of trainings that you can access at any time with an all-access pass.

So we're using some of those resources to provide an all-access pass to each of the team members and someone on their staff, but also to all of the Council members as well. So you'll all be able to participate and go in and use that resource as part of this Academy training.

And then we decided to put together some availability for remote and onsite technical assistance, but being a little bit more specific about it this time around based on what we learned from last time. So a lot of things that people wanted were specific trainings in their communities. So we had the flexibility to do trainings and work with teams to develop trainings.

Also in some of our virtual technical assistance, we'll be able to do things like create products, create outreach materials, really help people think about how they can get the word out both about their groups or if there's specific projects that they want to do so a little bit more flexibility about how, you know, we can support these groups in implementing their plans and you know, supporting their creative ideas.

There will also be an online learning collaborative as part of this. And so through the training center that will be providing all of the webinars but also the all-access pass, everyone that's part of the team will be in part of this learning collaborative where we can go and share resources and hopefully some of the Council members will go in there and share the resources that they have and expertise for all of the work that they're doing.

That starts this month. And so we'll be sending out emails to everyone this week. And before I leave, I'd love to get all the Council members' addresses so that we can make sure to add them to all the all-access pass work, but would love to hear questions or comments from any of you about how we're moving forward next year if you have any.

MR. IRVINE: You said one thing that kind of triggered an idea.

MS. OPOT: Uh-huh.

MR. IRVINE: You talked about reaching out more to landlords.

MS. OPOT: Uh-huh.

MR. IRVINE: And, you know, we have in our portfolio a little over a quarter of a million existing units.

MS. OPOT: Right.

MR. IRVINE: And, you know, over a series of many, many years, they all have LURAs that reflect the particular services and amenities that they're going to offer that it would be really nice if older existing properties could --

MS. OPOT: Uh-huh.

MR. IRVINE: -- somehow or another have a streamlined way that they could be brought more fully into the service-enriched housing world.

MS. OPOT: Okay.

MR. IRVINE: We might kind of tinker with that --

MS. OPOT: Yeah.

MR. IRVINE: -- on our side to see if something like that could be created.

MS. OPOT: That's a great idea.

MR. IRVINE: I mean I'm not knocking the services that they do provide, but some of them are more meaningful than other.

MS. OPOT: Uh-huh.

MR. IRVINE: And it would be nice if there was just a simple way that they could say, We want to agree to provide service-enriched housing that involves these components, these partners, these attributes.

MS. OPOT: Right.

MR. IRVINE: Boom, approve it.

MS. OPOT: Yeah. No, I think that's a -- Terri and I can work on how we put that together.

One of the other webinars that, you know, we want to -- what we heard so much of from our teams last year was 811, 811, 811. We want to know more about 811. Tell us more about 811. So Spencer and I will be talking about that.

And I know there's some changes coming through the QAP with 811, so really trying to help everybody understand what's happening with 811, how they can access 811. There was really some interest from the local communities and either becoming an 811 community or hosting some sort of event where they could recruit landlords to participate in 811.

So I think that's how we might go with some of our in-person technical assistance for those groups --

MR. IRVINE: Uh-huh.

MS. OPOT: -- that are looking specifically --

MR. IRVINE: Yeah, I see.

MS. OPOT: -- for people and sitting institutions. And so I'm hoping that we can really provide a lot of information on 811 through this process and help them feel like experts in it.

MR. IRVINE: That would be awesome.

MS. OPOT: Yeah.

MR. WILT: Another --

MR. IRVINE: More events, more choice.

MS. OPOT: Yeah.

MR. WILT: Sorry, Tom. Another question about landlord engagement, are you encouraging people to find landlords that are at properties with expiring rental agreements or at market rate Class C, Class D stock?

MS. OPOT: All of the above. I mean a lot of times it's market rate Class C, but also we've looked into -- some of the work that we've done around that is expiring rental agreements as well.

So it's looking for those opportunities where it's either maybe there's an expiring credit on there or some Class C properties or, you know, kind of other affordable properties where we could go and either with a partnership with the Housing Authority or something like that to provide housing in those.

But yeah, we know. Ideally I would prefer higher level apartments but that's been a challenge in cities across the state, so both.

MS. RICHARD: Don't you have a training that's coming up that's related to Medicaid and housing? What's -- I just got some of those announcements.

MS. OPOT: Yeah. And so that's a separate -- something through the training center. Another thing that our training center at CSH is offering is something called a Medicaid Academy. So that's probably what you're talking about.

MS. RICHARD: Yeah.

MS. OPOT: But we also have some separate trainings around how you can participate in Medicaid, and those that are logged onto our training center website will be part of the all-access pass. So some of --

MS. RICHARD: Okay. So they will be able to access that?

MS. OPOT: Some of them will be.

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MS. OPOT: The larger Medicaid Academy is a whole series of trainings that help organizations who are thinking about becoming Medicaid billers --

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MS. OPOT: -- teach them that, you know, giving them an overview of what it means to bill Medicaid and the process with Medicaid, and then this is the team you'd have to be put together and this is how you put a business plan together and all of those things.

MS. RICHARD: Okay, thanks. Thanks for that clarification.

MS. OPOT: And we do have some communities in Texas that will be participating in that. I'm trying to think; I don't think any of them are part of our HSP teams.

MS. RICHARD: Okay. Thanks, Kelly.

MR. IRVINE: Questions, comments?

(No response.)

MR. IRVINE: Okay. Andrew, come on up to the table. Andrew Sinnott, Drew, oversees our Multifamily Loan Programs, HOME, TCAP Loan Repayment, and most recently, National Housing Trust Fund.

MR. SINNOTT: Tim's right. So I'm here today to talk about National Housing Trust Fund. Since it's a new program that we're going to be administering, I guess we've already started administering it and drafting the allocation plan. But next year we're actually going to make the funds available through a NOFA for the first time with our inaugural allocation of National Housing Trust Fund.

