TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

VIA GOTOWEBINAR

July 14, 2020 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS:

LESLIE BINGHAM, Vice Chair PAUL A. BRADEN, Member SUSAN THOMASON, Member LEO VASQUEZ, Member

BOBBY WILKINSON, Executive Director

INDEX

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL CERTIFICATION OF QUORUM	7 7 8
CONSENT AGENDA	
ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS PRESENTED IN THE BOARD MATERIALS:	8

ASSET MANAGEMENT

- a) Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding a Material Amendment to the Housing Tax Credit Application 17288 Forest Trails Lindale
- b) Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding a Material Amendment to the Housing Tax Credit Land Use Restriction Agreement 04302 Sierra Royale Robstown

BOND FINANCE

c) Presentation, discussion, and possible action authorizing the extension of the Mortgage Acquisition, Pooling and Servicing Agreement between the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs and the Idaho Housing and Finance Association

SINGLE FAMILY & HOMELESS PROGRAMS

- d) Presentation, discussion, and possible action authorizing extensions to Neighborhood Stabilization Program 1 contracts and Program Income reservation agreements
- e) Presentation, discussion, and possible action authorizing extensions to Neighborhood Stabilization Program 3 contract and Program Income reservation agreement for Community Development Corporation of Brownsville, Inc

HOUSING RESOURCE CENTER

f) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on the 2021 Regional Allocation Formula Methodology

RULES

g) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on an order proposing the repeal of 10 TAC Chapter 1, §1.21, Action by Department if Outstanding Balances Exist; an order proposing new 10 TAC Chapter 1, §1.21, Action by Department if Outstanding Balances Exist; and directing their publication for public comment in the Texas Register

CONSENT AGENDA REPORT ITEMS

ITEM 2: THE BOARD ACCEPTS THE FOLLOWING REPORTS:

a) Report on the Department's Swap Portfolio and recent activities with respect thereto

ACTION ITEMS

- ITEM 3: FAIR HOUSING DATA MANAGEMENT & REPORTING 11

 a) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on a Reasonable Accommodation Request denial in accordance with 10 TAC §1.1(c)(4) relating to Reasonable Accommodation Requests to the Department
- a) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on timely filed scoring appeals under 10 TAC §11.902 of the 2020 Qualified Allocation Plan 20184 The Heritage at Abilene Abilene 20309 Casitas Los Ebanos Bishop
- b) Presentation, discussion, and possible action on timely filed appeals of application termination under 10 TAC §11.902 of the 2020 Qualified Allocation Plan 20116 Dian Street Villas Houston
- c) Report of Third Party Request for Administrative Deficiency under 10 TAC §11.10 of the 2020 Qualified Allocation Plan for 20177 Avanti Legacy Valor Heights, McAllen

PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS OTHER THAN ITEMS 70 FOR WHICH THERE WERE POSTED AGENDA ITEMS

EXECUTIVE SESSION 10

OPEN SESSION --

ADJOURN 77

PROCEEDINGS

MS. NORRED: Good morning, everybody. Thank you for joining us this morning for the July 13th Board meeting. Before we get started, we are going to be going through some housekeeping items.

So my name is Renee Norred, and I have here with me Nathan Darus. We are staff at TDHCA. And we will be going over some housekeeping for the GoToWebinar. Your screen may look like the slide. The GoToWebinar control panel is on the right, and the view is on the left. The viewer is where you can see the agenda and what is being discussed. The control panel is where you can track your audio controls or enter your questions.

This is an up-close look at your control panel.

During the course of this presentation, your control panel will collapse automatically when not in use. To open the control panel, select the orange arrow.

We will go over the audio and the questions box after the next few slides. When you open your control panel, you can select whether you want to call in to the dial-in number or use the computer's audio. Choose computer audio to use your computer's audio features.

Choose phone call to use your phone and dial in.

Once you fill out the phone option, GoToWebinar will show
you a phone number and access code. Use this information

to call in.

If you hang up and wish to call in again, you may need to wait for a few minutes so that the system recognizes that you are no longer logged in, and allows you to complete your call. If you hang up, and call back in right away, you may get a busy signal or some other error.

Also, if you called in for the webinar with a dial-in number but did not register online, you will not be able to participate. You must use the link to register if you wish to speak. If you are having issues with your computer microphone, you can use the sound check button in the audio control to help troubleshoot.

Public comment for today's meeting can be submitted in two ways. Written statements by those attending the meeting, but not wishing to speak, can be submitted using the question box in the GoToWebinar dashboard. If submitting a comment in the questions box, please include the agenda item, your name, any organization you are representing, and your position for or against.

Also, the web cam. If you would like to use the web cam when you are speaking, please indicate such in the questions box, so we know to turn it on for you.

All speakers, when you want to ask a question or add a comment by speaking, please request to do so in the

question box when your agenda item is being discussed. When it is your turn to speak, a moderator will call on you. All speakers will introduce themselves by name, and any organization they are representing with their comments, and time may be limited by the Board Chair.

If you wish to add a comment by speaking, please request to do so in the question box when your agenda item is being discussed. When it is your turn to speak, a moderator will call on you.

If you have a web cam and would like to present a video of yourself during comments, please indicate this in your request to speak as well. You will be given the ability to share your web cam, but must follow the instructions given to you by the moderator or you will be disconnected.

All speakers will introduce themselves, again, by their name, and any organization they are representing with their comments. You will have up to three minutes to speak, by the discretion of the Board Chair.

Registering a position on an item by those attending a meeting, but not wishing to speak, can be submitted using the question box in the GoToWebinar dashboard. When submitting a comment in the question box, again, please include the agenda item, your name, any organization you are representing, and your position.

1 Written statements other than your position are for or 2 against, will not be read or considered public comment. 3 If there are any disruptions to the Board 4 meeting, such as an internet outage or other technical 5 issues, the protocol on your screen will be followed. 6 TDHCA will issue continuation instructions through an email 7 announcement to all registered attendees of this meeting, a 8 posting on the TDHCA Board website and TDHCA social media 9 outlets. The meeting will then resume at the appropriate 10 point, prior to the disruption. Again, we would like to thank you for your 11 participation. And we will move on to the meeting. 12 13 MS. BINGHAM: Good morning. And thank you, 14 Welcome to the July 14th meeting of the Texas 15 Department of Housing and Community Affairs Governing 16 Board. 17 We will start with calling to order, and roll I see everyone, but just for the sake of everyone 18 out there listening, Mr. Braden? 19 20 MR. BRADEN: Here. 21 MS. BINGHAM: Ms. Thomason? 22 MS. THOMASON: Here. 23 MS. BINGHAM: Mr. Vasquez? 24 MR. VASQUEZ: Here. 25 MS. BINGHAM: And this is Leslie Bingham.

1	here, and we do have quorum certified. Would you like to
2	lead us in the pledges?
3	MR. WILKINSON: Yes, ma'am. Board members,
4	please remain seated.
5	(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was
6	recited.)
7	(Whereupon, the Pledge to the Texas Flag was
8	recited.)
9	MS. BINGHAM: Thank you very much. The first
10	item of business would be the consent agenda. Before we
11	entertain a motion on the consent agenda, are there any
12	items that staff or Board need to pull off of the consent
13	agenda or table?
14	(No response.)
15	MS. BINGHAM: Hearing none, we will entertain a
16	motion.
17	MS. THOMASON: I move to approve the consent
18	agenda.
19	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Ms. Thomason moves to
20	approve the consent agenda. Is there a second?
21	MR. VASQUEZ: Second.
22	MS. BINGHAM: Mr. Vasquez seconds. If there is
23	no further discussion?
24	(No response.)
25	MS. BINGHAM: All those in favor, aye.

1	(A chorus of ayes.)
2	MS. BINGHAM: Any opposed.
3	(No response.)
4	MS. BINGHAM: Great. The motion carries.
5	We are going to move into the action items,
6	starting with Item 3. And I would just remind those that
7	are attending the meeting and wish to speak that as Renee
8	instructed, there will be a three-minute timer provided for
9	public comment.
10	If you wish to speak, it would be great to log
11	into the web meeting, and you can see the three-minute
12	timer. If you are unable to do that, and you are dialing
13	in by phone, if you would set your own timer, we will cease
14	each speaking at three minutes.
15	The first item is Cate. Item three, Fair
16	Housing date management and reporting, (a).
17	MS. TRACZ: Good morning.
18	MS. BINGHAM: I think you are muted.
19	MR. VASQUEZ: Madam Chairman, is there an
20	Executive Session today?
21	MS. BINGHAM: So, we have the opportunity to go
22	into Executive Session? Would you prefer to do that right
23	now? I am sorry. I did not understand that that might be
24	the option. Shall we go into Executive Session, Bobby?
25	MR. WILKINSON: Yes. I think now is a logical

1 time, before we start the action agenda. 2 MS. BINGHAM: All right. Pardon me for that, So, we will go into Executive Session. I think the 3 then. 4 screen will just blank for the time being. And then, 5 Bobby, what time are you thinking that we would come back? 6 It's 9:10, right now. 7 MR. WILKINSON: 9:25. MS. BINGHAM: Very good. So we will try to be 8 9 back by 9:25. Thank you. 10 (Pause.) MR. ECCLES: Can you guys hear me? This is Beau 11 Eccles. 12 13 MS. BINGHAM: Yes. 14 MR. ECCLES: Okay. The Governing Board of the 15 Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs will go 16 into closed or Executive Session at this time, pursuant to 17 Texas Government Code Section 551.071, to take and receive legal advice of its attorney, or to discuss pending or 18 19 contemplated litigation. The closed session will be held via secured teleconference. The date is July 14, 2020, and 20 the time is 9:10 a.m. 21 22 (Whereupon, the Board recessed into Executive 23 Session at 9:10 a.m.) 24 MS. NORRED: Hi. We have returned from the 25 Executive Session, and we are ready to move forward.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you, Renee. We are -- the Board is now reconvened in open session at 9:26. During the Executive Session, the Board did not adopt any policy position, resolution, rule, regulation, or make any formal action or vote on any item.

