

Public Housing Repositioning Wednesday Webinar Series: Resident Engagement and Repositioning, 3-27-24

Andrea Juracek: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for joining today's installment of -- excuse me, installment of the Wednesday Webinar Series. Today's topic is "Resident Engagement and Repositioning." My name is Andrea Juracek, and I will be your host for today.

Before I pass it over to our presenters, I have a few housekeeping items. Our speakers will share their knowledge with us for the first part of the presentation, and we will reserve the remaining time for any questions that you might have. You may ask questions using the Q&A function on Zoom, and I will monitor and read the questions, and if we are unable to address them, we will send a reply by email after the webinar. All webinar participants are muted upon entry. If you would like to notify our team of any technical difficulties, please send us a message in the Q&A box. Today's webinar is being recorded and will be available on HUD Exchange in two weeks. Following the webinar. Immediately following the webinar, you will receive an invitation to complete a survey on today's webinar and we ask that you please complete this with any feedback that you might have for us. Jane, please take it away.

Jane Hornstein: Thank you. Andrea. Hi, everyone. I'm Jane Hornstein with the special application center. You might go to the next slide. Just as you all know, we've been doing these this series of Wednesday webinars throughout the last four years. There's more than 25 of them on all things repositioning. They are on HUD Exchange. The link is on this side to -- slide deck, and we'll be sending this out later. In addition, two webinars we wanted to highlight in particular, one is on public housing, on resident considerations as part of public housing repositioning. And the other one.

And that was done back in August of 2020. And then there's resident relocation, and that was done in December of 2023. We probably will not -- we're not spending much time on relocation today. So just making sure you all know that that is there available to you at any time. So -- okay. Next slide please. Okay. Our presenters today as myself that -- I'm the director of the special application center, Tiffany Green who is public Housing management occupancy division. Victoria Vann and Kathy Szybist are both from the Special Applications Center. Damainique Bruce is from the office of recapitalization. Christina Mortensen is with Choice neighborhoods. Kimberly Candelario is the Buffalo Pittsburgh public housing office. And Maria Queen-Lana is with community supportive services. So, they will each be speaking in approximately that order. All right. Next slide.

And just really quickly why are we here today. The goal of this webinar is to explain how PHAs can meaningfully engage with residents on which tools to pursue, to preserve, redevelop, or otherwise reposition your public housing. Okay. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Tiffany Green with the occupancy division.

Tiffany Green: Thank you, Jane, I appreciate that. Good afternoon, everyone. As previously mentioned, my name is Tiffany Green, and I'm a housing program specialist in the Office of Public Housing Program. My role consists of providing technical assistance for resident councils,

resident organizations, for staff and HUD staff related to public housing, resident organizing and participation activities such as guidance on such as providing guidance on usage and management of tenant participation funds, also known as TP funds. Today I have the pleasure of discussing Y resident engagement matters. Resident engagement holds significant importance for public housing residents, particularly within the context of repositioning, the repositioning process for public housing. Here are three categories. As you can see on the screen that highlights why resident engagement is crucial. First, being community empowerment and ownership. Engaging residents in the repositioning process foster a sense of ownership and empowerment within the community. When residents actively participate in decision making process, they feel more connected to their homes and neighborhoods. This involvement instills a sense of pride and responsibility, leading to stronger community cohesion and a great a greater commitment to the success of repositioning efforts.

Next is ensure that resident needs and preferences are addressed. Public housing residents have a unique needs and preference -- unique needs and preferences, and concerns that must be considered during the repositioning process. Engaging residents allow housing authorities or housing agencies and policymakers to gain valuable insight into these specific needs and preferences, ensuring that the redevelopment plans are tailored to meet the diverse requirements of the community.

By actively engaging residents in the decision-making process, stakeholders can design solutions that are responsive to the real-life experience and priority of those who are directly impacted by the repositioning efforts and last but not least, building trust and transparency. Building trust and transparency for residents, as far as resident engagement is crucial between the housing authority, policy makers and residents, meaningful engagement practices such as open communication channels, regular meetings and collaborative decision-making processes demonstrate a commitment to transparency and inclusive inclusivity. This fosters trust amongst residents who are more likely to support and participate in the repositioning process when they feel that their voices are heard and valued. Additionally, transparent communication helps dispel misinformation and making sure that we all -- we are supportive in terms of developing the community. Next slide please. Oh, sorry. Oh, thank you. Just seen that.

And so, ways in which the public housing agencies that can support ways and strategies that they can implement in order to support resident engagement can include support the formation of resident organizations, such as helping them form resident ambassadors. resident advisory boards. According to CFR 903, it mandates public housing agencies to establish RADs for resident involvement in policy development. Another thing the PHAs can do is support the formation of resident councils, according to CFR 964, it outlines the requirements for resident councils.

Another strategy that the PHA can implement is capacity building and technical assistance. This consists of offering training workshops to empower residents, as well as provide guidance to strengthen resident organization capacity or organizational capacity. Also connect residents with professional professionals to enhance resident led initiatives. Another strategy is leveraging resources. This is important and in ways that can support this is by providing grant funding and financial support for resident led initiatives such as tenant participation funds and the Ross Grant secured donations and partnerships with local businesses and nonprofit organizations, and

establish platforms for residents to share information, skills and resources such as social media platforms.

Another thing is to communicate and outreach communication and outreach initiatives. Making sure you implement that ways in which you can do so is by organizing gatherings to update residents on housing policies and program. Ensure communication materials are available in multiple languages is very important. Utilize website, email, listservs, new and newsletters and social media channels to share information and engage residents in the discussion about public housing issues. Next slide please.

So that -- all that being said, in terms of the why resident engagement matters as well as strategies to implement in order to make sure that it's being supported and thing that PHA wants to keep in mind is some of the plan requirements and that -- and when I'm referring to plan I'm discussing the PHA plan.