So a broad overview of National Housing Trust Fund, it's a formula grant from HUD to be administered by states. Texas is receiving approximately $4.8 million. It's intended to increase and preserve the supply of affordable housing for extremely low income households, and that's a 30 percent AMI or below.

It comes with a minimum 30-year affordability period. Funds can be awarded as grants, loans, and operating cost assistance. And beyond the income targeting requirement and minimum affordability period, it's very similar to our HOME funds. So if any of you are familiar with HOME funds, it's very similar to that save for the 30 percent AMI targeting requirement.

It has the same commitment expenditure deadlines, Davis-Bacon, environmental clearance, Uniform Relocation Act, all the same cross-cutting requirements.

To give you a timeline of this program, it's a program that was established under the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008. In 2009, funding for NHTF, which is a small percentage of new business purchases from

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, was suspended because of concerns about these two entities' financial solvency.

So we've gone several years now that it's been in existence but that it hasn't been funded. In December of 2014, the suspension on those, the funding for NHTF was lifted. So 2015 was the first calendar year in which we started to accumulate funds for National Housing Trust Fund. Also in 2015, the Interim Rule was established in preparation for the grants to the states in 2016.

Moving forward to this year, this past spring, TDHCA staff held roundtables in Houston and Austin. In July we presented a draft allocation plan for National Housing Trust Fund to TDHCA's Board, which included the Amended 2016 One-Year Action Plan and Amended 2015 to 2019 Consolidated Plan. Those are two documents that we have to submit to HUD throughout the five-year that we have for con plan and every year for the one-year action plan.

After the Board meeting, we received public comment on the proposed allocation plan and held a public hearing. Last month we presented the final version of the allocation plan to the TDHCA Board. After the Board meeting, we submitted the allocation plan and accompanying documents to HUD. We're hoping to hear back from HUD within the next couple of months regarding acceptance of the allocation plan and the issuance of our first grant agreement for National Housing Trust Fund.

Also last month we held a roundtable at TDHCA on the proposed Multifamily Direct Loan Rule. And I have a copy here of the proposed rule which will govern not only National Housing Trust Fund but also, as Tim mentioned, our HOME Program -- and you can just pass these around the table -- our HOME Program that we use for multifamily developments and TCAP loan repayments.

Last week we presented the draft, that draft rule, to TDHCA's Board for publication in the Texas Register. The rule will be published in the Texas Register October 28, and public comment will be accepted through November 28.

Staff plans on bringing the final version of the rule to our December Board meeting and the NOFA publication soon thereafter for applications to be accepted starting in January.

And the part of that rule that you have there that's specific to National Housing Trust Fund -- I mean all of it is going to govern the program, but there's one section in there in the set-aside section where we discuss the National Housing Trust Fund and what types of developments National Housing Trust Funds can be used for.

So on the set-aside section on page 4, you'll see there's a supportive housing soft repayment set-aside.

And that's going to -- that's what we're proposing dictates the use of National Housing Trust Fund in a very basic sense.

So you can either be supportive housing or you can be just a general development with no supportive housing specific services or anything. But you will have to have 30 percent AMI units that are not layered with any other funding sources from the Department, whether they be tax credits, HOME, or project-based vouchers or tenant-based vouchers.

So that's kind of an overview on National Housing Trust Fund. And yeah, I'd encourage all of you to take a look at this draft rule, and like I said, we'll be accepting public comment October 28 through November 28.

MR. IRVINE: One thing I would like to just point out, you know, any time you've got a new funding source, it poses both opportunities and challenges. And historically, TDHCA has been very measured in the way that it stands up new programs and tries to keep them fairly simple, fairly focused.

The National Housing Trust Fund is a little bit different from more stable established funding sources in that it's not a fully predictable ongoing stream. It's, you know, tied to the success or failure of the GSEs. So you know, we're trying to move into this in a very measured, careful way.

There are, under the federal statute, a lot more possibilities than the possibilities that we're specifically pursuing, and maybe as the fund grows and as it becomes a more stable organized source of activity, you know, we can look at layering on some other approaches. But for right now we think that, you know, fitting it into this particular approach is the most efficient and effective way to do it.

You know, we obviously want to minimize the administrative overhead and maximize the programmatic impact, and this is the way to do it.

MR. SINNOTT: Right. And given the funding level that it's at right now, it's at, like I said, it's 4.8 million total, 4.3 once you take out the 10 percent admin. We have the opportunity to do single-family housing with this as well, but we're not going to get into that with this initial allocation of the National Housing Trust Fund.

We're going to focus solely on rental housing and then, you know, we'll see if, like Tim says, it does become more established. The funding levels increase, we may start to rethink and readjust how we implement the program.

MR. SANTOS: So these funds can be used for developers to --

MR. SINNOTT: Right.

MR. SANTOS: -- make rental housing?

MR. SINNOTT: Correct. Yeah. All the programs, HOME, TCAP, Loan Repayments, and National Housing Trust Fund, are awards that we make to developers to develop or rehabilitate affordable housing.

MR. IRVINE: Yeah. Just for background, because we got some new folks in here that may be not steeped in affordable housing finance.

Basically when we finance the development of an affordable development, you know, it's got a cash flow. It's got to cover its obligations, its operating obligations, its maintenance obligations, its compliance obligations, and all of those things. And it's got depending on the levels of incomes that it's going to be serving capped rents.

The rents at extremely low incomes are obviously much lower than the rents at, say, 60 percent AMI. So on a cash flow basis, 60 percent, 50 percent, right in there's kind of the sweet spot for where you are charging rents. It should more or less cover costs of operation. When you get into those deeper rent levels, it really does require a subsidy.

And that's where the National Housing Trust

Fund really does come in through the soft financing method. It's a way that we can essentially take a cash flow burden off of a development so that it can serve extremely low income households.