At this time, we will continue with the action items. Action item, we will start with Item 3(a). Cate, is Cate back with us?

MS. TRACZ: Yes. Good morning.

MS. BINGHAM: Good morning.

MS. TRACZ: Can you hear me okay?

MS. BINGHAM: Yes.

MS. TRACZ: Okay. Great. Good morning, Board members. I am Cate Tracz, Fair Housing Manager. Item 3(a) is about a denial of a Reasonable Accommodation Request made to the Department by a tenant of a Section 811 program, who has requested to be transferred between properties participating in the Section 811 program.

As you are aware, the Section 811 program provides project-based rental assistance for extremely low-income persons with disabilities that are linked with long term services. The Department operates this program in coordination with the Texas Health and Human Services agencies, and through the oversight of HUD. Department staff works directly with clients and these partners to

help determine eligibility and to get these clients on the waitlist at their preferred properties into the program.

In accordance with the Department's approved participant selection round, once a client is stable housed in the Section 811 unit, they are then removed from any other waitlist, so others on the waitlist still have less of a delay to secure their own housing. In general, Section 811 tenants cannot transfer from one property to another without being placed on the properties' waitlist, because each property participating in the program has executed their own property rental assistance contract with the Department, and with HUD, specifying its own number of designated Section 811 units.

In this particular case, Mr. Edward Smith requested a transfer as a reasonable accommodation. Through several phone calls, emails, and communications with Department staff, he was advised to reapply at another property in order to secure a place on the waitlist. After careful consideration from staff of the Section 811 program, their housing section and the Legal Division, all of these staff have recommended to the Executive Director a denial of the reasonable accommodation request, for three primary reasons.

First, a disability-related need for the accommodation has not been provided by the requestor. By

definition, a reasonable accommodation is, in part, a change to a program that would allow a qualified person with disability to fully participate in the program. Mr. Smith has not specifically defined a reason under the reasonable accommodation definitions of how his disability could be accommodated by moving.

Second, fulfilling this request would require a fundamental alteration to the program administration. The Department currently has no contractual vehicle by which a participating property can be required to accept a transfer from another property without the client first being referred from a waitlist. There is no centralized administration of participating properties that would allow the Department to require or even permit another property to accept a transfer outside of the rental assistance contract and the waiting list process.

Third, no preference exists that allows an existing tenant of a Section 811 unit to be placed ahead of others on a waitlist. Even if contractually possible, this change to the program would have to be negotiated with the Texas Health and Human Services agencies and with HUD, and likely would not be allowed to be implemented until the existing waitlist is exhausted.

So, given these three reasons, staff recommended denial of the reasonable accommodation request. And the

request was then denied by the Executive Director.

When Mr. Smith was provided notice of this denial, he asked to be placed on the Board's agenda today, in accordance with 10 TAC Section 1.1, which provides the procedures for reasonable accommodation requests to the Department. So with this item today, staff is recommending that the Board deny Mr. Smith's reasonable accommodation request, completing the process that is outlined in 10 TAC Section 1.1(c)(4).

And before I conclude, I would like to let you know that Mr. Smith has opted not to attend the meeting by video but has indicated that he was going to dial in and listen by phone. And he has not provided any additional written comment.

Also, I believe a representative of the property where Mr. Smith currently resides is available as a resource, should there be any questions, although the property is not directly involved with this Board item, and a reasonable accommodation request between the Department and Mr. Smith, the tenant. That concludes my remarks on this item. Thank you.

MS. BINGHAM: Great. Thank you, Cate. So, I don't see either person interested in making a statement yet in the queue. But we will continue to keep an eye on that. So, we have a recommendation from staff to deny Mr.

1	Smith's reasonable accommodation request. Is there a
2	motion at this time?
3	MR. BRADEN: I will make a motion to approve
4	staff's recommendation.
5	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. I have a motion from Mr.
6	Braden to approve staff's recommendation. Is there a
7	second?
8	MS. THOMASON: Second.
9	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Ms. Thomason seconds. And
10	let's see, while we are waiting, does anybody have any
11	questions for Cate?
12	(No response.)
13	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Renee, I am just watching
14	the queue to see if anyone is showing up with an interest
15	in speaking to Action Item 3(a).
16	MS. NORRED: We have no one in queue, currently.
17	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. All right. If there is no
18	further discussion, we will take a vote on the item. All
19	in favor of the motion to approve staff's recommendation,
20	aye.
21	(A chorus of ayes.)
22	MS. BINGHAM: Opposed?
23	(No response.)
24	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. The motion carries to
25	approve staff's recommendation on Item 3(a). Moving, on.

Thank you, Cate.

MS. TRACZ: Thank you.

MS. BINGHAM: Moving on to Item 4(a), Marni.

MS. HOLLOWAY: Good morning.

MS. BINGHAM: Good morning.

MS. HOLLOWAY: This is Marni Holloway. I am the Director of the Multifamily Finance Division. Item 4(a) is presentation, discussion, and possible action on timely filed scoring appeals under the Department's multifamily program rules.

The appeal for application 20309 Casitas Los Ebanos has been withdrawn. So we will not be taking that action item up this morning.

The one that we will be discussing is application 20184, The Heritage at Abilene. So, the application proposes new construction of an elderly development in Abilene, 60 units. We received an RFAB questioning whether the application qualifies for points under concerted revitalization plan, or CRP, the rule that details the requirements for a CRP to be eligible. And staff found that the documentation provided did not meet those requirements.

The application score was reduced by seven points, pending the applicant's ability to appeal. A comprehensive plan submitted as the CRP is a plan for the

entire City of Abilene. The applicant also provided documentation of Neighborhood Empowerment Zone 1, which appears to be a multi-neighborhood area, four miles long and a mile wide, centered on downtown Abilene.

So, the rule states that plan must consist of one or two complementary local planning documents. So, we have that part. We have the two documents that together create a cohesive agenda for the plan's specific area.

So, this is the part that we don't have.

Further, the concerted revitalization plan may be a Tax

Increment Reinvestment Zone or TIRZ, or a Tax Increment

Finance Zone, or TIFZ, or similar plan. So that would be,

potentially, the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone.

The rule also says that a city or countywide comprehensive plan by itself does not equate to a Concerted Revitalization Plan. The Comprehensive Plan describes multiple Abilene neighborhoods in general.

It includes no documentation of a study or specific recommendations for the original Town South superneighborhood, which is the location of the development site, or any other area included within the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone. So, the rule requires the area targeted for revitalization must be larger than the assisted housing footprint and should be a neighborhood or a small group of contiguous neighborhoods with common attributes and

problems.

The appeal states that the planning process used by the City of Abilene is one that is similar to many cities across the state. And we have -- staff agrees with that point.

A Comprehensive Plan is produced to give it an overview of issues faced by the City, oftentimes with specific geographic areas called out for their needs, which results in future goals and objectives for those areas. Then, based on those initial assessments, specific localized plans or policies are introduced to implement the strategy/goal/objectives. These localized plans and policies, in concert with the Comprehensive Plan, constitute revitalization plans.

Staff believes that the City of Abilene has not completed the process of creating localized plans or policies described in the appeal. The rule requires documentation of a planning process that resulted in a plan document associated with the specific area. In this case, that Neighborhood Empowerment Zone.

Documentation of the planning and public input process was not provided in the application or on appeal that met the clear requirements of the rule, which is, that the problems of the revitalization area must be identified through a process in which affected local residents had an

opportunity to express their views on problems facing the area, and how those problems should be addressed and prioritized. What has been provided is a resolution creating the Zone, and excerpts from the statutory requirements and a map. The map does not match the boundaries of the old Town South superneighborhood from the Comprehensive Plan.

The City Council resolution creating the Zone states that it repeals a 2009 infill development program and creates a new infill development incentive program. Although the resolution arguably creates a framework for the City of Abilene to offer building incentives in this large swath of the city, it certainly cannot be said to be a local planning document together with a consolidated plan that creates a cohesive agenda for the plan's specific area, as required by the rule. Nor does it provide a history of sufficient documented and committed funding to accomplish its purposes on its established timetable, because all it offers is tax and fee waivers.

The appeal further states that because this scoring item has three point components, we also request that the three components be reviewed individually, and that the application receive three of the total seven points for the city revitalization with a solution, which is two points, and the opportunity index items, which is

1 one point. The rule describes the CRP plan as a predicate, 2 and then discusses the mechanics of how many points can be 3 awarded, given certain conditions and documents. 4 In other 5 words, an applicant cannot score CRP points if they have 6 not submitted a CRP in accordance with the rules. 7 Staff recommends that the scoring appeal for 20184 The Heritage at Abilene be denied. I would be happy 8 to answer any questions. 9 10 MS. BINGHAM: Thank you, Marni. Does anybody have any questions of Marni at this time? 11 12 (No response.) MS. BINGHAM: Okay. I know that we have 13 14 speakers. It looks like Sarah Anderson, Jerry Martin, Mr. 15 Ainsa and John Shackleford are in the queue to speak. will entertain a motion on the item, or a motion to hear 16 17 testimony. MR. BRADEN: I will make a motion to hear 18 19 testimony. MS. BINGHAM: Motion by Mr. Braden to hear 20 Is there a second? 21 comment. 22 MS. THOMASON: Second. 23 MS. BINGHAM: Ms. Thomason seconds. All those 24 in favor, say aye.

> ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

(A chorus of ayes.)

25

1	MS. BINGHAM: Great. The motion carries. All
2	right. Renee, we are ready for comment on Item 4(a),
3	Abilene.
4	MS. NORRED: Sarah Anderson. You are unmuted.
5	Can you hear us?
6	(No response.)
7	MS. NORRED: Sarah Anderson?
8	MS. ANDERSON: It looks like I am unmuted now.
9	MS. BINGHAM: Great.
10	MS. ANDERSON: Actually, if possible, could we
11	please have Frank Ainsa. It sounds like we have two on
12	each side of this issue. We were hoping Frank Ainsa could
13	speak first on this.
14	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Renee, they are asking for
15	Mr. Ainsa to speak first.
16	MS. NORRED: Okay. We are looking for him. We
17	are looking for him right now.
18	(Pause.)
19	MS. NORRED: It looks like Frank is muted.
20	MR. JOHNSON: This is the developer Brett
21	Johnson. I know Frank is on. It says he is talking.
22	MR. AINSA: I am. I think I am unmuted.
23	{inaudible] Can you hear me now?
24	MS. NORRED: Yes.
25	MR. AINSA: [indiscernible].

1	MS. BINGHAM: I think the Board members are
2	we are having a hard time understanding Mr. Ainsa. The
3	reception isn't very good.
4	MR. AINSA: I said I think I unmuted.
5	MR. WILKINSON: We can hear you. You are just
6	not clear.
7	MR. DARUS: Mr. Ainsa, can you try again?
8	MR. AINSA: Yes. Can you hear me now?
9	MR. DARUS: It is still coming through, very
10	difficult to hear you.
11	MR. AINSA: [indiscernible].
12	MS. BINGHAM: I think we are going to have to
13	adjust for just a minute and move to another speaker. I
14	know you hate to do that out of order, but we are not able
15	to hear Mr. Ainsa.
16	MR. JOHNSON: Madam Chairman, this is Brett
17	Johnson again. If I might suggest having Frank dial in,
18	rather than use the video conferencing.
19	MR. WILKINSON: Vice Chair, this might give
20	Member Braden some time to log back on. I think he got
21	logged off, accidentally.
22	MS. BINGHAM: Very good. Okay. Let's hold for
23	just a minute. We'll wait. If we can ask Mr. Ainsa to try
24	to dial in by phone. And then we will hold for just a
25	minute, while we are waiting for Mr. Braden to rejoin the

meeting.

(Pause.)

MS. BINGHAM: While we are waiting, it looks like there is another speaker, also. Adrian Iglesias. So, that would be Sarah Anderson, Mr. Ainsa, Audrey Martin, John Shackleford and Mr. Iglesias.

And what we will try to do is, have somebody speak that's speaking either in favor of staff's recommendation or opposed to it. And then, alternate to the other position. So, Renee will probably be touching base with speakers, just to get a feel for if they are speaking in support of staff's recommendation or opposing staff's recommendation.

And we will need to hold anyway, until we are sure we have Mr. Braden back, correct? Just because we need him to take action, in order to have a quorum. Yes. Very good.

(Pause.)

MR. WILKINSON: Welcome back.

MS. BINGHAM: Hello, Mr. Braden. Are you back?

Very good. Oh, now we have bumped Bobby. There is Bobby.

Okay. So, Renee, do we have -- did we, trying to read

through the notes here, have we -- did we find Mr. Ainsa on
a phone line?

MS. NORRED: Yes. We found Mr. Ainsa.

1	MG DINGUAM: Greet All winter to one monday
1	MS. BINGHAM: Great. All right. We are ready.
2	MR. DARUS: Mr. Ainsa, you need to enter your
3	audio PIN, so that you can be unmuted.
4	MR. WILKINSON: Nathan, I believe Mr. Braden is
5	still muted from your end. Would you fix it up, please?
6	MR. BRADEN: Thank you.
7	MS. NORRED: We are still waiting for Mr. Ainsa.
8	
9	MS. BINGHAM: I have got you.
10	MS. NORRED: Let's go ahead and move on to Sarah
11	Anderson.
12	MS. BINGHAM: Okay.
13	MS. NORRED: You are unmuted.
14	MS. ANDERSON: Yes. And I don't know what's
15	going on with Frank. He says he is in, and just waiting to
16	be admitted. And so I can go ahead and go. Unfortunately,
17	my testimony is sort of predicated on the attorney going
18	first, but
19	MS. NORRED: Okay. Sarah, we have Mr. Ainsa.
20	MS. ANDERSON: That is excellent.
21	MS. NORRED: Mr. Ainsa, can you hear us?
22	MR. AINSA: I can hear you. Can you hear me?
23	MS. NORRED: Yes.
24	MR. AINSA: [indiscernible].
25	MS. BINGHAM: No, you're not I can't

1	understand you.
2	MR. AINSA: Do I dial in? [indiscernible].
3	MR. BRADEN: Frank, are you on a phone line, or
4	are you on the computer?
5	MR. AINSA: I am on computer.
6	MR. BRADEN: Yes. It is really a muffled like
7	echo. I don't know. Can you call in? It might be better
8	on a phone line.
9	MR. AINSA: All right. I'll try again.
10	MR. DARUS: Mr. Ainsa, if you don't mind, could
11	you mute your computer's audio. That may solve the
12	problem.
13	(Pause.)
14	MS. BINGHAM: Renee, how about if we do this?
15	Can we not take so I've got Audrey Martin is in support.
16	Adrian Iglesias is in support. John Shackleford is in
17	support.
18	If they are still wanting to wait for Frank, can
19	we take somebody that is in support? And then hopefully we
20	can get the technical issues worked out with Mr. Ainsa.
21	MS. NORRED: Yes, ma'am. We can go ahead and
22	look for Audrey Martin and unmute her.
23	MS. BINGHAM: Thank you.
24	MS. NORRED: Audrey. You are unmuted. Can you
25	hear us?

MS. MARTIN: Can you hear me now? 1 2 MS. NORRED: Yes. MS. MARTIN: Great. 3 Okay. Good morning, Board 4 members, Mr. Wilkinson. I am Audrey Martin with Purple 5 Martin real estate. I am a consultant for the competing 6 application in this region, and I am speaking in favor of 7 staff recommendation to deny the appeal. The appeal presents a lot of documents and 8 9 technical arguments, however this issue can be broken down 10 simply. For concerted revitalization plan points to be awarded, there has to be an adopted plan, and a citywide 11 12 plan on its own is not sufficient. 13 This applicant presented one plan, which was a 14 citywide plan. And additionally, showed that a revitalization zone -- the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone 15 16 was created. 17 But the critical point is that the revitalization zone simply does not have an adopted plan to 18 19 accompany it. And therefore, points were correctly denied. 20 The adoption of the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone by the 21 City of Abilene certainly demonstrates intent toward 22 revitalization. 23 However, intent is not enough under the rule. 24 There must be an adopted plan to accompany the 25 revitalization zone, and there simply is not one. And for

this reason, under the rule, requirements for CRP points have not been met.

Another application has been cited by this applicant as support for approval of the appeal. The applicant's argument is that the other application has the same fact pattern and was awarded CRP points. In the case of the application that was awarded points, there was a Comprehensive Plan and a Neighborhood Empowerment Zone.

But again, there is an important distinction between these two applications. The application that was awarded points submitted an actual plan to accompany the adoption of the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone.

That plan outlined an application process, criteria for qualifying for incentives, and was very detailed. And thus, that application met the rule requirements. In fact, that application's documentation was so clear that not a single deficiency was issued by staff related to CRP points.

The item in front of you today is somewhat an issue of whether a duly adopted Concerted Revitalization

Plan exists that is not a city-wide plan. And in this case, it doesn't, because a plan document was never adopted to accompany the formation of the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone.

Further, the applicant has requested the award

1	of partial points under CRP. As Marni stated already, this
2	is not allowed for urban transactions under the rule,
3	because the baseline requirement for any CRP points is that
4	a qualifying revitalization plan exists that meets the QAP
5	requirements.
6	Staff made the correct determination here, and I
7	encourage you to support staff's recommendation to deny the
8	appeal. Thank you. I am happy to answer any questions.
9	MS. BINGHAM: Thank you. Thank you, Audrey.
LO	Does the Board have any questions for Audrey?
L1	(No response.)
L2	MS. BINGHAM: Great. Thank you very much. So,
L3	Renee, we would need somebody that is opposing staff's
L4	recommendation next. It looks like that would either be
L5	Mr. Ainsa again, or Sarah Anderson.
L6	MS. NORRED: Okay. We will look for Mr. Ainsa
L7	again, and unmute him, if we can get him on.
L8	MR. AINSA: Can you hear me now?
L9	MR. WILKINSON: It is still fuzzy to me.
20	MR. AINSA: I will tell you I don't
21	MR. VASQUEZ: Can someone from staff who is
22	already connected via phone call Mr. Ainsa and just tie him
23	in?
24	MR. DARUS: Mr. Vasquez, I am not sure how we

would even do that, to be honest.