So, I'm going to spend some time, because I know you all may be familiar, with the PHA's plan requirements for resident advisory or boards as also known as RAD and repositioning. So, I'm just going to spend a few minutes going over that. So as far as the plan requirements for resident advisory boards, PHAs must establish one or more RAD as part of their plan process. PHAs must involve its resident advisory boards and the entire planning process of the plan, including the repositioning actions included in the plan. PHAs must also comply with resident consultation requirements for the PHA plan.

This consists of making sure that there is a public hearing also a comment period and consulting with applicable RADs. PHAs must ensure reasonable outreach to engage broad public participation in the hearing on the PHA plan. Another thing as far as the PHA requirement for repositioning or repositioning actions must be included in the PHA plan. PHAs should include sufficient descriptions of the repositioning plan to make the decision and the discussion with the public, as well as RAD and residence meaningful. That being said, I'm going to pass it over to Victoria to talk more about the tool. The tools.

Victoria Vann: Good afternoon. My name is Victoria Vann. I am a neighborhood and community investment specialist for the special application center known as SAC. I'm going to talk to you very briefly about the toolbox, the slide that you see before you. It's a redevelopment toolbox, and I'm not going to go through every single bullet point for the sake of time. And also, because I believe that each bullet point warrants its own individual training. And we're not here from that. So, the toolbox that we're going to talk about at a high level is the public housing investment tools and the repositioning tools. What I really want you to take home from this particular slide and really let it resonate with you, is the resident perspective in all of this, right? It's imperative that you have conversations with your residents early on about the different tools that are available for your project or your PHA, right?

Because some of these tools are not going to be available for all projects or PHAs. For instance, to qualify for a choice implementation tool, the property needs to be severely distressed. And in addition, funding is competitively awarded under a NOFA. Section 18 is only available if a justification is met, so it's imperative that you explain to the residents which tools that may be available for a particular project. And along those same lines, I really want to stress the importance of making sure that the residents are engaged and informed throughout the entire

process. When you're deciding on your tools, your redevelopment tool, and which redevelopment tool you decide to ultimately use. Here's the deal. These particular tools, all right, are complex in nature, and if you don't have your hands on this every single day, or you're not a real estate professional, it can be overwhelming.

And to be quite honest, folks who do this every day, it could be complex to them. So just imagine the resident's perspective. You want to just make sure that when you're having communications with your residents that they are informed that they're engaged and that they understand the process, so they can really begin to figure out how this particular tool and/or process will impact or maybe not impact their life, right?

And so, when you're doing this process, you're eventually going to have resident consultations. Now, resident consultations are an absolute requirement for each tool. If you could advance the slide, please. So, the resident consultation requirements, right? This is a high-level overview, the resident consultation piece and what that looks like. It's going to be more discussed with my colleague Kathy who's coming up right after me. But the point of this overview and this intro is that once you choose a redevelopment tool, understand that the individual tools have their own separate and unique resident consultation requirements.

And these requirements are separate from and in addition to the consultation requirements with the residents that is a part of and required per the PHA plan, right? So again, we want to -- HUD, SAC, we want to make sure that the residents are informed, they're engaged, that they understand what, you know, is coming down the pipeline and that their voice, above all, is being heard. And their voice should be heard throughout the entire process. And so, I'm going to actually give the floor over to my colleague who is now going to do, like I said earlier, a deeper dive as to what the requirements are for each development tool. Kathy?

Kathy Szybist: Thank you. Thank you, Victoria, that was so well said. It was a really excellent overview, so thank you for that. So yes, as a -- as Victoria said, I'm going to explain briefly the individual program requirements for resident consultation under Section 18 demo Dispo and section 22 voluntary conversion. And then I'm going to turn the floor over to my colleague Damainique to explain the consultation requirement overview for RAD and the RAD Section 18 plans. So, let's start with Section 18, Demo Dispo. So just a brief overview here. PHAs must consult with residents who will be affected by the proposed action. This definitely includes residents living in the units, proposed for Dispo or Demo, but it could include other residents too: residents at neighboring sites, residents in the in the total AMP, anyone who the PHA believes will be affected by the proposed action.

The PHA must also consult with resident organizations and its Resident Advisory Board. And again, as Victoria mentioned, this consultation is separate from the consultation required as part of the PHA plan. The SAC reviews resident consultation that the PHA did on a case-by-case basis. There's no mandated number of meetings or how consultation occurs. Could be group meetings, one on one meetings, in person, Zoom. HUD believes PHAS should have flexibility in this area.

This said, there are some basic requirements for what good consultation looks like as part of a Section 18 application. First, the PHA should conduct the consultation early enough so good ideas from the residents can be incorporated into the final plans. Second consultation means a

two-way conversation. This isn't a notice. This isn't just the PHA talking at the residents. The residents must be able to pose questions and get responses from the PHA. The PHA should explain the complete proposed demo Dispo action in a meaningful way that's easily digestible by the residents. They should consult on all aspects of the application, especially things that will directly impact the residents like relocation, future use of the property, any right to remain, return, and timing.

PHAs must consult the residents in a manner that is effective for persons with disabilities. This might include bringing interpreters into the meetings if necessary. Some authors have posted the full stack application on their website or made the application available for review at its central office for residents to review, and those are great best practices. I want to emphasize here that residents have a statutory right to submit comments. About the proposed demo Dispo application, and the PHA must evaluate those comments and include those comments and their evaluations as part of the application they submit to the SAC.

During the consultation, the PHA should explain this to residents that their voice will be heard by HUD if they want to comment on the application, that they are welcome to do so in writing, and that those comments will be reviewed by HUD under the review process. And finally, I want to emphasize with Section 18 that HUD is actually required by statute to disapprove an application if there's insufficient resident consultation. It's one of the few things that the statute actually gives HUD the authority to disapprove applications on. It's just if only if it has information that's clearly inconsistent with the FPS certification or the resident failed to consult the residents.