MR. SINNOTT: Great.

MR. IRVINE: Okay.

MR. SINNOTT: Any questions?

(No response.)

MR. SINNOTT: Okay.

MR. IRVINE: Spencer, Bill, you guys want to come talk about 811?

MR. DURAN: Yeah, talk about 811. My name is Spencer Duran. I'm the manager of the Section 811 Program. And Bill Cranor's also here, and he is the program coordinator for the 811 Program. And his role is essentially to facilitate the communication between the local referring agents that we call them, those that are doing outreach and identify potentially qualified households and they're connecting them with the portfolio of participating properties.

It's been a great start and a great couple of weeks for our program. We have our first move-in that occurred here in Austin, and that's at Trails of the Park. It's a Foundation Communities-owned property. We also had our second move-in that occurred, and that was in Dallas.

And so we're really, really excited about that huge step forward.

So we've really gone from, you know, planning and property recruitment and the training we conducted to having an actual live program. We should also have some more move-ins coming up and also in Dallas and then also our first move-ins in Houston. So we're getting a, you know, pretty good geographic area and you know, the big cities of Texas.

That probably it makes a lot of sense that it would happen that way. But we have trained over 50 organizations all around the state, and we -- our program itself has a good geographic dispersion. You know, we're now operating in eight MSAs across the state. So I think that we're off to a pretty good start.

You know, as everyone knows and we're all fully aware, it was kind of a slow start, but you know, we were only in the Qualified Allocation Plan in the 2015 cycle. So in that respect, we're just kind of following, you know, that progression as the existing properties that we got in the portfolio from that cycle have been trained and understand all of their obligations and how to do the vouchering system.

So all eight of our existing properties have been trained, and their waiting lists are open. And we're doing as much technical assistance as we can to the local organizations that are making referrals to those properties.

Also from the 2015 multifamily cycle, we got 10 existing new construction properties that elected to participate in 811. So from the 2015 cycle we have eight existing properties, 10 new construction properties that are contributing a total of 192 units.

And so as those new construction properties get close to being physically constructed, we're doing -- we're kind of starting the clock all over again with what we did with the existing properties, which is create marketing materials, work with our Health and Human Services partners, work with our local partners to just make sure that everyone is aware of the new opportunity that's out there, because the great thing about new construction is you have a date certain move-in.

So we're trying to give ourselves plenty of time to conduct outreach and marketing, get people on what I guess would be kind of an interest list. While they're waiting for the property to be constructed, they're not, you know, waiting for a turnover; they're waiting for it to be physically constructed.

So we have, you know, more than 10 hopefully qualified households that are ready to occupy those 10 units so that our owner partners have, you know, some lease-up and everything goes really smoothly and we can get that initial occupancy.

So that's kind of what we've been doing with the 2015 cycle. Looking at the most -- the recent 2016 funding cycle that we just completed, we got approximately 21 properties. And I say approximately because there is one that was a conditional award, and I haven't touched base with our multifamily colleagues about exactly if the commitment notice has been sent out yet, if they're, you know -- but about 21 properties.

And of those, two are going to be either giving us previous existing units -- so two of us are giving us previous existing units and then two are giving us current existing units. So we essentially are going to end up with about maybe 18 new construction properties and two existing properties that we didn't have previously.

So this -- the 2016 cycle's going to be a much, you know, longer tail for a lease-up because they're not going to be physically constructed, you know, before the end of calendar year 2016. So you know, we're pretty excited about, you know, how many properties we've been able to bring to the table.

So now it's just a matter of making sure our local service providers and service coordinators are trained and that our properties are trained and everybody has a good understanding of the program.

We're also really excited. We've gotten 27 referrals to the program. You know, I think that we don't have -- I would like to have, you know, more referrals than units so that we could increase our chances of having qualified households on the waiting list whenever a vacancy occurs.

But we think that with our new -- we have kind of a new marketing push. Bill put together some really nice marketing materials. We've gotten a lot of support from our Health and Human Services partners to have contacts with those local organizations. And you know, because of those recent efforts, we've seen a spike in the number of referrals that we've been getting, so we think that, you know, we're going to keep on getting more and more referrals.

And especially as people have seen results from the program, you know, we have, you know, households that are moving into units. And so that, you know, hopefully around the state people will see that success, and it'll just kind of keep building and building on itself.

That's just really it. The big headline, we have our first move-ins, and we have more to come. So I can answer any questions y'all have.

MR. GOODWIN: I just got a couple. My personal opinion is there's some owners out there that ain't very smart, because this cracks your nut on vacancies. It really does.

What is your available unit inventory? And I don't mean they're ready today, but your inventory that you can fill, as opposed to your inventory of clients.

MR. SINNOTT: So we have 27 applicants, so I'd say maybe 20 of those are on the waiting list. And you know, we have 92 potential units that are available, so there's kind of a gap there. But those 92 units aren't physically -- you know, they're not vacant currently. We're waiting in general for natural turnover to occur on those existing properties.

VOICE: And they're not necessarily in the cities where the individuals are.

MR. GOODWIN: That was the next question.

MR. SINNOTT: Yes. Matching units and --

MR. GOODWIN: You also have a geographic issue that I've got 20 applicants on the waiting list in Austin and I've got 50 units available in Arlington.

MR. SINNOTT: That's exactly the scenario we have.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

MR. SINNOTT: So for example, we have, you know, over 10 people that are on the waiting list for our Austin property, but we have actual vacant units in our San Elizario properties, which are in, you know, the outskirts of El Paso.

So exactly. And we wanted to create -- we wanted to bring in as many properties as we could, so we didn't -- on the front end we did not want to be deciding that the property types to bring to the program. We wanted to cast a really widened net and then let the individual households kind of vote with their feet about what properties they want to live in.