25

1	MR. AINSA: [inaudible].
2	MR. WILKINSON: So is this telephone audio or is
3	this another attempt at computer audio?
4	MS. NORRED: It sounds like it might be a
5	computer audio.
6	MR. WILKINSON: But he dropped off the call,
7	anyway.
8	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Let's just Sarah. I am
9	sorry about this, but I think we are going to need to just
10	move forward with Sarah at this point.
11	MS. NORRED: Sarah is unmuted, and she is ready
12	to go. We are looking for Sarah.
13	MS. ANDERSON: I am unmuted, and I will go ahead
14	and go. Can you hear me okay?
15	MS. BINGHAM: Yes. Good morning.
16	MS. ANDERSON: Good morning. Okay, so good
17	morning. My name is Sarah Anderson, and I am the
18	consultant for the Heritage at Abilene.
19	And we are before you today with an issue, that
20	unfortunately, I and others in the development community
21	predicted would happen back when the CRP language was being
22	developed six or so years ago. Essentially, we have a
23	state level agency dictating what constitutes appropriate
24	planning for a revitalization area at the local level.
25	When the CRP language was originally brought up

all those years ago, I sat in front of the then Executive Director and staff, and asked how they would implement this, with a top down mandate on how localities should undertake planning in their cities. At the time, we were assured that this would not be about the requirements of an individual piece of paper and staff would look at the efforts of the city as a whole, where it would be the narrative in its totality that would help determine whether a city had an area where it one, had been prosperous and subsequently gone into decline, two, that the city had identified it as needing revitalization, three, had undergone planning to address the issues, or four, put money towards those efforts.

All of these items have been addressed by the City of Abilene and were done and articulated in the documents that were presented in the application, through the Comprehensive Plan and the NEZ creation documents. Now we are hearing the staff wants something more specific than what is required by the QAP. And in fact, is really more than what another application in similar circumstances has been required to provide.

I will say that this year, I did two to five CRP applications. I have never been turned down. I am incredibly thorough and strict with the guidelines as we go forward.

In this particular case, I did the added research of looking at the 2019 application for Fain Street, which is what we cited for this year as well. They are using the Comprehensive Plan and the creation of the NEZ.

And contrary to what Ms. Martin stated, there is no specific plan for the Fain Street NEZ. That is why it was so unique. Fort Worth has NEZs that have plans, and they have some that don't.

And in this case, the Fain Street one does not have a specific plan. What it has is reiteration of the statutory requirements that are mainly for a NEZ. But nothing that isn't actually in our application, as well.

While, yes, there were more documents, but rather than restating the statutory requirements, the City of Abilene simply cited them. At the end of the day, a NEZ is a NEZ. It doesn't matter how it was created or how we got there. They all follow the same statutory requirements.

The City of Abilene took the exact same process as the City of Fort Worth in the way that they dealt with the creation of their NEZ. The documentation meets the --

MS. BINGHAM: Sarah, your three minutes are up.

MS. ANDERSON: Can I just wind up real quick?

MS. BINGHAM: Let me just ask. Well, if you

keep speaking, it looks like Frank is trying to get back in 1 2 again. Do you want to use his time, or do you want to let 3 him jump back in? 4 MS. ANDERSON: I want to use 15 seconds and just 5 wrap up and say at that at the end of the day, he says that 6 you can either have a TIRZ or a TIFZ or something similar. 7 And a NEZ is another statutory stage program very similar 8 to those. 9 And simply by having passed the NEZ, this should 10 have been accepted. And I will leave the rest of the time for Frank to reiterate. 11 MS. BINGHAM: Great. Does staff have -- does 12 13 the Board have any questions for Sarah? We are actually 14 going to need to hear somebody in support of staff 15 recommendation next, and then, we will see if we can Frank 16 back on. Any questions for Sarah from the Board? 17 (No response.) MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Renee, do you want to see 18 19 if either Mr. Iglesias or Mr. Shackleford are ready? 20 MS. NORRED: Yes. We are finding Adrian now, 21 and we are going to unmute him. Adrian, you should be 22 unmuted. 23 MR. IGLESIAS: Okay. Can you hear me? 24 MS. NORRED: Yes. 25 MR. IGLESIAS: Okay. Perfect. Good morning,

Madam Chair and Board members. I am Adrian Iglesias with 1 2 Generation Housing Development. I am the developer for the 3 competing application which is located in the City of 4 Abilene. And I am speaking in support of staff 5 recommendation to deny the appeal. 6 In addition to our consultant's testimony, I 7 would like to add that our development team carefully 8 reviewed the documentation that the City had, to determine 9 if CRP could qualify in the City of Abilene, during our

10 site selections, and in preparation for the 2020 9 percent

11 round. We determined that the Neighborhood Empowerment

Zone without an actual plan would not qualify for CRPpoints. Our current competing application predicated on

14 this determination.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Staff and Executive Director Mr. Wilkinson made the correct determination. I encourage you to support their recommendation to deny the appeal. I am happy to answer any questions, and thank you.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you, Mr. Iglesias. Any questions for Adrian?

(No response.)

MS. BINGHAM: Great. Thank you. Okay. Renee, do we want to see if Mr. Ainsa is on a phone where we can hear him?

MS. NORRED: We are waiting for Mr. Ainsa to

1 enter in the audio PIN. And then, he will be good to go. 2 MS. BINGHAM: Awesome. 3 (Pause.) MR. DARUS: Mr. Ainsa, the audio table has been 4 5 sent to you, through GoToWebinar. I give a unique 6 identifier to everybody, and we don't have access to your 7 specific one. 8 (Pause.) 9 MS. NORRED: He is not on yet. 10 MS. BINGHAM: Let's go then, and take Mr. Shackleford, and then we will let Mr. Ainsa bring up the 11 end. 12 MS. NORRED: You are looking for John to unmute 13 14 him? 15 MR. DARUS: He is unmuted. 16 MR. SHACKLEFORD: Good morning, Madam Chair. 17 Members of the Board, Mr. Wilkinson. MS. NORRED: Good morning. 18 19 MR. SHACKLEFORD: Thank you for confirming that you can hear me. I will be brief. I don't want to 20 21 reiterate things that have been said. I do offer this 22 analogy for you. This Comprehensive Plan all cities in Texas seem 23 24 to adopt, I sort of liken that to somebody that writes out 25 their life aspirations of things that they may want to

accomplish. And one would be, you know, they write down they want to start a business. And then the NEZ that the City of Abilene adopted was merely by resolution.

To create it, that would be like if a person says, okay, my aspiration is to start a business. So they actually file articles of formation, Mr. Braden, to form the entity, but then they never do anything. They just -- they file it. And it sits there, and there is no activity. They don't move forward. The person never moves forward to actually do anything with the business.

And that is what it seems like has happened here. There has been very little done, if anything, by the City of Abilene to focus on this particular neighborhood in which this particular project is located. So, to me, that is sort of how I look at it.

I don't think the applicant met the required standard of providing what was needed under the rules. And so I support staff's decision wholeheartedly, and would ask that you deny the appeal. Thank you.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you, Mr. Shackleford. Renee, did we find Mr. Ainsa?

MS. NORRED: We have Sarah Anderson wants to take Frank's time, and then we also have Alissa Carpenter as well.

MS. BINGHAM: Okey doke. So, should we -- or is

1 Alissa Carpenter against staff -- opposing staff's 2 recommendation? MS. NORRED: Yes, ma'am. Hold on just one 3 I think Frank might be back on. Frank is unmuted. 4 second. 5 MR. AINSA: Can you hear me? 6 MS. BINGHAM: Yes. Good morning. 7 MR. AINSA: I am actually clear. Good morning. I apologize for all that trouble. I really can't explain 8 9 it, so I won't even try. But let me go forward here and summarize what I believe are the salient points that you 10 should consider on this appeal. 11 The Executive Director, in his letter of June 12 13 24, 2020, characterized this as a documentation problem. 14 That is on page 1 of his letter. And it essentially is 15 claiming that Overland did not submit adequate 16 documentation to establish a CRP. And it is my position as 17 an attorney, and from a legal standpoint, that the Executive Director and the staff have applied the wrong 18 19 test to this documentation issue. 20 I prepared a detailed letter, and I am sure you have read it. But I would like to point out, right at the 21 22 very beginning here, that the test is not specific 23 documentation. The test is whether or not there are local 24 planning documents that together create a cohesive agenda 25 for the plan's specific area.

And it goes on to state in the rule that a

Concerted Revitalization Plan, CRP, may be a Tax Increment

Reinvestment Zone, a TIRZ, or a Tax Increment, TIF or a

similar plan, like an NEZ. Now, what has happened here is

that the application was submitted with Abilene's

Comprehensive Plan and with Abilene's Neighborhood

Empowerment Zone 1.

And it appears to me very clear and if you look at my letter, especially on pages 3 and 4, you will see that the staff gave absolutely no credence to the descriptions that the Executive Director claims is missing, of the specific area, namely, the area that Overland proposes to develop. And I would like to point out, in that connection, that the City of Abilene itself submitted a letter which was attached to my letter. It is dated June 10, 2020.

And it went into great detail about the local planning documents and the local planning efforts that went into this application. And the City of Abilene very clearly states on the second page of its letter, we would like to emphasize that the Comprehensive Plan and the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone resolution collectively constitute a community revitalization plan with a cohesive agenda.

And as Sarah Anderson has pointed out, on this

application, which goes into the Comprehensive Plan in great detail, shows that all the criteria were met. Public input was sought and obtained by the City of Abilene. The plan describes the area that is included in the application.

And this documentation issue seems to be that Overland may not have submitted what the staff wanted to see. But that is not the test. The test is, did Overland submit documentation that satisfies the test, which is local documents that, together, provide a cohesive agenda for development.

And if you look at my letter carefully, and you look at the City of Abilene's letter, you will see that there is really no issue there at all on having met the test. And so, I submit to you that what has happened here is, the staff and the Executive Director have decided this case based on their own personal preferences, as opposed to the criteria and the rule.

