



Main Office - Department of Housing
264 Harbor Blvd., Building A, Belmont, CA 94002-4017

Housing & Community Development (HCD)
Tel: (650) 802-5050

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo (HACSM)
Tel: (650) 802-3300

Board of Supervisors:
Dave Pine
Noelia Corzo
Ray Mueller
Warren Slocum
David Canepa

Director:
Raymond Hodges

Deputy Director:
Rose Cade

**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (HCDC)**

**FY 24/25 WINTER NOFA* AND
THE EQUITY INNOVATION FUND** NOFA
STUDY SESSION**

MEETING NOTES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2024 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Location: 400 Harbor Blvd #B, CA 94002, Belize/Bali Room
AND 2405 Kalanianaʻole Ave PH – 11, Hilo, Hawaii 96720
Zoom Option for Public Attendance

Please find referenced materials on San Mateo County’s Department of Housing, Housing and Community Development Committee webpage:

<https://www.smcgov.org/housing/hcdc>

Attendees:

- **HCDC Members Present:** Richard Beadle, Ron Collins (Chair), Laura Escobar (Vice Chair), Richard Hedges, Monika Lee, Elizabeth Moreno, George Saman, Nell Selander, Annie Tsai, Steven Van
- **HCDC Members Excused:** Donna Colson
- **HCDC Members Absent:** Lavinia Prema, Jenny Skoble
- **Public Virtual Attendees:** Nicole Moutoux, Candy Rupp, Andrew Buhrmann, Janet Stone
- **San Mateo County Housing and Community Development (HCD) Staff in-person:** Stephen Bajza, Karen Coppock, Tina DiRienzo, Douglas Frederick, Matilda Horace, Yesenia Jimenez, Nila Kim, Eleazar Malabanan, Ronak Moradi, Rocio Nalda, Timothy Ponti, Danita Robertson, Gina Russell, Maryann Sargent, Alejandro Segura, Jan Stokley, Helen Tong-Ishikawa
- **San Mateo County Housing and Community Development (HCD) Staff Virtual:** Anthony Parenti

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions

Meeting called to order by Chair Collins. Roll call conducted and quorum established by Karen Coppock. Chair Collins introduced three new commissioners, Elizabeth Moreno, Nicole Moutoux, and George Saman.

2. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Public comments solicited by Chair Collins, no comments given.

3. Draft Sources, Uses & Funding Category Allocations

Karen Coppock defined the purpose of the meeting and explained the various funding sources and their eligible uses. She explained that funding increases and decreases each year, and staff recommendations on allocations may shift. At Chair Collins's request, Karen Coppock also explained the type of services and uses by application type. Karen Coppock also clarified that Abode Housing Development withdrew their new affordable housing development application, which caused an unexpected shift in staff recommendations.

4. Review of Applications

Capital Projects: New Affordable Housing Developments

Karen Coppock outlined the new affordable housing projects and staff's recommendation to fund Linc's Hill St. project and, instead of funding one of the other three new affordable housing projects, recommended that the remaining CDBG funds be rolled into the Affordable Housing Fund 12 (AHF 12) Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), which will be issued in March 2024. Karen Coppock mentioned that due to the withdrawal of one of the highest ranked new affordable housing projects, and other projects not yet ready, the remaining funding amount available should be added to that NOFA (AHF 12) which launches in 10 days to see if someone is more ready, or the same projects can re-apply.

Karen Coppock provided a breakdown of the Affordable Housing Development project rankings by Department of Housing staff. Full details of project evaluation outline and steps were then discussed. Karen Coppock shared that LINC and Abode had been the highest rated projects and were the two recommended for funding by staff, and further explained that Abode withdrew their application because the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee has significantly lowered the per-unit maximum. These are tax credits, and a lot of projects revolve around receiving a tax credit. The maximum was \$250,000 per unit, and now it is \$174,000 which was enough to have Abodes financial proforma to not make sense anymore, and resulted in their decision to respectfully withdraw.

Karen Coppock explained that with the changes from Ridge's decision to withdraw, staff have recommended moving forward with funding LINC and have the three remaining housing projects apply to AHF 12 and make some modifications to further explain or define their assumptions.

Karen Coppock provided opportunity for questions before beginning the review of the housing development capital projects.