And so you know, in San Elizario, there's not as many community amenities. There's not as much, you know, public transportation, sidewalks. The properties themselves that we've recruited, we have a pretty high bar for if you want to contribute an existing property.

You can't just give us your lowest performing property in your portfolio. You know, we have a vacancy rate that you'd have to hit. You have to have good physical inspection scores. You have to have pretty good transit proximity and things like that.

But there is still kind of a mismatch of available units and need. And we may end up, you know, seeing that these qualified applicants are just simply not choosing some of our properties, and that's okay.

MS. BOSTON: One of the dynamics of the program -- and y'all may have talked about this before. I'm Brooke Boston, and I'm one of the deputies at the Agency. And the Housing Resource Center, which of course organizes the Council for you guys, is newly assigned to be under me.

But 811 has been under me for a long time, so I would say one of the dynamics of the program is that when we get the properties to come into the program, we're doing that through QAP primarily. And now going forward, it'll be through a threshold item. But when we do that, we aren't requiring they immediately sign the federal documents that make them a federally held program.

And so if, in fact, let's say we have some properties who come into the program and we're excited and we market it, but no tenant ever asks to go there, we may never ask that property to execute the actual federal documents. So they wouldn't be triggered to have to do like some of the additional requirements.

MR. DURAN: But we did sign a contract with them after they didn't get their awards. It's called the Owner Participation Agreement. So any time over the next 30 years, let's say a new transit line is built or something, a community becomes more desirable to the target population for whatever reason, then we could go ahead -- we can market their property at any time. And then if there is interest, then we can trigger all of the HUD documents and then start moving people into those properties if they want to.

So we try to interject some element of tenant choice into what is otherwise a pretty rigid program design from HUD, being a project-based program. And I think that, you know, a lot of other states kind of sat down with their Health and Human Services partners and designed, you know, the perfect property, you know.

It would have to be basically brand new and they only wanted units that had already had roll-in showers and grab bars and you know, great accessibility and you know, great properties. But they were still making -- they were preempting choice because that kind of constricts the number of properties that are available to families.

And we're serving not just people with physical disabilities who may use a wheelchair, but our target population also includes individuals who have a severe mental illness, youth who are aging out of foster care. They could have a wide variety of disability types. And so you know, we didn't want to just recruit this, you know, specific property type.

So you know, I think the Texas program design, you know, really puts housing choice on the forefront. And in those other states that have tried to, you know, pick their idea of the perfect property, you know, they're leading up at about the same rate that we are.

So I'm not necessarily seeing that there's efficacy in us getting in the way of housing choice even if it is a good intention of trying to design and recruit what we think is the most perfect property.

MR. GOODWIN: That's a good direction. Having worked in housing for a bit -- and this is not meant with disrespect, but when we went to the first 504 and everybody was afraid of 504, there is not a wheelchair brigade that's going to come rolling down the street and overrun your property. You're going to be lucky to fill -- you know, so what you've got to do is have a unit available that if it isn't it's easily convertable.

And over 50 percent of your persons with disabilities are not persons with wheelchair requirements. You've got visual, you've got hearing, you've got the mental disabilities and things like that. And you don't need a lot of special stuff. So that approach of saying, Hey, you know, we can find a unit. We just need to get the people in it.

MR. DURAN: Yes.

MR. GOODWIN: That's an excellent --

MR. DURAN: Cast as wide a net as possible and let people decide for themselves.

MR. GOODWIN: Yeah.

MR. IRVINE: One disclaimer, staff has recommended and we have out for public comment a QAP that does make participation in the 811 a threshold item. There are, of course, different people who are entitled to their different points of view, and, you know, the Board ultimately will make its decision what to adopt in that regard.

And then once the Board takes its action, it goes over to the governor, and Governor Abbott, of course, has the ability to approve, approve with changes, or reject the QAP. So while we fully intend and hope and plan that it will be a threshold item and that that will be a permanent feature of it, it's not something we can absolutely guarantee.

MR. DURAN: Yeah. And from a program manager perspective, I'm excited about that possibility of it being a threshold because that would bring in a wider variety of properties.

MR. IRVINE: A huge number.

MR. DURAN: You know, because not all of our multifamily programs are -- you know, fall under the QAP. A lot of them follow under the larger multifamily I guess umbrella you could maybe call it. So yeah.

As far as the property recruitment goes, we could really bring in a lot more properties each year.

MR. IRVINE: And we've also had some pushback and concern from private sector lenders that are participating in the layering of our financing structures, and we've provided them with some comfort that the 811 program does not mess up their position. If anything, it enhances it.

MR. DURAN: Yeah. So I really think that -- I thank Megan Sylvester, our Federal Compliance Counsel, on, you know, helping me understand, you know, from a lending perspective some of the concerns that the lenders have been having and really helping us have that conversation. And it is just about information.

It hasn't been about any kind of -- I wouldn't necessarily say like a material objection to the program or anything, little fatal flaws or anything like that. It's just been about understanding. And once we have those conversations and once we provide some clarity, then everyone that we've spoken with has been fine with it once we talk and just help everybody understand how the program works.

MR. IRVINE: Cool. David, you want to talk about bond programs?

MR. DANENFELZER: Sure. I'm David Danenfelzer, the Senior Director of Development Finance at Texas State Affordable, and it's nice to be back. I see a lot of familiar faces. I haven't been to one of these meetings in a while, and I still get all the emails. So thank you for keeping me in the loop, Terri.

Yeah, we were just asked to go ahead and give a brief presentation and talk about our bond programs. In particular, I'm going to focus in on the one I operate, which is our Private Activity Bond and Tax-Exempt Bond Programs.

I think most of you know Texas State Affordable is a statewide nonprofit housing finance corporation. We get our authority to issue bonds through state statute. And since 1999, when we became a separate entity of the state completely, for multifamily housing we've issued over $700 million in bonds for multifamily housing. It totals about 15,000 units for acquisition rehab projects and another $80 million for new construction projects.