And that is exemplified, I think, by what Sarah Anderson got through saying, what is in my letter. And please, look at the letter from the City of Abilene. They very much establish together, that this is a CRP. And for that reason, I would ask you to grant the appeal.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Ainsa. Nice to finally hear you, too. Does the Board have any

1 questions of Mr. Ainsa's comment? 2 (No response.) 3 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Thank you. So, then, we 4 won't -- Renee, then you have Ms. Carpenter left? Is that 5 correct? 6 MS. NORRED: Yes, ma'am. That is correct. 7 MS. BINGHAM: Very good. Thank you. MS. NORRED: We are finding her to unmute her. 8 9 She should be unmuted. Can you hear us? 10 MS. CARPENTER: Hello. Can you hear me? MS. NORRED: Yes. 11 12 MS. CARPENTER: Okay. Great. Thank you. 13 name is Alissa Carpenter, and I am a consultant on the 14 Heritage Abilene application. 15 And I just wanted to reiterate, again, a couple 16 of points, and maybe explain them differently. 17 requires that you have or allowed two planning documents that together create a cohesive plan. One of the details 18 19 that I thought I read in one of staff's letter, was that 20 there was something about the Comprehensive Plan, not 21 talking about the specific and same area that comprises the 22 area of the NEZ. 23 And I want to point out that there is nothing in 24 the QAP that requires that both of the planning documents 25 speak to the same area. Our position on this, as well as

the City of Abilene's, was that the Comprehensive Plan was the initial planning document that looked at all of the neighborhoods of Abilene, grouped them by what neighborhoods needed revitalization and assistance, and revitalization efforts.

And then, subsequent to that process, the NEZ was adopted. And that NEZ took four neighborhoods south of downtown, including where Heritage of Abilene is located, and create a program that focused on revitalization for those areas.

So, our argument, which we believe is within the language of the QAP, is that we have two documents that together create the planning, the initial planning, and then the solution, which would be the NEZ, in order to revitalize the area. The NEZ is also new. It does have tax incentives, and those are already flowing to the area.

And so, we believe that this does meet the definition of a community revitalization plan and should be allowed by staff. And the points should be reinstated to the application.

MS. BINGHAM: Great. Thank you, Alissa. Does the Board have any questions of Alissa?

(No response.)

MS. BINGHAM: So, Marni is back on, too. Do we have any questions of Marni, regarding any of the comments?

1 Marni, would you like to respond to any of it? 2 MS. HOLLOWAY: I don't. I believe that my 3 comments at presentation covered all of staff's points. 4 MS. BINGHAM: Very good. 5 I just have a question. MR. VASOUEZ: 6 know if it is for Marni or for Bobby. It seems to me that 7 the issue hinges upon whether this NEZ is simply a 8 resolution. 9 Kind of like the day the Governor declares the 10 date TDHCA Day in the State of Texas. To me, that is a resolution. Nice, but it doesn't really have the weight of 11 12 law, or an actual program being implemented. On the other hand, the City of Abilene, how 13 14 after the fact, put in their letter all the key words that 15 we need to hear to make it sound like a true comprehensive 16 implemented plan. Again, can you just speak a little bit 17 more to that? MS. HOLLOWAY: So, looking at the resolution 18 19 that created the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone, and it is on page 100 of your Board book, it talks about desiring to 20 increase economic development within historically 21 22 economically distressed areas and repeals an earlier infill 23 development program and creates this new development 24 incentive program.

And so, what it says is that they may enter into

25

agreements for the purpose of benefitting the Zone, refinance of municipal sales taxes, enter agreements abating property taxes, set baseline performance standards, such as Energy Star programs to encourage the use of alternative building materials. May participate in up to 50 percent of the cost of water or sewer lines, so that would be fee abatements.

And then, authorize those incentives through a Chapter 380 economic development agreement. This further reduces fees, provide rollout containers, waiver-reduced sewage fees, waiver-reduced zoning application fees. This was adopted on May 10, 2018.

What we have is the resolution, a map, and the statutory, you know, statutes behind creation of the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone. So, I can't speak to whether a program was created as a result of this resolution. We have not received any of that documentation.

MR. VASQUEZ: So, what would be the difference between this and a TIRZ?

MS. HOLLOWAY: A Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone or a TIF, a Tax Increment Financing Zone, creates a pot of funds that are to be used within that zone for redevelopment activities that are administered by, generally, a board of directors that decide how those funds

1 are going to be used. 2 MR. VASQUEZ: Okay. I mean, I guess the difference is, there is a formal organization, the TIRZ, or 3 4 a management district, versus just --5 MS. HOLLOWAY: Right. 6 MR. VASQUEZ: Just here is a menu of a la carte 7 items that you can take from. 8 MS. HOLLOWAY: Right. Well, and the other 9 difference is, that it is actually a pot of funds. 10 is actually, you know, a source of funds that is created through that tax increment that are used for redevelopment 11 activities within that zone. 12 The Neighborhood Empowerment Zone is about fee 13 14 abatement and tax abatement, but it is not necessarily 15 investing dollars into the area to be redeveloped. And you 16 know, we don't have evidence of any activity that has taken 17 place under this, I don't believe. MS. BINGHAM: Since 2018? Since the due date? 18 19 MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes. 20 MS. THOMASON: I have a question, Marni. 21 MS. HOLLOWAY: Uh-huh. 22 MS. THOMASON: If this 2018 resolution were to 23 satisfy that, would the competing development also be 24 eligible for those points? Or is that in a different zone?

MS. HOLLOWAY: It is in a -- the competing

25

application does not make use of this Neighborhood Empowerment Zone.

MS. THOMASON: Okay.

MR. BRADEN: I have a couple of questions.

Sorry, I was on mute, so I wasn't able to speak before.

That was me, not you all. So Marni, how does Palladium differ from this Abilene application?

MS. HOLLOWAY: So, first off, you know, I think that discussing another application and comparing them is akin to this applicant appealing a decision on another application. So, I want to be very careful about how I characterize the differences between the two.

Talking about the Fain Street application, and I think even Sarah mentioned, there was a great deal more documentation. And as I recall, we were able to get comfortable with that Fain Street application that activities were going on within this very specific area. There was documentation that there had been investment and work done in order to improve this very specific revitalization area.

MR. BRADEN: That just means Fort Worth has been more successful than Abilene in the last two years. I mean, I am not sure that is determinative of the issue. The fact that there is activity already in one, and not in the other doesn't seem like it answers the question.

And you know, adopting something by resolution has a binding effect. This isn't something that is passing. It is just -- you know, cities adopt by ordinance or resolution. Many, many things are adopted by resolution and the statute probably requires it.

And the difference between an Empowerment Zone and a TIRZ, I mean, there is a difference. But there are statutes that talk about the empowerment zoning having sort of TIRZ powers in certain categories. So, this is nothing like. An empowerment zone is something real and does carry.

MS. HOLLOWAY: I agree. But I would refer back to the requirement and rule that calls for a history of sufficient documented and formative funding to accomplish its purposes on its established timetable.

That part of the rule is there for a very specific purpose. Because in the past, this Board and -- the Boards and through our rulemaking process, we have been very clear that the affordable housing should not be the first thing in. And so it should not be the only purpose of the revitalization plan or the zone.

Which is not the case here, but the affordable housing should not be the first thing in. So, that if the zone had established that timetable, and had documented and committed funding, then it would meet the requirements.

That is the case here. They have adopted the 1 2 There isn't a plan to go with it. And the Comprehensive Plan, while it talks about neighborhoods in 3 4 general, doesn't have that specific plan for this 5 revitalization area. 6 MR. BRADEN: And just the Abilene resolution, it 7 doesn't have a specific timetable or date associated with 8 it? 9 It doesn't. Not that I can see. MS. HOLLOWAY: 10 MR. BRADEN: The rule about affordable housing not being the first thing in, is that actually a rule, or 11 12 is that just the practice and the policy that we have followed? 13 14 MS. HOLLOWAY: That is, I don't remember if it 15 is actually in the rule or not. But that is, in fact, the 16 conversations that we have had around these revitalization 17 plans since day one. That the affordable housing needs to be part of a larger plan that is about the entire area and 18 19 not about just the development. 20 MR. BRADEN: Okay. MS. BINGHAM: Mr. Braden, Renee is letting me 21 22 know that Sarah would like to respond to Marni's comments. 23 And that also, there is another speaker in support of 24 staff's recommendation.