So, I mean, the Congress took resident consultation on the Section 18 applications to be so important that it actually gave HUD the requirement to disapprove applications if resident consultation was not done in an adequate way. So now I'm going to move on briefly to section 22. Section 22 is a voluntary conversion. It includes streamlined voluntary conversion. The statutory requirements for resident consultation under section 22 are a little more specific than they are under Section 18, which gives housing authorities a bit more flexibility.

Under section 22, residents are -- PHAs are required to involve residents in the development of the voluntary conversion plan, and it requires the significant resident participation in the development of the voluntary conversion plan. So again, this should occur early on in the planning stages. And section 22 requires at least one meeting where the housing authority explains the requirements of section 22 and the reg at 972. And at that meeting, the PHA must provide residents with copies of the draft voluntary conversion plan which should include at that point, you know, the draft future use of the property and relocation plan. Housing authority must provide the residents a reasonable comment period so that they can reflect and provide comments on the draft voluntary conversion plan.

And then, as with Section 18, the housing authority must summarize the resident comments. and the PHA's responses to the comments made by the residents and -- as part of their final plan to HUD. One thing, one last thing I'll mention on Section 18 and section 22 is consultation does not mean consent. So, the PHAs, the residents don't need to agree. They don't need to give their approval of the demo Dispo action or the voluntary conversion plan submission. But they do need to be consulted in a meaningful way.

And again, their comments about the PHA's action, including, if they disagree with it need to be included as part of the application to HUD. This said, and this is kind of a side issue, resident consent is required in a section 22 voluntary conversion for the residents units to be project-based. But that's a side issue. And that's not necessarily consenting to the voluntary conversion plan itself but consenting to their units becoming PBV. So, before I turn it over to Damainique to speak to RAD in the blends, I -- you'll also note on the chart here at the bottom, there's a reference to public housing, capital fund modernization and public housing development.

We're not going to cover these extensively because the -- this webinar we're focusing on existing units. But I do want uh, and this is kind of relevant for cap fund mod [ph]. These programs also have resident consultation as part of as they work under the public housing program. So even if a housing authority is just modernizing units or developing new units, they, they do need to consult residents. as part of the capital fund submissions. Okay. With that, I will turn it over to Damainique.

Damainique Bruce: Hi, everyone. Again, my name is Damainique Bruce. I'm with the Office of Recapitalization. I focused primarily on resident engagement as well as outreach, and I serve as the Office of Recapitalization subject matter expert on relocation as well. To give you a brief overview of some of the resident consultation requirements with the RAD program and RAD Section 18 plan program, it's important to note that in July of 2023, we did a major overhaul of our regulations. And within that overhaul was an extensive inclusion of additional and supplementary resident engagement requirements. So, if RAD or Section 18 blend with red is something that you're looking into, please note to that please go and reread that 2023 notice that we just submitted. There's quite a number of changes, especially when it comes to documentation of resident engagement that is important to understand prior to agreeing to participate in the program. As a part of those revisions, we changed when resident engagement should be mandatory and the minimum number of meetings with residents.

So, for the RAD Section 18 blend program, we have a minimum number of five meetings that are mandatory with residents, and those are throughout the conversion process. The first two meetings should be before submitting your application to convert to RAD, and those meetings must be held within six months of your application submission date. The next two meetings should happen after you receive your commitment to enter into a Housing assistance payment, contract or chap with the Office of Recapitalization. And again, that's an additional two meetings, in addition to the meetings that happened prior to application submission.

And there's at least one minimum meeting required after the issuance of the RAD conversion commitment and prior to closing of the contract. I'm not going to go into detail exactly what those meetings should consist of. We do have on our website a webinar that is available, as well as handouts and fact sheets that go more extensively as to what should be included.

But please let us know if you have any questions involved with those five meeting requirements and what should be included in the documentation for those meetings as well. Like I previously stated, we did an overhaul of the documentation requirements for resident engagement, there are several different points at which you should be submitting documentation that you have engaged in resident engagement with the residents of the affected property. That includes resident logs, logs of the meetings, the -- what the presentation was, how did the residents receive notification of the presentation materials?

Did they attend in person? Did you have to go to them one on one to give them the information? And then as well as other parts of the process such as relocation, we have a lot of documentation requirements that now must be submitted. And some of those documentation requirements happen prior to the concept call itself, where you discuss your actual plans for the RAD conversion. And so, we do have additional meetings and consultation with residents that may be required if any substantial changes to the project plan occurs or if HUD requests.

So that includes if there is a change in the ownership structure, there are any changes in the construction plans and how long that may take. Those would be considered substantial changes to project plans, which would trigger an additional meeting and consultation with residents where you would be required, what required to allow the residents provide feedback and ask questions, and then provide them with a written response, and then again submit that documentation to us for review. So those are some of the things that would trigger additional meetings. Within the RAD and RAD Section 8 team blend program. And then additionally, we encourage the PHA to partner with residents and resident leaders throughout the process. We want to make the process as least combative or restrictive to the residents themselves.

This is a process, while they don't necessarily have a final say in whether or not the conversion takes place, we want them to have a voice and not feel like a conversion is happening to them. So, we do have several, like I said, stated additional protections that we added for resident engagement to prevent, prevent that sort of animosity that may occur through a conversion process. Next slide please. Thank you. And so, we've provided a few charts sort of going over this, a brief summary of key considerations for resident engagement. Again, this is not an extensive list. It does not go into extensive detail. I do suggest that if you have additional questions or need clarification, please reach out to the respective repositioning program to ask some questions.

And this is just to serve as a brief overview. For example, the right of return, as you can see for each program, may look a little bit different. For traditional public housing modernization, the right of return typically does not apply. The family remains with a as a public housing tenant for the RAD program or RAD Section 18 blends. The residents do have a right to return for Section 18.

They do not have an explicit right of return choice. Neighborhoods they do, and for a stream voluntary conversion. The family has a right to remain and has a right to stay with tenant-based assistance if the project will be used as housing, post conversion or post repositioning. Next slide, please. And again, this is not an extensive list. These are just so you can get a general idea. Again, please ask questions if you have additional questions or would need more clarity on these different program requirements. This is just to serve as considerations to sort of easily identify the different.