We really act very similar to any local housing finance corporation in the state of Texas. We have all the powers of a local housing finance corporation and operate as such, but we do have some unique language within our statute that was really the reason we were set off as a secondary statewide housing bond issuer, TDHCA being the primary housing bond issuer in Texas.

And the legislature at the time wanted to see if there was a way to target those housing needs which were not being met by most local housing issuers. And that's not to say that the local housing issuers aren't meeting needs. They certainly are, but the most common properties that we see over the years is really that more than 90 percent of the housing bonds that are issued are in the four largest metro areas of the state. They're in the Dallas-Fort Worth, the Houston, Austin, and San Antonio metros.

And then of that over 90 percent, most of those are for new construction. About 73 percent is that new construction, and the rest is for acquisition rehab. So one of the things that we've done and how our Board has defined targeted housing needs is to look at those things that are not being done.

And we do look at acquisition rehabilitations of at-risk properties. That's one of our primary goals, but we also try to look at properties in smaller urban markets and rural markets. We try to look at senior and service-enriched housing developments. And the last of our four primary housing targets is housing in areas with disaster declarations.

The last one we don't do very much of, I'll admit. Primarily we leave that open-ended because disasters are very fluid, and it's often very hard for a community to react as quickly as they need to to really get a bond project on the ground. But we do leave that open, because we do see that it is a critical need, particularly in areas where very large disasters happen.

We've looked at a number of deals recently in the Dallas area from last Christmas. There were several tornadoes that have touched down in particularly in the Rowlett area. And there's a number of developers looking to target that area right now, and we're trying to work with them.

But for this presentation I'm actually going to try to focus in on the senior and service-enriched housing developments that we try to target. And you know, we don't have a way to simply go out and pick a developer and say we are going to develop this type of housing. We are limited on the way we have to do that through both federal and state statute, and so we do have to have developers come in and we have to create incentives for that.

One of the ways we do that is that we get 10 percent of the state's allocation every year for residential rental bonds. That equates to around $65 million for this year and it'll probably be a little bit more next year. And we target at least 20 percent of that. We hold it in reserve specifically for service-enriched housing and rural housing projects. We also then provide scoring incentives for those types of projects.

And our service-enriched housing in particular was one of the things that, early on when the HHSCC was created, there was a comment by that group. One of the first biennial recommendations of this group was to create more focused scoring, and we went ahead and took that recommendation and added that into our policies. And we've kind of tried to tweak that over time because initially it didn't have much impact, but we are starting to see some impact.

We've continued to narrow it and incentivize it more. And in the last couple of years we've actually had now three applications that are targeting at least households at 30 percent and below. It's not 100 percent of the units, but our scoring requires initial scoring is 5 percent of the units set aside for 30 percent and below, and we've gotten that minimum at this point under three recent projects.

And we're kind of excited about that that we're finally starting to see some real progress on that. I think, as any of you know who operate federal grant or funding programs, finding that right mix and balance of scoring to incentivize the things that you want to get done is tough, because there's a lot of things we want to get done.

You know, I will say I think one of the things we gave up in the most recent couple of policies was we gave less importance on green building and environmentally sound building. But we also feel that a lot of the basic building standards now have improved so much that we're actually reaching a lot of really good quality construction anyways without having to sacrifice these other -- I hate to use the word "sacrifice," but to offset green building with out losing out on the supportive housing because we do think service-enriched and supportive housing is critical.

The last thing I wanted to kind of touch on, you know -- and I'll talk a little bit more about the three projects. But as we look at projects each year and we try to figure out how to manage these targets, the 30 percent housing, up to 30 percent AMI limit is, you know, the simplest way we can target that housing. We do require there also be services in those projects, but when we look at -- but the easiest was to track it is simply stating 30 percent.

But one of the things that we find when we look at that is the cash flow that's available to a property to repay debt -- and bonds are debt -- really gets restricted. In fact, most 30 percent units don't pay for themselves. They will not support any form of debt, and in many case, they need to have additional subsidy simply for operating.

On larger projects, like Gateway Northwest, which was a 2013 award we did up in Georgetown, there is going to be nine units there of extremely low income housing. But we did have a very motivated builder and developer who also will receive some Section 8 rental vouchers for that property and be able to subsidize those rents that way.

The two most recent ones we've had is an aq/ rehab project up in Dallas. It's a portfolio project. There's two 100-unit projects. They're committing a total of 11 units between the two different properties, six in one, five in the other. And we're excited to work with this particular development, developer. They're out of Denver, the Steele Properties.

But they've not only chosen to do this set-aside, but they've been pretty creative in how they're financing and structuring their deals. They have another project which we're still in the early stages and we've induced at our last board meeting, which is Brook Manor, which is only 50 units and it's in West Columbia. So it meets our sort of small urban market area target as well as meeting the service-enriched housing.

But one of the things to remember is, you know, bonds are expensive, and it's not really the bonds. It's actually the lawyers and the financial advisers or as we have to call them today municipal advisers. And a typical project really, you know, typical bond fees for bond counsel are between 75 and $100,000. The municipal adviser fees are around $40,000 on a project. There's a whole bunch of other fees for trustees and for other parties ans legal fees.

But one of the things that traps us in the bond world, particularly for these smaller projects, is federal rules say that only 2 percent of your bond proceeds can be used to pay those types of expenses. So in this particular project for Brook Manor, they are issuing about $3 million, which means they only have $60,000 to pay for bond counsel, trustee fees, all these other fees, but we know that the bond counsel fees alone on that project will be around $65,000.

So finding an additional subsidy that can cover those costs -- the cost of financing for bonds is really critical, particularly for 30 percent and below or service-enriched housing. Finding a way to, you know, take advantage when you can of higher tax credit pricing which we have right now, it certainly is helping the projects we're looking at. But a subsidy source that would fulfill that -- and actually CSH has an excellent paper, a white paper on the use of bonds for supportive housing.