We don't have a motion right now. Would we like

25

to hear the other two comments, and then make a motion and 1 2 wrap up? Okay. All right. Let's do that. So, why don't just -- so that it is still fresh 3 4 with us, why don't we get Sarah on the line first, Renee. 5 And then, we will have Ms. Applequist right after. 6 MS. NORRED: Sarah has been unmuted. Can you 7 hear us, Sarah? 8 MS. ANDERSON: Can you hear me? 9 MS. NORRED: Yes. 10 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you so much for letting me speak again. I did want to correct something 11 that Marni had said. There has been funding flowing into 12 the NEZ, based on the resolution. That was part of the 13 14 letter from the City in the original application. 15 While it passed at the end of 2018, I believe 16 the City provided a letter that said at least \$180,000 in 17 incentives had been done. And so, it has been enacted. There is a program. 18 19 The resolution actually did talk about that the 20 City Manager will -- is the person that does it and gives information on how it will be -- how the incentives are 21 22 given out. But there definitely has been activity in this 23 area and this would not be the first thing going in. 24 So, thank you. 25 MS. BINGHAM: Hey, Sarah, before you leave, I

1	have to so you said so there is in the Abilene letter
2	that is in our packet, there talks about some waiver of
3	fees that is valued at \$160,000. Is that what you are
4	referring to?
5	MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
6	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. All right. Anybody else
7	have any questions of Sarah?
8	(No response.)
9	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Chris Applequist?
10	MS. NORRED: Chris Applequist should be unmuted.
11	Chris, can you hear us?
12	MR. APPLEQUIST: Hello. Yes, I am here. Can
13	you hear me?
14	MS. NORRED: Yes.
15	MR. APPLEQUIST: Okay. Madam Chair, members of
16	the Board, thank you for your time. I very much appreciate
17	this. I think again, the very simple fact here, we are the
18	competing application here, that is currently first place.
19	
20	But the first step is to have a resolution. So,
21	they have that. There is no plan that comes after that.
22	So, you need a plan for this to work.
23	We have looked at this site. We have looked at
24	multiple sites in Abilene. And it doesn't meet the
25	requirement. And it is very simple. You can have a

resolution that is one sheet, and the critical point is 1 2 that there is no application. Fain has an application. 3 They also have an application for incentives, which is a 4 lot different from just having an application. 5 So, it is -- we see it as being very simple. We 6 looked at these sites. We looked at the plan. It didn't make sense. It shouldn't meet what is in the QAP. 7 easy way to avoid this, is to talk to staff before you 8 bring an application. And that is what should have been 9 10 done. And so thank you for your time. We support staff. MS. BINGHAM: Thank you, Chris. Any questions 11 for Chris? 12 13 (No response.) 14 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Staff's recommendation was 15 to deny the appeal, and we are pending a motion from the 16 Board. Is there a motion from any of the Board members? 17 MR. VASQUEZ: All right. I will throw one out there and see if I get a second. I would actually move to 18 19 consider the Neighborhood Empowerment Zone sufficient of a 20 plan and move to grant the appeal of the applicant. 21 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. We have a motion from Mr. 22 Vasquez to grant the appeal of the applicant for Heritage 23 at Abilene. Is there a second? 24 MR. BRADEN: This is a tough one, and --MR. VASQUEZ: Oh, very much. 25

> ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1 MR. BRADEN: And you know, obviously, if Abilene 2 knew that it probably needed this, they would have adopted it at the same time they did the resolution. So I don't 3 4 want to penalize one city because they just didn't do it. 5 But I guess what I struggle with is, has there really --6 MR. WILKINSON: Sorry. Either way, Abilene gets 7 a deal. There is only two in the subregion. And so either way you go, it is either in elderly or general. If you 8 support staff, the general wins. If you oppose staff, the 9 10 elderly win. They are both in Abilene. I don't know that the City necessarily prefers 11 12 the elderly. Perhaps so, given that they submitted some 13 documents. 14 MR. BRADEN: Okay. That is a good point, Bobby. And I guess that -- and I hate, this is a long way to 15 16 second or not second a motion, though, sorry. 17 But somebody -- Marni made the point, and it seems to be a valid one, that affordable housing is not 18 19 supposed to be the first thing in. And we've -- I've heard 20 that over in the last few years on the Board. Now, I think Sarah came back and said there were 21 22 other things already in this zone. I mean, do we know? didn't really -- when I looked through the letter, I didn't 23 24 see a statement saying that other things were going on. 25 Did I miss that?

1 MS. HOLLOWAY: So the letter itself says that there is no detailed information regarding incentives that 2 3 has been compiled. And that the City is in the process of 4 implementing a tracking system for the NEZ incentives. 5 So we don't know at this point what (coughing) 6 have received those incentives or what type of incentives have been provided to folks who are doing work within the 7 8 We have a dollar amount, but I can't tell you how Zone. 9 those dollars were spent. 10 MS. THOMASON: I think that is my hang-up, as well, is that there is -- it is an estimated amount. 11 12 there is no specific tracking available for how that would 13 be applicated. 14 MS. BINGHAM: Leo's lonely motion is still out 15 there, I think. 16 MR. VASQUEZ: Make another --17 I mean -- so in the absence of a MS. BINGHAM: second, the motion to approve the applicant's appeal, is 18 19 there another motion? 20 MR. BRADEN: I will make a motion to support staff's recommendation. 21 22 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. We have a motion from Mr. 23 Braden to support staff recommendation to deny the appeal. 24 Is there a second? 25 MS. THOMASON: Second.

1 MS. BINGHAM: Ms. Thomason seconds. Any further discussion? 2 3 (No response.) 4 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. All those in favor of 5 staff's recommendation, aye. 6 (A chorus of ayes.) 7 MS. BINGHAM: Opposed? MR. VASQUEZ: 8 Nay. 9 The motion carries in support of MS. BINGHAM: 10 staff's recommendation on denying the appeal for Heritage at Abilene. Thank you all for your work on that. 11 So Renee is telling me that there are some -12 there's commenters teed up for Casitas at Los Ebanos. 13 had said that that one was withdrawn? 14 15 MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes. 16 MS. BINGHAM: Are we hearing that one on the 17 23rd, or not at all? MS. HOLLOWAY: We have received an email from 18 19 the applicant telling us that they are withdrawing their 20 appeal of that scoring item. 21 MR. WILKINSON: So that's your discretion 22 whether you want to remove the item and just hear public 23 comment on it. They worded their appeal to me as if I 24 didn't award it, to put it on the agenda at the next 25 meeting.

And so it was placed on it, because I awarded 38 out of 40 points that they had lost. So the two points -- this appeal is about two points, or about scoring in general. We think we could probably review some that I gave them back, as well.

We got an email from them, what, yesterday, Marni?

MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes.

MR. WILKINSON: That they actually don't want to appeal. I don't know that anyone from the applicant is even on the line to speak to it.

But there is definitely some, I believe, some opposed to the development that would like to speak. So, whether you left it an action item with no one appealing to you, or we can hear discussion and public comment.

MS. BINGHAM: Yes. I am struggling with that a little. I mean, if there is no action to be taken, it is not that we don't want to hear the comment, but it doesn't sound like there is anything that we can do with the comment.

But any feedback from other Board members?

MR. BRADEN: I agree with you, Leslie. I think,

if people want to make public comment at the end about

things that are not discussed as a Board item, I think that

is okay. But I mean, I would make a motion to delete that

item. It has been withdrawn.

MS. BINGHAM: Great. So, Mr. Braden makes a motion to just remove the item from the agenda, since the appeal has been withdrawn. And then, just as a follow up that there is time at the end of the meeting for folks to make comment on items that aren't on the agenda, so that would be available. And I don't know. Typically, I guess, since it has been withdrawn. It wasn't part of consent agenda, so we don't necessarily pull anything off the active agenda.

Is there a need for a second on Mr. Braden's recommendation?

MR. WILKINSON: I don't think so. I think just Vice-Chair can agree.

MS. BINGHAM: Very good. Great. Let's do this, then. Renee, if we could just let the folks that are in the queue for Casitas at Los Ebanos know that if they would like to speak at the end of the agenda, there will be time to speak after we finish the rest of our action items.

MS. NORRED: All right, Chair Bingham. It looks like a couple of people do not -- no longer wish to speak on that. And we don't currently have anyone else in the queue for that.

MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Great. Thank you very much. So then, if everybody is okay moving forward,

quickly then, we will move to Item 4(b). Marni, this is yours also.

MS. HOLLOWAY: Yes. Item 4(b), regarding 20116

Dian Street Villas, we are also pulling from this agenda.

After the agenda was posted, but before we put up the book, or before our meeting today, the Executive Director granted the appeal. And so, there is no longer an appeal to be discussed.

MS. BINGHAM: Great. So, I would doubt there would be any additional comment, then. But Renee, just in case there is additional comment, it looks like, on Dian Street Villas, Application 20116, has been pulled.

MS. NORRED: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BINGHAM: So, then we move on to Item 4(c). Which is a report item, I believe, Marni, on Avanti Legacy Valor, which was an application that was heard at a prior meeting.

MS. HOLLOWAY: Correct. Item 4(c), Report of
Third-Party Request for Administrative Deficiency under 10
TAC '11.10 of the 2020 Qualified Allocation Plan for 20177,
Avanti Legacy Valor Heights in McAllen. As we discussed
last month, through a third-party request for
administration deficiency or RFAD, an unrelated person or
entity may bring new material information about an
application to staff's attention.

At the June 25th meeting, the Board directed staff to review its determination for this application to ensure that the development site was not located within 300 feet of a junkyard. You will recall that our rule uses the definition of junkyard from the Texas Transportation Code Section 396.001.

That section states that junk means copper, brass, iron, steel, rope, rags, batteries, tires, or other material that has been discarded or sold at a nominal price by a previous owner of the material. The term does not include a wrecked vehicle. Junkyard means a place where a business that owns junk and is operated to store, buy, or sell junk keeps all or part of the junk outdoors until the business disposes of the junk.

In response to an administrative deficiency, the applicant provided a number of reasons why the property does not meet the definition. First, the property is zone C, general business, and under their code of ordinances, the City of McAllen expressly prohibits any wholesale trade or trade accessory of metals and minerals and scrap or junk waste materials within this zoning.

The business -- the property owner is not in the business of storing, buying, or selling junk as defined by the Texas Transportation Code. It was initially leased and used as an automotive repair shop, and is currently being

used by the owners as a private automotive repair facility for their personal collection of vehicles and personal property.

The third-party requestor was unable to find any business or online presence associated with the property, because the owner is maintaining it for their personal use. The applicant provided additional photos from street level that were not included by the third-party requestor, which shows the property from the view of a passing person or vehicle, which shows that the property is privacy fenced, and that the contents of the storage yard are not visible from the street.