Aspects of each program and how they may affect residents, or what your requirements may be as far as resident engagement, such as the right to relocate with a Housing choice voucher or a tenant-based voucher, and long-term affordability. As you can see, each program varies. Sometimes complete opposite answers. So, it again, just use this chart as a guideline, not a complete end all be all resource tool. Please contact the respective repositioning program, for additional follow up and questions and clarity.

Next slide please. And some extra considerations that we thought it was important again to just highlight, not extensive, for resident engagement. So, for traditional public housing, we thought it was important to note that public housing rights continue during and after the modernization and the Uniform Relocation Act, or URA, may apply if a family is displaced due to modernization more than 12 months.

For the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program, or RAD and Section 18 RAD blends, public housing rights continue throughout the conversion until that actual closing of the housing contract and post conversion, the residents would have certain rights and protections covered underneath the Section 8 program and then RAD as a program within our regulations, we provide additional protections supplementary to those in public housing and through Section 8 that would also apply for the residents going through a RAD or RAD Section 18 blend conversion for Section 18 demo displace the residents rights in new housing, depend on the type of comparable unit received, whether that's Section 8, tenant-based or project-based vouchers, PBV or public housing for choice neighborhoods.

The residents right to a replacement unit depends on the type of the unit, again, whether that's RAD project-based vouchers or public housing. And for streamlined voluntary conversion, Section 8 tenant-based assistant rights would apply. Not Section 8 project-based voucher rights. If the family consents in writing to a project-based voucher lease. And now I'm going to pass it off to my colleague Christina.

Christina Mortensen: All right. Great. Let's go to the next slide. Thank you so much. Damainique, this is Christina Mortensen. I'm a deputy director with Choice Neighborhoods. We're going to kick off a couple case studies on the various repositioning programs and talk about the resident consultation and engagement. Starting with Choice Neighborhoods planning grants, we'll share an example of a Choice Neighborhoods planning grantee. Then my colleague Kimberly Candelario is going to talk about how PHA moved from choice neighborhoods planning to implementing the vision that they created. So quick refresher for anybody that needs it. Choice neighborhoods is a competitive grant program. It's for PHA's to apply for under two opportunities planning grants or implementation grants. PHA's are identifying a severely distressed public housing property for redevelopment with a planning grant. They're planning towards its redevelopment for an implementation grant, HUD awards up to \$50 million to redevelop or reposition that severely distressed public housing as part of a larger mixed income community. It's done with neighborhoods and residents in mind. Funds are used for the planning and implementation of neighborhood improvements, residents supportive services. So just keep in mind that this is a comprehensive program, which means that resident engagement goes beyond just the public housing repositioning reinvestment. So, keep that scope in mind. It brings with it its own requirements and expectations that are unique to the program.

So, you've heard about the tools, you know the tools. And if you are representing a PHA that's looking to invest or redevelop a particular property and you're just getting started Choice Neighborhoods planning grants are a great resource out there for PHA's. It's a great first step towards that engagement, towards that potential redevelopment. These grants are providing PHAs up to \$500,000 to develop a comprehensive Choice Neighborhoods Transformation Plan.

Leading up to this, the resident consultation requirement to apply is a written notification to residents of the housing site of your intent to apply. It's an entry point because we know over the

next two years, PHAs will engage residents in a very meaningful way. And when we talk about meaningful engagement from choice neighborhoods, it's going beyond the meeting presentation and incorporating residents into things like design charrettes, resident surveys, incorporating resident voices into the planning itself, which may look like representation on a steering committee or decision-making body.

So, residents are decision makers on this plan. They can participate in working groups that are identifying strategies on repositioning or supportive services. Neighborhood investment. It's creating a space through the grant to give residents the opportunity to review, react and make informed decisions on a redevelopment effort. Obviously, engagement is a huge benefit to these grants. They also do help PHAs build capacity. That may mean hiring staff.

That may mean hiring a third-party consultant that can lead or support your planning effort. Funds can be used for market studies, environmental reviews, other early start activities to get the ball rolling. So, we bring this up to let folks know that the planning grants NOFO, that notice of funding opportunity, is coming out this spring and spring has sprung, so stay tuned for the choice neighborhoods planning NOFO for any PHA that thinks this opportunity could be a good fit. FY appropriate -- FY 24 appropriations made up to \$10 million available for these grants. And we know that a lot of the PHA's that receive them go on to reposition with a variety of the tools and resources out there.

So, it's a great opportunity for PHAs looking to tackle that severely distressed housing asset. And even for those that don't, we have a lot of great materials available for PHAs, for example, resident surveys, best practices, case studies. And I know my colleague Maria Elena will share some resources later. So, let's go to the next slide please and dig into an example.

So, we are headed to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh and the City of Pittsburgh jointly received a \$500,000 grant back in 2016 focused on the redevelopment of Bedford Dwellings. Bedford Dwellings is that superblock barrack style, public housing that's doesn't fit into the street grid. It feels isolated.

That may feel familiar to some of you out there, and it's a very old property that needs some significant reinvestment. So, their grant was focused on planning for the redevelopment of Bedford Dwellings and the surrounding hill district, an area that is experiencing a lot of investment given it's near downtown location, a lot of development pressure. So, a lot of nerves right in the community with what that meant. So resident engagement and what that looked like in Pittsburgh was very intense, really.

I mean, they had 25 steering committee meetings. So, this was their decision-making body that included representation from the mayor's office, city council and residents. Residents at Bedford Dwellings were members of the steering committee, making decisions on the kind of vision for Bedford dwellings in this neighborhood. There's clear representation in that room. Residents participated in working group meetings, focus groups on topics ranging from public safety to employment. There were large community meetings for everybody to hear the same information at the same time. Be transparent. Like Tiffany talked about earlier, there were design charrettes.