And their primary thing that they look to are projects where either the state or the local housing issuer was actually what's considered a direct issuer, meaning they actually are to a certain extent guaranteeing funding the bonds versus in Texas where we're traditionally local housing finance corporations and in fact, state agencies and us, we're only allowed to really be conduit issuers, meaning we just are passthrough for an investor.

And so bringing down those legal fees and costs are very hard for us to do directly, but it's not impossible. And we're looking for ways to fund-raise for that and see if we can -- and provide a fund for that. But at the same time any other sources out there that can buy down those costs of issuance for bonds or even allow us to swap out bonds for lower cost financing or subsidized financing in the future would be great, because we can issue bonds on a short-term basis which gives us access to the tax credits and then replace those bonds with lower cost funding.

Because we have actually in the Georgetown project -- that was one of the reasons we were able to get those 30 percent units, because the bonds were only issued for a 2-1/2-year period and repaid with very a low cost FHA permanent mortgage.

I'll kind of leave it at there. I can talk all day about bonds. It's what they pay me for.

(General laughter.)

MR. DANENFELZER: Yeah, Michael?

MR. GOODWIN: Dumb question of the morning, why does the bond counsel cost so much?

MR. DANENFELZER: You know, yeah, if I knew why lawyers were paid so well. No, you know, I think the biggest issue is that first of all, you're dealing with the IRS as well as the Securities & Exchange Commission. And there is an enormous amount of complexity in those rules that the bond counsels and tax counsels need to ensure the legal documents are sound.

And you know, when I look at our bond counsel, one of the things we often hear is that they're very expensive, but when we look at what they actually -- most of the time their fees are not based generally on an hourly basis but on a bond amount basis. So it can be really difficult for them to make as much money as they would in the private sector doing private bonds, and that's what I mean is doing larger scale bonds.

You know, if a bond lawyer is doing a billion-dollar deal for TxDOT and helping them issue bonds, they're making far more on a bond -- on a dollar-for-dollar basis, but on a per-bond basis they're making far less. On a housing deal, the per-bond basis is much higher because it's much smaller. We're not issuing a billion dollars in housing bonds; we're doing $3 million or $10 million or $20 million.

But their fees are still -- they're doing the same amount of work and they're getting paid far less on that per-bond amount, but it also means it's a bigger portion of the deal that we have.

And yeah, again, the IRS and the SEC do not make it easy on us.

MR. GOODWIN: I was going to say you're going to make a great PR guy for the bond --

MR. IRVINE: I could actually --

MR. DANENFELZER: Well, if it -- yeah.

MR. GOODWIN: Because I'm on the receiving end of those bonds, okay.

MR. DANENFELZER: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: And you talked about three deals you're doing with the same company. Why would there be any difference in the bond documents between those three deals and so why should the bond attorney charge you three times, if you will, that amount of money when all they're doing is copying the ones they did and changing the name?

MR. DANENFELZER: Well --

MR. IRVINE: There's a guy that practices for years in our firm that issues bond opinions. It is qualitatively quite different from a typical hourly legal advice practice, so even an opinions practice. You know, get an opinion and if it's a well-written opinion, somewhere in there it's going to say this is not a guaranty.

But I think that in the bond world, if you're not a Red Book-approved bond counsel, the issuer will not accept your opinion. So first of all, it's a very limited and frankly specialized group of firms that write opinions that are accepted. Malpractice insurers do look at bond opinions quite differently from the way that they look at just general legal practice opinions.

And frankly, you know, a bond counsel is incurring financial -- I won't say direct liability or responsibility but something that's much more akin to responsibility that aggregates as they approve and issue their opinions on more and more bonds. And you know, frankly, it's a risk opinion.

MR. DANENFELZER: Yeah. And you know, to your point of like doing the same deal over and over again, you know, I would love to do the same deal over and over again, but irregardless there is always a new party. And I often tell people my job is really not to be an expert in bonds; it's in herding cats, because --

(General laughter.)

MR. DANENFELZER: -- literally, you change out one party -- it could be the tax credit syndicator's different on one deal from the last one. And all of a sudden the lawyers for the tax credit syndicator have a whole different way of wanting to write different phrases and different things in a bond document than the previous.

And so we rarely do more than two deals that look even remotely close to one another. We used to always talk when I was at the Department and worked with -- you know, like oh, this is like a typical bond deal. Well, I've really decided that we were fooling ourselves.

There is no such thing as a typical bond deal. There's always a change. The markets always change. The investors always want something different. And so you know, even in this particular case where we are literally doing deals within a couple of months of the other, there are some significant changes in the deal because of location, because the investors will pay more in the Dallas-Fort Worth area than they will in West Columbia, because, you know, there's slightly more risk in West Columbia because it's considered a small urban market or rural area.

And so all of a sudden, you know, different things come into play, and it creates ripples throughout the documents. And we really do depend on our bond lawyers to make sure that those ripples don't end up putting us as an issuer at liability for those bonds but then also to make sure they are still meeting all of the federal and state rules that need to be met.

And I sit on the Tax-Exempt Bond Advisory Board for the IRS right now. And yeah, trust me, I'm advocating to simplify it as much as possible, but now that I'm actually able to advocate for it directly with the IRS, it's not as -- that's definitely, you know, one of those I thought it would be greener, but boy, it's not.

(General laughter.)

MR. DANENFELZER: Well, if there's no more questions, I'll just -- I'll be here.

VOICE: Thank you.

MR. IRVINE: Okay, coming down the home stretch, Monthly Notifications and Funding Opportunities. I believe there's a --

MS. RICHARD: Yeah, I was -- I wanted to -- I forgot to let everybody know that you're supposed to sign in via this handy dandy little --

MS. BARNARD: Oh, yes. I'm sorry. I failed.