The response included a letter from the mayor of McAllen regarding current use of the property for personal storage, and a letter from the State Representative, stating his understanding of the City's pledge to monitor the property, to ensure its compliance with state and local laws. Based on the information provided, staff determined that the property does not comprise a business operated to store, buy, or sell junk.

Since the last meeting, staff has received documents from the group that filed the RFAD, providing information about why they believe the property meets the definition. The response is included in your Board book. All right.

I am sorry. The letter states that the letter supplied by the Mayor and the State Representative would seem to concede that the junkyard site is in fact used for business. Per that letter, the Transportation Code does not require that the business be operated solely to buy, sell, or store junk.

Whether the owners of the junkyard site also operate a private auto repair shop, or in fact, any type of business or private activities at the site, the junkyard site is a business, as confirmed by the City, and operated to store junk, as quite clearly shown by the photographic evidence, as stated in the letter.

The staff also received documents from the applicant which recap and clarify information already submitted, and include a letter from the offending property owner, confirming the statements of the applicant and the City, which states that no commercial business activity was conducted at this site as of February 28, 2020, which was the application deadline.

Staff recommends that the Board accept this report. I would be happy to take any questions.

MS. BINGHAM: What questions does the Board have for Marni?

MR. BRADEN: I don't really have any questions.

I think the staff did this report on the basis of my

1	questions at the last meeting. I very much appreciate the
2	thorough job and you answered my questions easily. I would
3	make approve to accept the report motion to approve and
4	accept the report.
5	MS. BINGHAM: We have a motion to accept the
6	report from Mr. Braden. Is there a second?
7	MS. THOMASON: Second.
8	MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Mr. Braden moves to accept
9	the report, Ms. Thomason seconds. And we can take a vote
10	on this. There are a few people that want to speak. Let
11	me see.
12	We are going to work with Renee here. We have,
13	hold on just a minute. We have Michelle Snedden, followed
14	by Michael Beard, Holly Beery is maybe out there somewhere,
15	James McDonald and Cynthia Bast. So, Renee, are we going
16	in that order?
17	MS. NORRED: Yes, ma'am.
18	MS. BINGHAM: Very good. So, we will hear
19	Michelle Snedden.
20	MS. NORRED: Michelle, you are unmuted. Can you
21	hear us?
22	MS. SNEDDEN: I can. Can you hear me?
23	MS. NORRED: Yes, ma'am.
24	MS. SNEDDEN: Great. Good morning, everybody.
25	I am so, yes, I am Michelle Snedden with the Shackleford

Law Firm. I represent the Pendleton Square application. I am here to discuss application 20177, and the presence of a junkyard facing the proposed development.

Firstly, I think it is important to remind ourselves that TDHCA has made a public policy decision that it does not want affordable housing within 300 feet of a junkyard. Why is that? Because individuals in need of decent affordable housing do not want to, and should not have to, live next door to a large accumulation of junk. That is what will occur if the McAllen development is awarded credits.

Secondly, I want to address staff's comparison between the auto wrecking and salvage yard definition and a junkyard. Staff states that theoretically the outside question is whether a business that used to operate as an auto wreck and a salvage yard but ceases to operate, does that auto wrecker and a salvage yard convert into a junkyard. We think this question somewhat distorts the issue.

The definition of a salvage yard in the Code only addresses the storage and use of vehicles. The definition of junk in the Code addresses items as Marni said, such as steel, batteries, tires, and other material that has been discarded.

To determine that this property is a salvage

yard rather than a junkyard, or perhaps it even meets both definitions, disregards the large amount of junk on the property, including discarded toilets, AC units, old vending machines, tires, old appliances, a bathtub, all as evidenced in the photographs in your Board book. And I know you looked at that in the last Board meeting.

As Mr. Vasquez noted in that last meeting, if it looks like a duck, it walks like a duck, it quacks like a duck. And this is clearly a junkyard.

It is really hard to believe anybody would consider this property anything other than a junkyard. Ms Bast and the Avanti applicant know that from street level there is a fence that surrounds and hides the sight of the property. That is irrelevant and not a determining factor on whether this is a junkyard under the QAP or the Code.

It is also going to be irrelevant for a tenant who lives on the second or the third floor that has a direct constant view of the junk. Staff states that the presence of a nearby salvage yard creates the same impression as a junkyard.

The Board can issue guidance to consider expanding the definition of junkyard in next year's QAP.

As noted just a moment ago, this incorrectly assumes that the property was and continues to be a salvage yard.

Disregarding the junk as defined in the Code, stored on the

1 property. We believe that the property is undeniably a 2 junkyard. 3 However, we are also not opposed to a rule clarification if the Board deems it necessary to ensure 4 5 that the public policy continues to be achieved. 6 in the interim, the Avanti application should be deemed 7 ineligible with or without a change to the rule. 8 To render this property anything other than a 9 junkyard would be a disservice to those future tenants and undermine the intent of the rule. Thank you. 10 MS. BINGHAM: Thank you, Michelle. 11 Michael Beard? 12 MS. NORRED: We are finding Michael Beard to 13 14 unmute him. 15 MR. BEARD: Yes. Can you hear me? 16 MS. NORRED: Yes. 17 MS. BINGHAM: Yes. MR. BEARD: Good. Good morning, Madam Chair and 18 19 members of the Board. My name is Michael Beard with BETCO 20 Consulting, and we represent the applicant that submitted 21 the RFAD against application 20177, Avanti Legacy, Valor 22 Height. 23 We can do all the legal hairsplitting that we 24 want to about whether this is a business that buys, sells 25 or stores junk. At the end of the day, you have a site

that has an accumulation of junk less than 50 feet away from the proposed development site that no one has done anything with or about.

With all due respect to the attorneys, one shouldn't need a law degree to see that this is a junkyard, and prospective residents should not have to live next to this detrimental site. It is an eyesore. It is a health hazard. It attracts vermin. And whether it is [inaudible] or not, it is there.

This is the type of site that we all should know not to build next to, as we should strive to do what is best for the residents and foster good housing policy. Building next to this detrimental site is not good housing policy. That said, perhaps the rules should be changed so the developments are not built next to an auto salvage yard.

They want to change the rules in the future, so the applicant cannot build near a site like this. If this is the case, why not accept that this is a junkyard and not allow housing to be built next to the site now. Why not protect these elderly residents, too, and not just the ones in the future.

At the end of the day, the accumulated junk will still be sitting outside and in plain view of the residents of Avanti Legacy Valor Heights, regardless of whatever the

1 applicant has submitted to the contrary. 2 Just ask yourself this. Would you want to live 3 here? Would you want your parents to live here, next to 4 this detrimental site? I think the answer would be no, and 5 for good reason. I would be happy to answer any questions 6 the Board may have. Thank you. 7 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Beard. was my mistake. We were trying to alternate support and 8 9 oppose. 10 And I think we had one of the speakers that elected not to speak. Renee, can we -- if there is no 11 12 questions from the Board members of the prior speaker, can 13 we have a speaker that is in support of staff's report? 14 MS. NORRED: Chair Bingham, we have Henry 15 Flores. And we are finding him to unmute. 16 MS. BINGHAM: Awesome. 17 MS. NORRED: Henry, you are self-muted. MR. FLORES: Hello. Can I be heard? 18 19 MS. BINGHAM: Yes. 20 MR. FLORES: Good morning, everyone. Cynthia 21 Bast was actually scheduled to go first. I face more of a 22 situation like Sarah did earlier. But let me offer my 23 comments, and if necessary, Ms. Bast can also address the 24 matter.

Let me first say, thank you, Madam Chair and

25

members, and Director Wilkinson for having reviewed this matter so carefully. We concur with their conclusion.

They have reviewed this matter several times. And I believe the recommendation is thoughtful and correct.

Cynthia will offer some technical perspective, but again, this is more than a technical matter. I wanted to talk about some of the things that have been inferred in the comments by our competition. And again, I emphasize, our competition. They are offering these comments in hopes that we are denied and that they fall into the funding range.

Now, when we were looking at sites in McAllen, back in August, we reviewed a number of sites, and chose this one specifically because of its location. There is a blighted structure nearby. There is no doubt about that.

But it is the only blighted structure in that census tract.

It is not a bad place to live. In fact, it is an exceptional place to live. It is, under TDHCA's rules, a high opportunity area, because of all the additional -- because of the factors of that community. In addition, it is one of the highest rated urban areas in the Rio Grande Valley.

It is a very desirable place in McAllen. In fact, there is no other tax grade deal in this census

tract. So, it would be the very first one.

There has been opposition to deals in this census tract in the past. We worked really hard to ensure that we had political support for this transaction, by demonstrating to city council members and to the mayor that what we were building was located -- it would be run correctly, and it would be located in an area of high opportunity.

You know, we -- in September, we met with staff because of that blighted structure. Staff has specifically -- Michelle Rivera, the assistant city manager took it under advisement. Staff were sent out there to review the matter, reviewed whether it was a junkyard or not and advised us, that in their opinion, it was not.

In fact, as Marni Holloway said earlier, it is not zoned to allow a junkyard. She referenced a letter from the mayor, which indicated we'd had this visit back in September with staff.

And the mayor says that they assured us that the site was not a junkyard, and pledged that the City would monitor the property to ensure the owners' continual compliance with state and local laws, and that they would ensure that the property never fell and never became an undesirable site feature.