They had a residents survey where they got below the surface with Bedford dwelling residents to talk about things like their housing preferences or their service needs. And lastly, grant funds

were used to pay stipends to public housing residents to serve as resident ambassadors. They were supporting this process. They were proactively engaging their neighbors bringing them out to meetings, hosting their own community gatherings, pop up activities. They called themselves the Bedford connect team.

You'll start to see this theme of connect, reconnect this community physically, socially to what's around. It was a theme that emerged. So, connect, Bedford connect. And this level of engagement, it's really, truly above and beyond with that comprehensive scope of the Choice Neighborhoods program.

But this is what the housing authority felt necessary, given the pressures and their, you know, intent to redevelop not only the site but focus on what was around it. So, the plan that they developed through Choice Neighborhoods was a big vision. It was a framework of what development could look like, what the goals were for neighborhood transformation, which providers could be brought in to support residents, how this could all coordinate. But the housing authority, they walked away with more than a plan, even though that's the goal, is the plan.

But more than that, the residents and their participation throughout walked away with a real clear understanding of what folks were talking about, proposing their buy in because they supported it. They gave ideas that were heard and reflected in the plan. And it wasn't just the Housing authority's plan. It was their plan, too, built on their input and tailor made to the particular community's needs and assets. So, planning grant, big vision, big picture framework. And now I'm going to turn it over to Kimberly on the next slide. Who's going to talk about how we took that vision in Pittsburgh, how the Housing Authority built on it and refined it towards their implementation of the vision that they created. Kimberly? Next slide.

Kimberly Candelario: Thank you, Christina, and thank you for all your hard work with Pittsburgh over the years on their various transactions. We really appreciate that. And thank you to the other presenters as well for giving the field office a voice in this presentation. So, continuing on with HICP, one primary goal developed in partnership with the Residents was to create a unified community. The residents expressed the Bedford Dwellings campus felt isolated and disconnected from the surrounding community. As the Housing Authority transitioned from planning to implementation, they refined their plan to reconnect Bedford across several sites in the neighborhood, essentially breaking up the super blocks to blend in and become more functional part of the fabric of the surrounding neighborhoods. The Housing Authority started a first phase through mixed finance that would be HUD's mixed finance program. Then the Housing Authority decided that choice neighborhoods would provide some of the necessary capital to develop the remaining six phases. For Choice Neighborhoods, PHAs are required to meet with residents two times to apply for the Choice Neighborhood Implementation grant. The planning grant meeting satisfied this requirement. However, HICP continued meeting with residents to discuss the application, repositioning efforts and other programs such as RAD. And also, just as an aside, as my other colleagues have mentioned here, RAD and some of the other meeting requirements are have their own requirements separate and apart from Choice Neighborhoods.

So, leading up to the application submission, HICP continued to attend monthly resident meetings discussing the plan and topics such as relocation. Their constant presence allowed for open communications, accessibility concerns, and other questions and concerns to be addressed

on an ongoing basis and maximize the trust building process. Residents also served on master planning and master developer selection committees.

All of these amazing efforts led to HICP -- sorry, HACP being awarded a Choice Neighborhood Implementation Grant of \$30 million in 2014 for the Larimer Revitalization. Next slide, please. In addition to the \$30 million Choice Neighborhood Implementation Grant, and as a result of HACP's meaningful resident engagement and proposal to create a mixed finance -- sorry, a mixed income community, HUD awarded an additional \$50 million implementation grant in July of 2023. This is for a different revitalization. This speaks directly to the amazing work and success the Housing Authority had in its planning preparations with the residents. And you'll notice in the photograph you'll see the residents posing with the big check to celebrate this \$50 million award and PIH's own Diaz Menocchio [ph] is pictured in the very back is very small, but he's there.

And he would -- he traveled to Pittsburgh to make the announcement and present the check. So -- but the work is not done. So, moving forward, HACP will collaborate with a multitude of HUD offices to bring the plan to life, including the Choice Neighborhoods Office, the Office of Recapitalization, the Office of Urban Revitalization, the Special Application Center and of course the Buffalo Field Office -- Buffalo Pittsburgh Field office. Sorry, we're one office now. And this is all -- this is an all-in approach to redevelopment. And the residents are part of this implementation process.

So, if you look at the slide you can see that the new plan is for 823 units. 411 will be replacement housing units, 210 of those units will be LITCH units 202 unrestricted and market rate units. This project contemplates 14 total funding sources, and the estimated TDC is approximately 450 million. So that's quite a lot of work that's gone into these plan and preparations HACP's engagements continue as part of the oversight of the implementation grant, resident leaders will serve on a steering committee with HACP, the mayor's office, the city council and other local leaders. Okay, so I will turn this over to Victoria. Thank you.

Victoria Vann: Thank you. We have someone to advance the slides, please? Thank you so much. Okay, so this case study is concerning scattered site units. So, a PHA had approximately 228 scattered site units all single family. And they were unstable to operate as public housing. So, the PHA engaged with impacted residents as a part of that Section 18 application consultation process that was mentioned early on and they heard from 44 residents that they were actually interested in purchasing their homes, which is awesome.

So, the PHA kind of redefined their plans and then put the 44 units into a section 32 home ownership application and put the remaining into a Section 18 disposition application. This case study really illustrates the PHA's willingness to adjust its initial Section 18 plans to sell all of the 244 units through RFQ,-based on the input of residents during the Section 18 consultation. Again, the importance of really just having that time to talk with the residents early on and engaging the residents in the process really shows an example of how you work together with the residents and how you can make the community better. I'm going to pass it over to Kathy, who's going to present another case study. Kathy.

Kathy Szybist: Thank you. Victoria. That's great. So, we're going to move on. Next slide -- next slide please. To another case study. And this case study illustrates how a housing authority

initially put in an application to convert a 60 unit building through RAD. The plan was to rehab the property with tax credits. And retain the property for the same families under the RAD PBV program. They submitted the CHAP, and they started the resident consultation requirements required under RAD and they provided an overview.