MS. RICHARD: Yeah. So these next two items I'll just pass it around if you guys will -- if you haven't done it already sign into their --

MS. BARNARD: So what she's passing around is an iPad that the Texas Department of Agriculture uses to track all visitors and have a record of everyone who's visited the Agency. So we ask that everyone sign in. Is that what you're --

MS. RICHARD: Thank you.

MS. BARNARD: That's what it is?

MS. RICHARD: Yes.

MS. BARNARD: Okay.

MS. RICHARD: That is what it is. It didn't have to be escorted. You just have to use the --

MS. BARNARD: Yes.

MS. RICHARD: -- iPad.

MR. SANTOS: Unless they signed in in the front desk.

MS. RICHARD: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: Yeah, we signed in at the front desk.

MS. BARNARD: Did you sign in at the front? If you signed in at the front desk, you don't need to repeat.

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MS. BARNARD: But if you skipped that step --

MR. GOODWIN: Yeah, we had that piece of paper thing down there.

MR. IRVINE: So even state employees have to sign in?

MS. BARNARD: Yes.

MS. RICHARD: Yes.

MS. BARNARD: I'm sorry.

MS. RICHARD: Okay, so --

(Pause.)

MS. BARNARD: I think they'll let me know, but I'm not sure.

MS. RICHARD: I just wanted on this item to get some input from council members. I wanted to see how many of you have signed up for those monthly notifications and funding opportunities that I send out?

(A show of hands.)

MS. RICHARD: Okay, so a few of your do. What I was wanting to get some feedback on is are they valuable, are you using them, what could I do to improve them? You know, is it something we need to continue to do?

It does require -- in the statute, it does require us to look for funding opportunities for service-enriched housing. So I just wanted to take some time to kind of revisit that process and see if that's something that you guys have an ideas on how to improve those.

MR. GOODWIN: I personally have not used one of them, but I send them to various people when I get them based on what the subjects are --

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MR. GOODWIN: -- where they come from. And you know, it's kind of like pumping the shotgun. If you get one BB and it hits the bird, then you're going to get the bird.

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MR. GOODWIN: And by them being blasted out, at least they're out there.

MS. RICHARD: Okay. Well, that's good to hear.

MR. DANENFELZER: Yeah. And I would say, I mean, just personally I know we internally talk about it at our office, but I think we can do a better job sending you ideas for that as well --

MS. RICHARD: Right.

MR. DANENFELZER: -- so that it's not as -- you know, you're not the only one looking for those opportunities. And we are on a number of listservs, and I think we can do a better job of getting those ideas to you.

MS. RICHARD: Thank you, David, because that was one thing I was going to bring up. I hope that other state agencies could do the same thing. I do try to go find them like from HHSCC or from DAD. I do try to do that, but it would be great if people could send me things that I could include in those notifications.

I've sort of taken the liberty of trying to take on just notifications not necessarily about funding but opportunities to give public comments, you know, where there's public hearings. One thing I wanted to run by you, you know, the biennial plan that we just went through completion of, one thing that Tim commented on is it's just a lot of -- it was a lot of information.

I mean I did a literature review, and I think I had five pages of sources. And so one suggestion and it might not have to be through that same process, but would you all like to see some of the research and some of the articles and some of the things that I look at all the time on a more ongoing basis rather than every two years, you know, getting a lot of articles that we expect you to read and go through?

And I could one thought was to maybe kind of do it through this notification process that I'm already doing where I could find the articles and just send links or is it something different? I could send them maybe --

maybe every council meeting we could talk about some. I'm open to --

MR. IRVINE: I think it's good to have a one-source sort of clearinghouse for information, studies, comment periods, NOFAs, all that stuff.

MR. GOODWIN: It's the same with the funding notifications. You know, I send them to my competitors, if you will, but if I know somebody's deep into affordable housing and there's one of those, I send it to them.

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MR. GOODWIN: You know, we do some of that, but it's not all we do, and the more people out there that get them, the more program's going to do.

MS. RICHARD: Okay, that's good to hear. Any other thoughts, ideas?

Karen, David, on the phone, do y'all have any ideas? Do you use those?

MR. RAMOS: I have.

MS. HOLT: Terri, this is Karen.

MR. RAMOS: I have.

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MR. RAMOS: This is David.

MS. RICHARD: Great.

MS. HOLT: Yeah, I forward them quite frequently to different folks.

MS. RICHARD: Okay. Great. Well, that's really great feedback. I really appreciate that.

Those of you who haven't signed up for them, if you just go to our Services and Programs website and it says TDHCA supported councils, that's where this council's website is. And on the left-hand side, it prompts you to sign up for those.

And so I will go ahead and include notifications from state agencies, the ones that I, you know, can find or that I get from council members. And then I'll start including some of the articles. I think we just mentioned something that you've just -- David, you just mentioned one that CSH just came out with. And so I'll start including those.

And I try to do those the first part of the month sometimes depending on workload. I didn't do it this time because I wanted to see -- this month yet -- because I wanted to see what your thoughts are. But that's super helpful. I appreciate the feedback. I really appreciate the feedback on that. Okay.

MR. IRVINE: My turn?

MS. RICHARD: Your turn.

MR. IRVINE: All right. This is a Discussion of 4% and 10% reductions in State General Revenue. And I guess what I would say is first of all, I do notice -- I watch pretty much every day where West Texas Intermediate is. And it seems to be up nudging 50 right now, which is good.

West Texas Intermediate is the price per barrel for oil that is generated in this state. And that has a very strong correlation to tax revenues. And the Comptroller's revenue estimates will be based on what they foresee coming into the tax coffers. So you know, I think that some firming in oil prices is a really hopeful thing.

But I think that the Governor and the LBB, when they directed us to model these reductions, you know, they're just exercising prudence. They're not saying we're going to do it, but what they're saying is if we don't see some strengthening in the things that lead to tax revenues, then we may need to be tightening our belts to deal with reduced revenues.