LINC Development Hill Street

Jan Stokley and Eleazar Malabanan outlined the nature and status of Linc's project and reasons for staff's recommendation to fund this project. Jan Stokley explained that LINC Development is a non-profit affordable housing developer. They were selected to develop 37 affordable housing developments through a NOFA by the City of Belmont. The City offered the land to the developer for one dollar, and also provided a \$1 Million dollar loan. The City of Belmont has about \$5 Million dollars invested in this project.

Jan Stokley gave a high-level overview of the development background. She explained that of the 37 units, it includes 1 manager's unit, 18 apartments for people with disabilities, and 18 2-3 bedroom apartments. The apartments for disabilities have project-based vouchers which is significant because their rent will be limited to 30% of their income. Jan Stokley further explained that The Health Plan of San Mateo County has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Developer to provide enhanced case management to the people with disabilities.

Jan Stokley explained that this project meets the County funding priorities due to serving people with disabilities, and also increased their number of the larger, 2-3 bedroom units for families. The project does have other fundings secured but explained that this project would benefit from additional County funding to make their application more competitive.

Jan Stokley explained that the project is already entitled and has already received authority to use grant funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and is ready to apply for tax credits in the second round of 9% tax credits, which should be in August. She noted that these are all the reasons why the project is being recommended.

Jan Stokley moved on to outlining some concerns regarding the project. She explained that the project is small and has an extremely high cost per unit. Because of the project's small state funding, it needs a high state tax credit request.

Nell Selander asked what financing gap staff expect based on recent changes in State tax credit funding. Jan Stokley replied that staff haven't discussed it with Linc or calculated it, but staff believe that the project will need more local funding. After further staff review, Jan Stokley explained that this project will probably need more than just the \$2 Million in County funding. Nell Selander suggested that staff ask Linc to provide that information in the public hearing on February 29, 2024 regarding cost per unit and other finances. Doing so would help clarify what their ask might be for AHF 12. Jan Stokley explained that this project meets the Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) requirements and can meet funding timeliness.

George Saman asked why the unit cost is \$1.27 million. Jan Stokley explained that it's a smaller project which inflates the cost per unit because all extra costs need to be distributed among a small number of units. She explained other cost drivers such as, Architectural, Planning, Financing Fee Application, Appraisals, Environmentals, and Compliance with HUD. Staff agreed to ask Linc and provide more information on the cost structure in the public hearing on February 29, 2024.

Annie Tsai asked if the Ridge project had the same expected challenges with the State tax credit funding changes as the Linc project. Jan Stokley explained Ridge cited the Reduction and Maximum State Tax Credit for their reason for withdrawing, and that new cap would also apply to the Linc project. Candy Rupp from Devine and Gong clarified that the per unit state credit ask came in at \$205,107, and that assumed the award of \$2 Million from this NOFA. This is compared to the \$274,000 for the Ridge project, which results in a lesser impact than of the project to Linc but is still impactful.

Jan Stokley affirmed Candy Rupp's comment. Steven Van asked if they cited the costs per unit for people with disabilities, and Jan Stokley clarified they didn't specifically say that their costs are higher because of the units set aside for people with disabilities.

George Saman asked if it would be wiser to put funding into a larger project, not just a small costly one. Elizabeth Moreno replied that available funds need to be spent, otherwise they will become unusable. Jan Stokley said that the Cities have sites that are important to their overall planning and this site accommodates 37 units, and it's also good to have a mix of affordable housing types. The cost per unit is a consideration because it increases the amount of soft subsidy needed.

Ron Collins explained that cities also have regional needs they have to meet. Nell Selander commented that the project is financeable, it's an important product in transitional neighborhoods, and while the cost per unit seems high, it's normal in San Francisco for that number to start at \$1.2 million. George Saman clarified that he wanted to learn and understand where the money goes per unit cost and why the pricing is going up. George Saman suggested staff look at the fee structure, pay structure, admin cost, and how much of the money is being allocated to the actual project. Jan Stokley briefly responded that the state tax credit has a cap on developer fees, explaining that developers have a max on what they can forecast.

Karen Coppock commented that Housing and Community Development staff can provide George Saman with information regarding costs associated with affordable housing, and review items such as a proforma. Karen Coppock also explained that staff will prep housing development applicants about the financial questions that the Housing and Community Development Committee have.

Jan Stokley ended the presentation portion by emphasizing that the County is not very deep into this project yet, compared to other County projects.