However, after starting this process, they did a DNA on the project and determined that the project was actually physically obsolete and qualified for Section 18 obsolescence. So, they determined with their development partners that they could generate more funds under the non-RAD PBV rents in this particular locality; and this higher PBV rents would generate more funding to rehab and to operate the project as quality project-based housing going forward.

So, they decided to switch applications to -- application types from section -- from RAD to Section 18 disposition. They requested that the office of recapitalization rescind the chap. And, and then they went back to the public and to their residents, and they amended their PHA's plan to say, hey, we're going down the Section 18 route now. And then they're consulted the residents and they explained, hey, the future use is still the same. We're still rehabbing this property with tax credits and going to project-based, and you're still going to be able to stay here under a different kind of lease.

But the vehicle, the tool we're using is different. And as we've explained in this webinar the exact consultation requirements are different. And the exact rights, as Damainique referenced in this charts are different. So, the Housing Authority went back to the residents and explained the differences between RAD and Section 18. In re consulting the residents. Next slide please. Great.

So, this next case study illustrates how housing authority had a disposition plan and it consulted the residents on that plan. But then after getting SAC approval of that plan, things changed a little. So here the housing authority had a big project 52 obsolete buildings, 300 units in a huge amount of land, 72 acres of land. A hotel developer approached this housing authority and said, hey, that site would make a great location to build my hotel resort development. And the housing authority thought, great, you know, this is obsolete anyway. We can get a whole lot of money of proceeds from this hotel developer and build low-income housing, public housing, PV off site somewhere.

So, they entered into this agreement with the developer to sell the property at above fair market value. And they told the residents about this plan and that, you know, they would all get comparable housing. They'd all be relocated off site, all their moving expenses would be paid. And they just explained the whole disposition plan. SAC agreed that the property was obsolete, liked that the housing authority was getting more than fair market value from this hotel developer and approved the application.

And then after receiving HUD approval, the developer kind of looked at its hotel plans and determined, hey, I don't really need 72 acres, I only need 42 acres. So, the PHA renegotiated the disposition with the developer down to 42 acres. And then they decided, hey, you know, with this remaining 30 acres, let's redevelop it as affordable housing. So even though this was after SAC approval, the housing authority did the right thing, and it went back to its residents, and it explained the change in disposition plans and said, hey, we're actually going to redevelop 30 acres of your site as affordable housing.

And the housing authority was still kind of early on and how that would be developed, redeveloped and whether residents might get an opportunity to return to the site. But they explained all that to the residents as part of the reconstitution. And then after consulting the residents and securing a board approval, they came back to HUD and the SAC and they said, hey, you know, can you approve our change in plans? And we did. And we very much appreciated that. They're consulted the residents clearly and were very transparent about the change in plans. So that is I think the major points I wanted to cover in these two case studies. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Maria.

Mario Lana-Queen: Okay, everyone. Thank you. Thank you all. Presenters, can you hear me? Okay. Yeah. Okay. Can you move to the next slide, please? We're nearing the end, so this has been great. This is just a recap of everything that our presenters have presented, but these are the resource links where you can find great information. And I want to highlight everything here is very resourceful, informative. But you know, we spoke about those great resources and tools for residents the Tiffany spoke about. So be sure to tune in to the tenant hub right there under public housing. And then choice neighborhoods, of course, highlighted there. Excellent. Resources. That's on the HUD exchange.

So, all of this presentation will be available to you all. Of course. But I just wanted to highlight that here. But let's go on and move to some Q&A. We have 11 -- it looks like 11 questions. And I'm going to do my best to facilitate here in the order that the questions came to us. So, the first question -- and I'll put this out to the team, the appropriate presenter can respond. HUD tracks RAD actions in each community and state on an Excel spreadsheet available to the public and residents. Is there anything similar for the other repositioning so people can help evaluate what's appropriate or what has gone -- what has occurred so far? So, I'm going to throw that question out. HUD team?

Maria Lana-Queen: Do you need me to read the question again or --

Kathy Szybist: Yeah. Could you read it one more time? I'm looking at it now, but I think --

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Hud tracks RAD actions in each community and state on an Excel spreadsheet available to the public and residents. Is there anything similar for the other repositioning so people can help evaluate what's transpiring so far?

Jane Hornstein: No, no, there is not. It is in every for public plan or -- not public annual plan or five-year plan, which is open to the public, but we have not published a spreadsheet like that for every action in Section 18 and section 22.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay.

Jane Hornstein: Don't intend to do so.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Thanks, Jane. Okay. The second question. If residents or resident councils feel that they are not being provided information on the different repositioning options available for their particular development, but just being told that, you know, X or Y is what the PHA or board has decided to pursue, and residents feel that the options do not primarily benefit them, to whom at HUD should they direct their complaint to? And it says, is that the SAC or what office should they direct their complaints to?

Jane Hornstein: They should direct those complaints to the field offices, to their points of contact, because we will. The SAC doesn't approve anything without going through the field office. And if the field office is aware of it, they can bring it to our attention.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay.

Kathy Szybist: Yeah. I'll also chime in there a little bit. I think, you know, if a housing authority proposes to go down and to use a certain tool like Section 18 or RAD and the -- the residents don't agree with it. They their first opportunity to kind of comment on that is at the PHA plan that Tiffany explained so well. So, you know, they can, as Jane said, make comments object to the action as part of the PHA plan process. In the field office again, reviews and approves those plans.

And so that is the first time to kind of object to the larger use of the tool. And then if the Housing Authority continues to proceed and apply for that tool and the residents continue to object then as I explained with the Section 18 and 22, the residents can certainly submit written comments to the housing authority. The housing authority needs to include those comments in their evaluation, to the application to HUD. And with RAD, Damainique, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe there is a new online form now that residents can submit comments directly about their concerns with a RAD application, right?

Jane Hornstein: Can I stop us for one second? Our principal deputy assistant secretary, Richard Monacio [ph], is on the line with us. Andrea, he'd like to say a few words. Can you bring him into the panel discussion?

Andrea Juracek: Yeah, let me see if I can unmute him.