You know, it's one of those things where you really need to each the economy as a while carefully and listen to the Controller's periodic assessments.

When we went through this theoretical, at least for now, tightening exercise, I think that you need to understand that it's none of it is stuff we want to do. It's stuff though that if, God forbid, the revenues weren't there, we would be required to do it. We took a process where we prioritized as much as possible preserving direct programmatic assistance.

The TDHCA revenue streams are generally heavily dependent on federal programs and fees. But we do have several programs, including those funded through our Housing Trust Fund, those funded through our Homeless Housing Services Program, that are GR funded.

And we really are loath to cut those critical direct services. Those are some of the most flexible programs we run, things like the Amy Young Barrier Removal Program, the Bootstrap Program, then of course the eight large cities and their approaches to addressing the issues of homelessness.

We have some other smaller uses that are funded through GR. The support for this Council is one of those things. We really think that, for example, the use of some of that GR for the Academy has been a good investment.

And we're really hopeful that we can continue that, but if it comes to a prioritization between cutting direct services and pulling back on some of these other things, then we want to preserve direct services. So it's not a happy thought, it's not a happy discussion, but it's about a priorities.

There are things that we always do to keep our administrative overhead as tightly managed as possible. I talked earlier about when we stand up a program, we try to make sure that it's, you know, a carefully selected menu item, and we try not to create a lot of little boutique programs that would proliferate staff and proliferate administrative costs. We really try to keep things as focused as possible.

One of our large programs we have not been taking administrative funds on at all, but we do incur administrative costs. We are now to the point where we were seeking to have a modicum of administrative costs for the administration of the Homeless Housing Services Program. We basically even cut that ask in half as part of our proposed reductions.

So you know, apologies. Don't take any of it as sentiments against any of the great work that is supported through our GR. It's just when the boss says, Tell me how you tighten your belt if you have to, then you got to tell him how you would. So that's what we've done.

MR. WILT: I don't know if it's a question or a comment, but I was at a Communications Conference last week that LBJ school puts on, and there were a lot of Tim Irvines there, or maybe people that report to Tim Irvine.

MR. IRVINE: Better than.

MR. WILT: Like Brooke.

(General laughter.)

MR. WILT: And there was the LBB Director, and she said she had talked to some agencies. They have gone through this modeling exercise. And she was surprised that none of the agencies that she had talked has contemplated cuts to their procurement contracts, so all the third-party vendors that agencies are working with, that that was never contemplated and that that was something that really surprised her.

MR. IRVINE: Well, with regard to procurement contracts, the overwhelming preponderance of our procurement contracts are not funded through GR. So even if we were to cut those things, it would be impacting predominantly our fee balances.

So to the extent that we use any GR for procured activity, you know, we think that we do a really efficient job. We try to use things like intergovernmental contracts and things of that sort as ways to keep costs down, but, yeah, we scrub our procurements pretty hard.

Brooke, you want to comment on that?

MS. BOSTON: No, I just -- we're not an agency that does a lot of outsourced procurement in that vein. I mean it's pretty few and far between. Like probably one of the few examples is, you know, right now we have an outsourced contract for the Homeless Use Study with one of the universities, and that was procurement.

But I mean that kind of stuff is pretty uncommon in TDHCA, so I could see some of the agencies -- you're right -- I could see why Ursula would say that, but I don't think we're one of the ones where that would be the place for us to find savings.

MR. WILT: Sure.

MR. IRVINE: Yeah. We have historically done some procurements for large studies, but I think that we've tried to build into our staff a little bit more capacity to do that sort of analysis.

You know one of the big challenges of fair housing is in connection with your consolidated plan historically you've had to go through the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, and that's been very expensive procurement contracts.

We ultimately found that, you know, it was lovely to have supported the private sector, but we ended up having to do the majority of the work ourselves just because we're so much more immersed in it and sensitive to it and you know, knowledgeable about it.

So you know, we're really trying to get away from a lot of those procured study-type activities.

MR. GOODWIN: I'll make a comment. I've been surprised, pleased, whatever you want to say, at the level of the staff that has supported this group has done in-house. And going back to the 811, all of that that has gone on, that in-house staff has probably cost the outside procurement people a lot of money because they've done yeoman tasks doing research and publication and things --

MR. IRVINE: Yeah, we've got some --

MR. GOODWIN: -- and quality has been --

MR. IRVINE: -- some real quality on our team. And frankly, it's tremendously efficient. I mean, you know, I think for Terri, my observation is that in large part this Council is a labor of love. It's something she's really personally committed to, and she really immerses herself in it and puts in a lot of time and effort, but she does an awful lot of essential work for the Agency that, you know, I hear you helping people on the phone and handling individual assistance requests.

MS. RICHARD: I enjoy it.

MR. IRVINE: Those guys, you know, they spend a lot of interacting with us, but they also spend a lot of time running a program. But thanks.

MS. RICHARD: Thank you.

Do we have any public comment? Anybody? Karen, David, any --

MR. IRVINE: I don't think they heard you.

MR. RAMOS: No, I'm okay.

MS. RICHARD: Okay.

MR. IRVINE: Since we're not officially convened, we don't need to adjourn.

(General laughter.)

MS. RICHARD: I did have the next meeting January 11 on the calendar. January 11.

MR. IRVINE: Thank you. We will then be in the next legislative session.

MS. RICHARD: Yes. Thank you. Thanks, David. Thanks, Karen.

(Whereupon, at 11:19 a.m., the board meeting was concluded.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

MEETING OF: Housing & Health Services Coordination Council

LOCATION: Austin, Texas

DATE: October 19, 2016

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 59, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Leslie Berridge before the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs.

10/24/2016

(Transcriber) (Date)

On the Record Reporting
3636 Executive Cntr Dr., G22
Austin, Texas 78731