Eden 851 Weeks Street

Van Diggans provided a brief overview of the Eden 851 Weeks Street Apartment project, explaining the project is a 79 unit Senior housing development, and includes a mix of studios and 1 bedroom units. Van Diggans explained the reasons staff are not recommending funding, one of which is that the developer will not use the awarded funding until at least 13 months from the time of the meeting, and the department needs to expend funds in a timelier manner. She also explained that the developer would need a \$9 million award from AHP funding and bonds and 4% LIHTC, which seems unlikely. The potential high rent cost for seniors and the rate of 0.4% Full-time Equivalent/Employee (FTE) for a Services Coordinator also contributed to staff not recommending the project.

Karen Coppock commented that this specific project is a new development, and this is the first time the County has reviewed the project.

Nell Selander asked about the project's potential eligibility for AHF funding. Karen Coppock explained the AHF is handled in March and, if funds remain after the AHF process, an over-the-counter process would be open for projects which have applied in the past 2-3 cycles.

Steven Van asked about the 0.4% FTE for resident service coordinators for a senior housing project and commented that seemed low. He asked what staff would consider an adequate number for senior housing. Van Diggans replied at least 1 FTE. Monika Lee asked what that is based on, and Karen Coppock explained it's based on the population and their needs. Ronak Moradi clarified that for supportive housing, the average is 1 staff member for every 17 units. Nell Selander explained the number may be misleading as additional staff may also play a role in connecting residents to services, and Housing and Community Development staff should consider asking how many full-time staff are on-site.

Annie Tsai asked if there are other contributions the city of East Palo Alto is making that haven't been discussed yet. Staff and the due diligence consultant did not recall any explanation regarding City investment or support. The group agreed that because this is part of an inclusionary project, it is unlikely the city would be open to additional waivers, but staff agreed to reach out to the City for input into the project and their level of support for it.

Candy Rupp confirmed that there was not any explanation in their application regarding fees being waived by the City. Candy explained that because this is part of an inclusionary requirement for a private development, it is unlikely that the City is open to waving fees.

Karen Coppock explains that this project is pretty new to the County, and staff is not too familiar with the City involvement and engagement at this point.

Janet Stone clarified that there was no mention of any city commitment, other than in-lieu fees. Eden was unable to say exactly how much the in-lieu fees would be. The assumption was that there would be approximately 65 units and those fees would equate to approximately \$16 million, but Eden did not yet have the exact number, which leads her to believe that the city has not finalized an agreement with the master developer on how many market-rate units there will be.

Monika Lee asked if this project is available to all seniors in the County, and why she assumed the rent is too much. Karen Coppock replied that the project is open to all seniors in the County, but since the average social security income nationwide is only \$16,500 a year, paying \$975 for a studio would mean using more than half of one's income on rent, which is not sustainable. Monika Lee noted that people have other income, not just social security. Helen Tong-Ishikawa said that, looking at data, units at higher rent and area median income (AMI) levels have taken a really long time to find eligible tenants.

Karen Coppock confirmed that staff will follow up with Eden and the City to understand the City support.

Alta 2809 El Camino Real

Timothy Ponti presented the Alta 2809 El Camino Real project and noted that the project has been before the Housing and Community Development committee twice. Under AHF 10, this project was awarded \$391,666. Under AHF 11, they asked for millions of dollars and, under that NOFA, were not awarded. This is a 51 unit project in unincorporated San Mateo County, over El Camino and Dumbarton at the site of an old carwash. The income band will be 20-50% of the Area Median Income (AMI). This project has set aside units for homeless veterans via the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers.

Timothy Ponti shared that with recommendations the developer received from their last NOFA, they purchased the site and refinanced that purchase with a Local Initiatives Services Corporation (LISC) loan. The project received their entitlements and expect entitlements this month or next. The project, with anticipation of receiving this award (2024 Winter NOFA) the project will then apply for a 9% tax credit application in the first round with an expected award in May 2025. With construction going on into June 2027.

Timothy Ponti explained that the project is requesting \$4,000,000 under this NOFA which is specifically for acquisition. According to staff review, with our due diligence consultants, we have a 15.62% leverage

of County funds. This was used to identify the effectiveness of the County dollars. This also takes into account their projected AHF 12 asks.

Timothy Ponti explained the concerns for this project, noting that the fundamentals of it have not changed significantly. Consider this project as 9%, and a review for a potential lower AHF 12 ask to address their 15% of County funding. The additional concern is the timely use of funds by the project. Timothy Ponti shared that the project completed their Phase 1, which was a non-intrusive report that tells us what is likely to be there. This project has a Phase 2, which examines what is actually at the site. There are underground storage tanks and helps easily identify the scope of Phase 2. With that and the tax credit award, staff do not recommend the project for funding at this time.