Jane Honstein: Okay. That would be great.

Andrea Juracek: Rich, I'm just going to give you -- here we go. Rich, you should be allowed to speak now.

Richard: Well, thank you very much. Thanks, Jane. I just wanted everybody to know I'm actually learning a lot here and really appreciate the HUD team going through this in such detail because it's such an important issue. You know, as we've increased the number of options available to redevelop properties, we've also increased the complexity. But we always want to make sure that there is adequate, sufficient resident input because -- you know, not just because it's the right thing to do, but it's also the smart thing to do.

I've seen a lot of developments now during my tenure here, and almost without a doubt the most -- the most successful developments are the ones that have this resident inclusion on the front end. And you know, the opposite holds true too. So, it's really good that we've spent this time and really, really in detail to let people know what their specific rights are. And just to let people know to that, you know, we're open to we want this kind of input. We -- you know, it's not -- it's not veto power, but, you know, it's a significant voice in what happens to the future of the development because the residents are the major stakeholders. So, I appreciate everybody, and we'll continue to listen. So, thank you.

Andrea Juracek: Great. Thank you, Rich. Maria, do you want to continue?

Maria Lana-Queen: Yeah. So then -- thank you, sir, for joining us. Okay, so the next question is uh, let me read this for streamlined voluntary conversion. When the voluntary conversion regulations say that residents should be provided draft copies of the conversion plan, does that mean the complete version plan draft with all of the draft components, including impact, etc.? And are they entitled to see the final conversion plan before it's submitted to HUD?

Kathy Szybist: I can take a shot at that, but Jane, chime in here. So, I think it -- first, there's two kinds of voluntary conversion plans. There's one that's under the normal voluntary conversion plan. And then there's one under streamlined voluntary conversion plan. And a streamlined voluntary conversion plan waves certain parts of what would be required in a normal, required or voluntary conversion plan, including the impact analysis and some other parts of the conversion assessment.

So I would say that because PHAs need to consult and involve residents in the development of the voluntary conversion plan, they don't have to present a complete voluntary conversion plan to residents at that initial consultation meeting and involvement meeting, but they do have to provide at least a rough draft of their ideas and where they're going so that the residents can, can significantly participate in the final development of that plan.

And then I would say the second question as to whether the residents have to be presented with a final conversion plan. I don't think the Reg requires the PHA to meet with residents again and provide a copy of the final conversion plan they're submitting to HUD, but they do have to make sure they consider all of the resident comments and input as they complete the final plan and before they submit it to HUD. Jane, I don't know if you have anything to add.

Jane Hornstein: I do want to clarify, Kathy, those plans should be in the annual plan. Or in the five-year plan. It should be available to the residents at any time so that they can review it. And comment. in this in the streamlined voluntary conversion, it has to go into an either an annual plan or a five-year plan. With voluntary conversion, there has to be a full plan, and that should be available to the residents for comment.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Thanks, Jane and Kathy. So, the next question, you may have just addressed this, but I'm going to state it anyway. If there is not significant resident consultation in section 22 or the streamlined voluntary conversion must HUD disapprove the application?

Jane Hornstein: So, it depends. I won't say that we would necessarily disapprove it. We may go back to the Housing Authority and say it's insufficient, go back. Do it again. Make sure you get to certain issues. So, we might put the application on hold for a while, put it back into draft. I mean, if we, if they're still not getting it right and it's still not going anywhere, we have the option to disapprove it. But we will push back hard if it's not complete.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Thanks. Okay. For RAD, to whom at HUD should residents or resident councils direct a complaint if they feel that they have not been consulted with versus just being told of the RAD application? And/or, a PHA has already issued a chap, but didn't inform the residents.

Damainique Bruce: So, on our website which is hud.gov slash RAD. We have a section for both public housing residents and phase two, which would be our PRAC 202 properties. If you go on either of those websites, we have a new link where you can actually submit an inquiry to us. It

doesn't just have to be from a resident, it could be a resident advocate, legal services, the PHA themselves or just a concerned citizen. And that will go directly to our office. And then we can assist you with any questions. And we will investigate if it is something that might be related to noncompliance of our regulations.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. The next question, I think, is coming from a resident. And thank you very much. The question is, if you're interested in a rental assistance or voucher, what would be the criteria for you or your family applying?

Jane Hornstein: If I -- if I'm not mistaken, and Kathy, you may know more, those are set by the housing authorities, not HUD. There's certain criteria that HUD has, but --

Kathy Szybist: Right. Yeah, I agree, I'm -- all of these tools that we've discussed have good resident protections. So, residents should not if you're an existing public housing resident and a housing authority is utilizing one of these tools, there are resident protections, including comparable housing, right, to return in some instances a resident is not going to lose their housing as a result of the PHA losing any of these tools.

That said, you know, the Housing authority does have some discretion as to what kind of comparable housing they offer the residents and the residents qualify to, again, depending on the tool. So, a resident can certainly express its interest in a mobility voucher or another public housing unit. And to the maximum extent feasible, the housing authority will usually try to accommodate the resident's preference, but the resident or the housing authority does have some discretion depending on the tool in the family.

Maria Lana-Queen: And if I could add, it's -- Helen. Helen, thank you for this question. I'd like to refer you to the HUD.gov website. There you can then look into public and Indian housing, and there are questions and answers to are you eligible? What type of housing are you looking for? What location, meaning state or city are you located in? And then there's some information that would further guide questions to the appropriate housing authority. That's www.hud.gov. Okay. Thank you. The next question. What if someone is randomly selected to receive four bedroom at one of the public housing authorities and they have finished the application process and sent it in with all of the documents, met the timeline, but it's been since 2023 since anybody has contacted them, what should they do or what process should they follow?

Damainique Bruce: I always advise that you -- depending on whatever funding program you are under or you're applying to, that you contact your local field office and the respective staff from the HUD Department.