In my mind, this is a very clear subject. It is

1 a wonderful site in a wonderful part of McAllen. 2 competitors provided really misleading photos of the location. Mr. Vasquez talked about, does it look like a 3 duck, quack like a duck, walk like a duck. 4 5 This does not look like a duck. This is a 6 wonderful site in a wonderful part of McAllen. 7 appreciate again your thoughts and consideration at this 8 time. 9 MS. BINGHAM: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Flores. 10 Any questions for Mr. Flores? 11 (No response.) 12 MS. BINGHAM: We can hear from Cynthia Bast, and then I think we will be back to even, and we will have Mr. 13 14 McDonald wrap up. 15 MS. NORRED: We are looking for Cynthia Bast to 16 unmute her. She is good to go. She is self-muted. 17 Cynthia, you are self-muted. MS. BAST: I think it is good now, right. 18 19 MS. NORRED: Yes. 20 MS. BAST: Okay. Thank you. Cynthia Bast of 21 Locke, Lord, representing the applicant for this matter. 22 Because this is a report item and I am not arguing an 23 appeal, I will try to be brief. 24 We do support the staff's conclusion.

over 100 pages of materials showing the information that

25

has been presented and considered. And after all of that, the Executive Director has directed -- has confirmed the staff's interpretation. Whether a certain land use constitutes a junkyard can be in the eyes of the beholder.

So to avoid speculation and interpretation,

TDHCA chose to rely upon a statutory definition of junkyard
in the Texas Transportation Code. The applicant duly
investigated this site, as you heard from Mr. Flores -performed diligence in accordance with and understanding
TDHCA's rules.

Based on those rules, it selected this site for all of the good characteristics that you heard about. You have a letter from the owner of the property that says there is no business being conducted. And under the Texas Transportation Code, without a business, there can't be a junkyard. Just because a site is zoned for commercial activity does not mean commercial activity is being conducted on the site.

Therefore, we believe that the Executive

Director's conclusions and staff's conclusions on this

matter are appropriate, and we thank you for your support.

Renee, so there is no other comment, Renee, at this time?

MS. NORRED: No, ma'am. We have no comments at

Thank you. Thanks, Ms. Bast.

MS. BINGHAM:

this time.

MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Great. So we -- just this was a report item, just answering some Board questions from the previous meeting. We have a motion from Mr. Braden and a second from Ms. Thomason to accept the Board's report as submitted. If there are no further questions or discussion?

(No response.)

MS. BINGHAM: All those in favor, aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MS. BINGHAM: Opposed?

(No response.)

MS. BINGHAM: The motion carries on Item 4(c).

The report item.

MS. HOLLOWAY: Thank you.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you very much. Thanks,

Marni. So this, it looks like this is the end of the

agenda for today. We do set aside time for public comment

on matters that are items that weren't on the agenda today.

So, let's let Renee check quickly to see if maybe either the folks that were going to speak on Los Ebanos, or any other topic. We are only able to just accept the comment. We wouldn't be taking action here today, but we do want to provide the opportunity for that.

MS. NORRED: Vice Chair Bingham, we do have a

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1 couple of people queued up to talk about Dian Street 2 Villas, 20116. They haven't said anything, but we do have -- there is no specific order, but we do have some 3 4 people that want to speak about that. And then we also 5 have at least one person for an application, 20223. 6 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. We'll look that one up 7 quickly. And we can open the line for the speaker for Dian 8 Street. 9 MS. NORRED: Okay. We are going to start with 10 Kevin Strickland. We are going to find him to unmute him. This is for Dian Street Villas. 11 12 (No response.) MS. NORRED: Kevin Strickland is not available. 13 14 We are going to move on to Jason Shaughnessy. 15 (No response.) MS. NORRED: His audio is off. We have lost 16 17 We are finding him. Russ Michaels, you are Michael. unmuted. 18 19 MR. MICHAELS: Hi. This is Russ Michaels. Can 20 you hear me? 21 MS. NORRED: Yes. 22 MR. MICHAELS: Okay. Great. I am just here to 23 speak in favor of Dian Street Villas. Just as you know, I 24 am the Executive Director of Texas Interfaith Housing, the 25 owner and operator and the applicant. We have Cynthia Bast

with us that also could speak.

But there is no opposition. I just wanted to just state that this is a top scoring application in Houston. It is going into an area that is a high opportunity zone. We are doing everything that we are supposed to do to follow the QAP rules. And that is what we have done up to this date.

I am glad that it was reinstated. And I am looking forward to working with the City of Houston and the disaster dollars there, and also with TDHCA to move this deal forward. That is really all I have.

I appreciate you all at least being here today and helping us through this process. It has kind of been a long process, especially in Houston with COVID and doing outreach with notifications with the neighbors, et cetera.

But having said that, I will just pass it off to Cynthia and save some time here. I think she wants to see if there any neighbors that want to speak. Thank you very much, folks.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you. Thank you, Russ.

MS. NORRED: Vice Chair Bingham, we have just a couple of more people for Dian Street Villa.

MS. BINGHAM: Great.

MS. NORRED: We have Jervon Harris. And he is unmuted.

1	(No response.)
2	MS. NORRED: Jervon, you are self-muted.
3	MR. HARRIS: Good morning. Thank you. I really
4	don't have any comments to add. We were prepared to
5	discuss in more detail if there was continued opposition to
6	the application.
7	But being that there is none, we don't really
8	have any comments. So, we look forward to moving the
9	application forward. Thank you.
10	MS. NORRED: Thank you, Mr. Harris. We have no
11	more people in queue to speak for Dian Street Villas.
12	MS. BINGHAM: Great are there any did you
13	mention that application 20223.
14	MS. NORRED: Yes, ma'am. We have Omar Izfar.
15	MS. BINGHAM: Great.
16	MS. NORRED: He is unmuted.
17	MR. IZFAR: Lovely. Can you hear me?
18	MS. BINGHAM: Yes.
19	MR. IZFAR: Thank you. My name is Omar Izfar.
20	I am with the law firm of Wilson, Cribbs and Goren. And I
21	represent the Briar Hollow Townhouses Association.
22	And we were made aware of application 20223, for
23	the Campanile at Briar Hollow application for tax credits.
24	That was on, I believe, last month's agenda in front of
25	this Board. And we have a few objections that we think we

would like this Board to consider that this project should not be funded for a couple of reasons.

First is, we never received notice of this. And we are an organization that is required to receive notice under the statute in the Government Code. And we have reached out to the applicant and we have asked them to provide us notice.

And we didn't know that this application would not be on today's agenda. We checked the agenda when it was posted a few days ago, and we decided to speak anyway.

And so, I don't normally practice in this area, so I don't know what it is I need to do to have to be put on a notice list, or to have the applicant take it seriously. But by our review of the Code, we were required to receive notice by the applicant.

My second objection to this project is that it can't be constructed as proposed. In reviewing the architectural drawings that were submitted in this application, probably -- and although the architectural drawings don't have this measurement in place, it probably violates a great amount of a recorded covenant that requires a 40-foot setback from a certain property line, which I drew out and submitted in a letter from my firm on July 7, which we had submitted in anticipation of being a week before this meeting, in accordance with what we

understood to be the speaker rules, not realizing this application would not be on this meeting.

But because this violates the 40-foot setback from this certain property line between the townhouses in which my clients reside in and this project that is proposed to be built, it couldn't be built this way, and it can't be permitted by the City of Houston, who requires compliance with private covenants and restrictions in order to issue building permits.

Even though the City has come out publicly to support this project from their executive office, the development rules would prohibit this from being platted without recognition of that building line or permitted without compliance with that building line. So I think it doesn't make sense to fund a project that represents that it will violate that.

And I would like any kind of guidance from the Board as to how to get notice for my client, or what I should do in order to speak when this application is before the Board again. Thank you.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Izfar.

And, Bobby, somebody can follow up with Mr.

Izfar?

MR. WILKINSON: Yes. We are in communication with him.

1 MS. BINGHAM: All right. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Izfar. 2 And it looks like Renee said there is somebody 3 4 that still wants to speak on Los Ebanos. That's Sidney 5 Culp. So this looks like this will be our last public 6 comment. 7 MS. NORRED: We are looking for Sidney to unmute 8 Sidney, you are unmuted. Can you hear us? You are him. 9 self-muted, Mr. Culp. 10 (No response.) MS. NORRED: It looks like he might be self-11 12 muted. 13 (Pause.) 14 MS. NORRED: Mr. Culp, you are self-muted. 15 you unmute yourself? 16 (No response.) 17 MS. BINGHAM: Just while we are giving him just one more moment to see if he can unmute. So we -- staff 18 just get like a little very short break to catch their 19 breath and then we all see each other again on the 23rd, 20 21 July 23rd. So the Board will reconvene July 23rd. 22 Renee, any --23 MS. NORRED: No, ma'am. It looks like he is not 24 unmuted. 25 MS. BINGHAM: Okay. Thank you very much.

> ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	Anything else from the Board members, before sorry. Did
2	you say he is back?
3	MS. NORRED: No. We are good.
4	MS. BINGHAM: Very good. All right. Anything
5	else from Board or staff?
6	(No response.)
7	MS. BINGHAM: Thank you all for your time this
8	morning. Great Board meeting, and we will look forward to
9	convening next Thursday.
10	MR. WILKINSON: Thank you, members.
11	MS. BINGHAM: The meeting is adjourned.
12	(Whereupon, at 11:06 a.m., the meeting was
13	concluded.)

via GoToWebinar

DATE: July 14, 2020

LOCATION:

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 7677, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs.

DATE: July 20, 2020

(Transcriber)

On the Record Reporting 7703 N. Lamar Blvd., #515 Austin, Texas 78752