Steven Van noted that some units have been set aside for homeless veterans, and asked if those rooms are upgradeable for set asides for individuals who are disabled. Timothy replied that there are 14 units that will meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) limits.

Richard Hedges asked why the project isn't being recommended if the project touches on all of the things the committee is concerned about. Timothy Ponti responded that the issues involve timeliness and the fact that the NOFA has favored large units, and this project includes studios and bedrooms.

Andrew Buhrmann from Devine and Gong noted that if this project is not funded in this round, this would not affect their overall timeline. Andrew Buhrmann explained that the pre-interest burn would be saved by an award now, but would not necessarily throw off the schedule. It would presumably increase their AHF 12 since they would not add this net portion to that request (being AHF 12).

Karen Coppock recapped: not receiving this money right now won't throw off their timeline, it may make them more inclined to increase their ask for AHF 12, and they already said they would ask for \$4,000,000 and another \$3.6 Million in AHF.

Andrew Buhrmann confirmed the recap and explained that they are essentially breaking up their funding asks from the County.

Annie Tsai commented that it would seem prudent for any developer to split up funding into multiple rounds. She asked if staff can apply a condition to the funding award. She remarked that if the Committee only moves forward with Linc and 3 or 4 others are being told no, there would be quite a bit leftover, and asked what the conditions would need to be for the Committee to say yes.

Douglas Frederick noted that the concern for this project is readiness. Every April the department is measured by HUD in using CDBG funds, and it can have no more than 1.5 years available. The Department did not allocate funds in the previous year and cannot wait an additional year for the funding to be used.

Nell Selander noted that the projects are being penalized on timeliness, but they can deliver. She said that saying the schedule won't change is not fair as the funding sources have to align perfectly to get the award. A question was about Alta's past performance on projects and Timothy Ponti agreed to look to past performance (for AHF funded projects) and timeliness, and report back during the February 29, 2024 public hearing.

Monika Lee asked if there would be money left over if the committee rejected funding for the project.

Karen Coppock noted that if the committee just funded Linc, that would allocate 100% of the HOME

funding. The idea was to put any leftover CDBG funds into AHF 12 and see if another project was able to use it sooner than Alta.

Richard Hedges noted that not understanding HUD rules, he would be inclined to fund the project.

Steven Van noted that it would be helpful to obtain better understanding regarding the ground tanks, and if staff did conditional funding, what would the conditions be.

The Committee requested that staff fund the Alta project and include that in the recommendation for the public hearing on February 29, 2024.

Karen Coppock confirmed that staff will ask Alta for more details on the underground tanks and the consensus was to consider what funding conditions would staff recommend for them.

Timothy Ponti noted that an additional ask to the staff when connecting with Alta is to discuss their experience with reporting and requests during February 29th meeting.

Novin 3051 Edison Way

Ronak Moradi presented the Novin 3051 Edison Way project, the project consists of 6-stories, is new construction, and will contain 100 units for people who are considered low-income. She explained that, during staff evaluation, the projects resident services has been noted as an area of concern due to the limited experience of engagement with persons with enhanced supportive service needs, along with a large gap in committed funding, which leads to feasibility and timeliness concerns.

Ronak Moradi explained that the project proposes 51 units to be for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD). These units will be considered Permanent Supportive Housing units (PSH). Services for these PSH units are purposed with the design to support those who have been formally homeless and support them with transitional housing. Supportive services for the IDD units will be provided by Housing Choices, one of their sponsors. The project's unit rate will start at or below 30% AMI, then at or below 60% AMI, and 1 managers unit.

Ronak Moradi explained that the developer requested \$2,000,000 under this application for acquisition. Total project cost is \$52,000,000. It is like \$29,000 per adult. The project is seeking \$14,000,000 from the state Housing and Community Development (HCD) National Housing Trust Fund, the NHTF, and \$5,100,000 from HCD Infrastructure Grant Program (IIG), for a total \$19,000,000. As well as, \$2,500,000 the upcoming AHF 12. The project will need to address the gap funds in 2024 in order to start construction. During this application period they presented a large gap in funding. Although the project is competitive in resources, they may not secure all of these funds. Even with the \$19 million from HCD and the County's funds, this project financing plan is not feasible. They will also not be able to apply for tax credits.