Maria Lana-Queen: Mm-hmm. Okay. Thank you. Next question. What are the odds of the program being revoked for the property that doesn't have the amount of bedrooms that the tenants need?

Jane Hornstein: I'm not clear on what that's -- what --

Kathy Szybist: Yeah, I think it depends on the tool. And like with RAD, Damainique, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the Housing authority is required to make sure it can accommodate the impacted families. So, everyone has a right to return with bedroom sizes.

Damainique Bruce: Correct, that we have a 100 percent replacement. So whatever units were occupied and available for the residents prior to the conversion, there at minimum needs to be at least an equal amount post conversion.

Kathy Szybist: And with most of the SAC tools, again, it depends. A housing authority is not required to replace on a one for one basis or return the same number of bedroom sized units if they are doing replacement housing. That said, they do need to provide the families, the impacted families with comparable housing. And if it's not at the same site then it has to be at a different location, either through tenant-based or another public housing unit.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Thank you. The other question is, and this is probably associated with an earlier question regarding handout availability, the hand with the information today, where would it be available. But the question is where can I find more information about the scattered sites Section 18 case study.

Kathy Szybist: I mean, you -- you're -- you can feel free to reach out to Jane, Victoria and I if you want to discuss that more in depth. But that was just an example of a housing authority that had applied under Section 18. And as part of the application we reviewed, we just observed that and thought it was a really nice best practice. I don't know that there's much more to tell on that. But yeah, feel free to reach out to us if you have more questions.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Thanks, Kathy. Next question, in the RAD to Section 18 case study, again, it's associated with the case study. Were there any residents who, due to a change to Section 18, could not exercise a right to return without rescreening? And in this case, as an example, if there was an over income issue due to low-income housing tax credits?

Kathy Szybist: Right. I don't know the portfolio or the demographics of all the residents impacted. In the particular case study that was presented. All I know is that the Housing Authority did its due diligence and went back to the PHA plan and the residents and explained its change in plans, and then the housing authority then met all the requirements of Section 18. And in the event there was an over income family or a family that might not have qualified to remain at the site as a tax credit project, then the PHA would have been required to offer that family other comparable housing off site.

Damainique Bruce: And I'll just add in there. So, the RAD program -- so even if it is a Section 18 blend, it's still covered underneath the RAD regulations. As well as the RAD relocation provisions, which is supplemental to the Uniform Relocation Act, the URA. And so, we do extensively describe and protect residents, right, to return back to the property, even if they will be receiving a NOHAP. Or they will not no longer be assisted. It is very explicit within our relocation regulations, our general program regulations, as well as the URA that residents cannot be disqualified. From a property just because there's going to be a supplemental funding source attached to the property, such as low-income housing tax credits. So, we do -- again, I advise that you take a look at our actual regulations and our relocation rules to get more detail on that, or feel free to get in contact with me to ask an additional question for clarity.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Thanks, Jane and Kathy. Okay, the next question. I think this is actually a good suggestion. I'll read it. Might it be helpful in the future, in a future presentation,

to have a case study of an unsuccessful application or one that was rejected -- rejected, excuse me, for lack of resident consultation?

Jane Hornstein: It's a good suggestion. We'll take that up, I don't know.

Maria Lana-Queen: Right. Yeah. And this seems to be the final question. We've had some great questions. I may have missed the section as I joined, you know, the webinar later, but here's the question for -- RAD/Section 18 blend understand there are five mandatory meetings. What are sometimes when PHAs have more than five meetings? Does that ever happen?

Damainique Bruce: Yes. So, there's a couple of different circumstances that might trigger additional meetings. So, as an example, when we HUD can always request an additional meeting or if the residents contact our offices, we can request an additional meeting on behalf of the residents. Or if there are any substantial changes to the RAD application or the RAD projected plan project plan.

So, whether that's, you know, there's a changing in funding structure, let's say you start. Actually, working on the contracts to complete the project and the rehabilitation of the property, and you're finding that you have a gap in funds of what is needed versus what you actually have materialized. And now you need to bring in an additional funding source, whether that be through a conventional loan or through adding an additional partner or owner to the property, those would be considered substantial changes that would trigger an additional meeting.

And as far as those substantial changes, you must meet with the residents within three months of that substantial change occurring. So, if you bring in an additional funding source or an additional partner, you must have a meeting with the residents to provide them that opportunity to comment and explain to them how it impacts the not only the conversion process, but how it may impact them as well. In the future, if that clarifies.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Very helpful. Thank you. All right. So that wraps up the questions that have come to us. Are there any further questions or things that we did not address? Okay. I'm going to turn it back over to -- let's see, the producer. Is that right?

Andrea Juracek: No problem. There was one more question that looks like just came in. Was there a number of months or days after which a VA must inform residents of the receipt of a chap?

Damainique Bruce: So, the residents should receive within 30 days of issuance, a notice that they have entered the beginnings of the conversion process. So, there should be a conversion and we would call that notice the Resident Information Notice or Rin.

Andrea Juracek: Great. Thank you.

Maria Lana-Queen: Mm-hmm.

Andrea Juracek: And I believe --

Maria Lana-Queen: There's another one?

Andrea Juracek: Yeah. Go ahead, Maria.

Maria Lana-Queen: Okay. Was there a number of months and days after which for must inform residents of a receipt of a chap?

Andrea Juracek: Yeah. So that's the one we just did.

Maria Lana-Queen: Oh, okay.

Andrea Juracek: But there was one right ahead of that one.

Maria Lana-Queen: But have there ever been any such case -- well, did I say that? Have there ever been any such cases rejected? When is an application rejected due to noncompliance with resident participation? I thought we addressed that. Unless I'm -- Unless you have something else on your screen.

Andrea Juracek: Nope. I think that that's it. Great. Okay, well, if there are no other questions, we thank you all for joining us this afternoon. And we will have all materials posted including the recording of the presentation on the HUD exchange in a couple of weeks. So please check back where you registered for the event. And thank you so much and have a wonderful rest of your day.

Maria Lana-Queen: Thank you.

(END)