Ronak Moradi shared that the key to achieving the starting construction date in 2025 is to decrease their gap fund in 2024. Also, the project is seeking to support 51 units with IDD and PSH services, but they are serving two very different populations with different services of needs and can potentially become a complicated project to manage successfully and provide services. Novin has indicated they do not have experience with owning and managing this type of population development. Due to a large gap, no commitment, securing PSH services or rental assistance for PSH units, and developer's lack of experience with mix of IDD and PSH population, staff are not recommending the project at this time.

Karen Coppock explained to the Committee that the Staff noted this project recommendation as a no. Linc was the highest rated project, they want to use it for construction cost, which can only be HOME. Which means if staff were to move forward with Linc, they would only have the CDBG funds which a for-profit could not use. Karen Coppock noted that if the Committee moves forward with the project, staff would have to revisit their overall allocation.

Karen Coppock asked for any questions for Novin.

Richard Hedges noted his belief that the project would be a good fit in the community as the neighborhood is a combination of residential and commercial buildings.

Steven Van expressed concerns about the project including the grantee's experience in dealing with the community and asked if staff had a recommendation for the contractor to get a consultant to fill the experience gap. Ronak Moradi replied that staff would be happy to meet with the developers after the 2/29 meeting and provide advice. This is the third time Novin has applied to the County for funding. They need to define their target population and define a few things.

Laura Escobar followed up by mentioning that as much TA as we can offer them after this, especially the developmental disability population. Getting Golden Gate Regional Center support is a big deal, this is a needed gap in terms of population to be served, and she wants to provide whatever help the committee can give them.

Karen Coppock explained staff wanted to loop back to the projects that we will not be provided funding to let them know what some of the concerns were and what was said here in the public meeting. Staff will communicate that information back because we believe that some of these applications can be even better with some additional partners and more.

Affordable Housing Rehabilitation Projects

Coastside Associates (MidPen) Laureola Oaks

Yesenia Jimenez presented the project – fixing windows in an affordable housing complex built in the late 1990s, and noted that staff recommended the project for funding.

Richard Beadle asked if staff knew if they're applying for utility/energy efficiency programs. Yesenia Jimenez noted that staff were not sure, but would ask and report back at the public hearing on February 29, 2024.

City of Foster City Existing Unit Rehab Project

Ronak Moradi presented the project, rehabilitating two City-owned units to prepare them to be permanently supportive housing units, and noted that staff recommended the project for funding.

Nell Selander asked if the City will do the work themselves and if they have done this before. She also noted that compliance with CDBG money for construction is tough. Her main concerns were that the project might become a major logistical problem for City and County staff. Ronak Moradi replied that Foster City had done construction before. Karen Coppock noted that the City currently works with HIP housing and they won't do the work themselves, but will likely work with an experienced contractor. They have a new housing person who is very engaged and conscientious about adhering to required rules and processes.

City of Foster City Homeowner Rehab Loan Prog.

Karen Coppock presented the project and noted that staff did not recommend it for funding, not due to the strength of the application, but to the fact that County discontinued its own major homeowner rehab project due to escalating costs and community impact per dollar invested. The minor home repair component of the project was not recommended for funding as it was duplicative of the minor home repair programs the County was already funding and to which Foster City residents could take advantage of.

Richard Hedges commented that they should consider the project long-term.

Nell Selander noted the difficulty in managing these types of loans in the long-term. She said it was a drag on staff 20 years later, and she hopes they're considering that.

The Committee agreed that from an impact and community benefit perspective, staff's recommendation to not funding a major homeowner rehab project made sense.

Public Facilities & Minor Home Repair Projects

Tina DiRienzo presented the Rebuilding Together project and noted staff recommended the project for funding.

Monika Lee asked what type of facilities they have done in the past. Karen Coppock covered a few of their past projects. Richard Beadle clarified that they had determined which facilities based on cost, and asked if the county would have input. Tina DiRienzo noted that the process will open up in April when they receive applications and the County will have input on projects.

Mercy Housing: Middlefield Childcare Center

Nila Kim presented the project and noted that staff did not recommend it for funding. Staff's main concerns revolved around the possible ineligibility of proposed scope of work (e.g., tenant improvements including furnishings), timeline feasibility, and requirements for preschool-aged children versus toddlers. The applicant did not submit final architectural drawings. Nila Kim noted she had reached out to them for these, but at the time, they did not have architectural drawings completed. She expressed that down the line they might be ready, but they are not right now.

Monika Lee asked if they gave an idea when they expect architecture drawings. Nila Kim responded no, and their drawings may be outdated based on who their rooms are meant to support.

Karen Coppock noted that there were 30 more projects to cover, and recommended reordering project explanations based on time and the committee agreed.

Minor Home Repair Applications

Matilda Horace explained all five minor home repair programs and noted that staff are recommending all for funding, but with a slightly lowered level of funding for the one new project and with conditions for the Rebuilding Together projects given reporting/invoicing delays and the significant increase in both total funding request and the estimated funding per household. Karen Coppock added additional context for how staff decided on their recommendations. The committee gave no comments and asked no questions.

Community Development Projects

Karen Coppock provided an overview of all the community development projects for FY2024-25.

Laura Escobar noted her familiarity with all the programs due to her work at United Way and asked for clarification regarding El Concilio, specifically regarding their loss of CORE status and the specific work they do (direct services vs. referral services).

Alejandro Segura noted that they provide safety net services and more basic human need resources: food pantry, emergency hotel stay, utilities assistance, and other basic needs. Staff agreed to review the application and ask El Concilio for further details regarding their specific work (direct services vs. referral services).

Nila Kim noted that when staff reviewed their application in 2019, they were still a CORE service provider. Their niche is providing services for Spanish-speaking, immigrant and undocumented residents of the County, a segment of the community that not many agencies specialize in or effectively reach.

Matilda Horace noted that the previous year HCD staff did a walkthrough, and the organization still did open door services.

Nell Selander noted that they tried to establish a presence in a way that duplicates city services, YMCA services, and recommended asking HCD staff to investigate further. She advised not discounting how good they are at providing services in Spanish, but questioned where they're providing services and how many people they serve.

Equity Innovation Fund (EIF) Projects

Eleazar Malabanan explained the EIF projects and noted HCD staff recommended four and gave partial recommendations to two.

City of East Palo Alto: Affordable Housing Preservation – Program Guidelines and Community Engagement

George Saman asked what the City of East Palo Alto would do with the funding for the Community Engagement project. Eleazar Malabanan explained that they would hire full time staff to engage with the community and determine ways to more effectively aid them. Laura Escobar noted that a one-time EIF is a good use of funds to get the community to communicate their needs. Eleazar Malabanan noted that this project is a method to address gaps in equity.

Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto: Legal Services for Equitable, Healthy Housing project.

Eleazar Malabanan explained the project and noted HCD staff gave a partial funding recommendation.

Nell Selander asked what the partial recommendation is. Eleazar Malabanan clarified that HCD staff want to move to a full recommendation contingent on a discussion of scope.

Nell Selander noted a desire to support projects that gave legal aid not just at the point of eviction, and that there is duplicative scope in most of the projects and not just this one.

Laura Escobar noted that the two legal projects appear to be continuations of their regular applications, but it seems duplicative.

George Saman asked if the funds could be used for other projects, not just those that applied for EIF funding. Karen Coppock replied that they cannot, only the EIF applicants were eligible for EIF funding. She noted that if one project was not funded and additional funding is available, even though the Department of Housing generally doesn't fund for more than an applicant's ask, staff can let organizations know that more is available and work with them to revise their budgets/metrics to utilize the additional funding.

Annie Tsai asked if it was a bad thing that the non-profits are offering duplicative services. Karen Coppock noted that if one agency is doing something well, unless there's a specific niche or new way of doing it, then overhead is duplicated.

Laura Escobar noted a desire to hear from applicants more about how their projects are different from existing services.

Steven Van noted a desire to investigate some of the projects further, and although that would take a lot of time for a little money, a positive outcome would be worth the financial investment.

Laura Escobar asked if the money had to be spent right now. Karen Coppock explained that HCD staff need to make a decision by March 15th, but ideally all decisions would be made next week in the public hearing.

Nell Selander noted that a recommendation from staff that looked holistically at projects, not individually, would be useful.

George Saman asked if there are metrics of success provided by the various programs. Eleazar Malabanan noted that Community Legal Aid does provide data and that staff would collect data for the renew projects and make sure it was available to the Committee in the public hearing on February 29, 2024.

Chair Collins left the meeting due to time constraints.

6. Next Meeting: Public Hearing

The commissioners and HCD staff discussed a variety of clarifying questions and logistics for the Public Hearing the following week.

Vice Chair Laura Escobar motioned to adjourn the meeting and the motion was passed.