



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

901 P Street, Room 102  
Sacramento, CA 95814

July 26, 2023

### CDLAC Committee Meeting Minutes

#### 1. *Agenda Item: Call to Order and Roll Call*

The California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC) meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. with the following Committee members present:

Voting Members:      Fiona Ma, CPA, State Treasurer  
                                 Evan Johnson for State Controller Malia M. Cohen  
                                 Teresa Calvert for Governor Gavin Newsom

Advisory Members:    Anthony Sertich for Department of Housing and Community  
                                 Development (HCD) Director Gustavo Velasquez  
                                 Tiena Johnson Hall, Executive Director for the California Housing  
                                 Finance Agency (CalHFA)

#### 2. *Agenda Item: Approval of the Minutes of the May 10, 2023, Meeting – (Action Item)*

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:  
None.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2023, meeting, and Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

#### 3. *Agenda Item: Program Updates* *Presented by: Ricki Hammett*

Ms. Hammett discussed the following topics:

**Grand Openings:** CDLAC Program Manager D.C. Navarrette and Program Analyst Chris Shephard attended the Salvator Apartments grand opening on Arden Way in Sacramento. The applicant is CalHFA and the developer is Community HousingWorks. The project produced 120 units, 119 of which are affordable. This is a large family, new construction, Mixed-Income project.

**Extension Updates:** On February 23, 2022, by Resolution No. 22-004, the Committee delegated authority to the Interim Executive Director to grant extensions for projects with USDA components to accommodate USDA's loan approval timeframes. Since the last update, one USDA related extension was approved, for a total of five extensions.

On March 27, 2023, the Committee approved Resolution No. 23-016, delegating authority to the Interim Executive Director to grant issuance extensions for projects impacted by bank closures. Since the last update, one extension was approved, for a total of five bank closure related extensions.

CDLAC Committee Meeting  
July 26, 2023



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

**Supplemental Pool Updates:** On July 20, 2022, by Resolution No. 22-005, the Committee delegated authority to the Interim Executive Director to award supplemental allocation to projects where the total delegated supplemental requests are no more than 10% of the project's approved allocation and no more than 52% of the aggregate depreciable basis plus land. A total of 37 applications have been received so far, and approximately \$79.7 million of the \$129.9 million beginning balance has been allocated, leaving a remaining balance of approximately \$115.5 million. Of the 37 applications received, two supplemental requests will be presented today, as they are requesting more than 10% of the project's approved allocation. If those requests are approved, approximately \$82.6 million will have been allocated from the supplemental pool, leaving a balance of approximately \$112.6 million.

Chairperson Ma expressed her best wishes for Nancee Robles, former CDLAC Interim Executive Director, and said she hopes a new Executive Director is found soon.

Mr. Johnson asked if staff assumes most of the projects impacted by bank closures have moved through the system at this point.

Ms. Hammett said the requests for extensions have declined since the initial impact of the bank closures.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:  
None.

4. ***Agenda Item: Recommendation for Award of Allocation to Qualified Private Activity Bonds for Exempt Facility (EXF) Projects (Round 3) – (Action Item)***  
*Presented by: Emily Burgos*

Ms. Burgos reported that one Exempt Facility application was received this round. Staff recommends approval of a \$100 million tax-exempt bond allocation for Republic Services to make improvements to existing landfills throughout the state.

Chairperson Ma invited a representative from Republic Services to speak.

Ben Barker from California Municipal Finance Authority (CMFA) said the project is straightforward and will improve existing landfills throughout the state.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:  
None.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to approve the recommendation, and Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

5. ***Agenda Item: Resolution No. 23-024, Request to Transfer Allocation from the Housing Authority of the City of San Diego to the California Housing Finance Agency (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4 §5120) – (Action Item)***  
*Presented by: Emily Burgos*

Ms. Burgos explained that Junipers Apartments (CA-22-568) has requested a change of issuer from the Housing Authority of City of San Diego (SDHC) to the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA).



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

The project was originally awarded at the end of November 2022, and projects in that round were given a 90-day extension due to volatile market conditions. As a result, the project's bond issuance deadline is in August 2023, and the City of San Diego's offices are closed in August. In order for the project to meet the issuance deadline, CalHFA has agreed to accept the transfer of the allocation. This is an uncommon occurrence, but a similar request was approved by the Committee in the past.

Chairperson Ma asked if the entire City of San Diego is closed in August.

Ms. Burgos said she could not confirm, but her understanding is that the city offices are closed for the full month.

Mr. Sertich asked if there will be any issues since the allocation was carryforward from 2022.

Ms. Burgos explained that the project technically cannot transfer the allocation because SDHC is holding the allocation as carryforward, but staff will apply that carryforward to SDHC's next project and move some allocation around on the back end to make this work.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:  
None.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to adopt Resolution No. 23-024, and Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

**6. Agenda Item: Resolution No. 23-025, Request to Waive the Maximum Bond Allocation Amount (\$75,000,000) for Qualified Residential Rental Project (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4 §5232) – (Action Item)**

*Presented by: D.C. Navarrette*

Mr. Navarrette reported that Meridian Family Apartments (CA-23-548) is requesting an allocation of \$87,195,898. The project is a 233-unit, large family, new construction project located in San Jose. The applicant is CalHFA, and the developer is Pacific Housing.

Ms. Johnson Hall expressed support for this project.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:  
None.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to adopt Resolution No. 23-025, and Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

**7. Agenda Item: Resolution No. 23-026 and 23-027, Supplemental Bond Allocation Request Above the Executive Director's Authority (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, § 5240) – (Action Item)**

*Presented by: D.C. Navarrette*

Mr. Navarrette reported that there are two projects with supplemental allocation requests above the Executive Director's authority. The first project, Pismo Terrace (CA-23-513), is requesting \$992,619 in supplemental allocation. The project's original allocation was \$13,414,789, and the original supplemental allocation was \$643,307, which was approved by the Interim Executive Director. The combined



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

supplemental request is \$1,635,926, which is 12.19% of the Committee-approved allocation. This is above the Executive Director's authority, but the project meets the 52% basis limit. The project is a 52-unit, Special Needs, new construction project, located in Pismo beach. The applicant is CMFA, and the developer is People's Self-Help Housing Corporation (PSHHC).

Chairperson Ma invited representatives from PSHHC to speak on behalf of the project.

Katherine Aguilar, Director of Multifamily Housing Development at PSHHC, said Pismo Terrace is an important project that has faced construction delays and cost increases, as well as increases in construction loan interest rates. Cost increases occurred between the project's first and second supplemental allocation requests, including overbudgeted items, such as windows. Additionally, the electric installation was \$400-500,000 over budget. In total, costs increased by about \$1.8 million. PSHHC is continuing to look for additional sources for the project's permanent financing. This is an important project for the community and includes 24 No Place Like Home units. The developer is working with local service providers and agencies to lease up the project, and it is expected to be completed by the end of November 2023.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments on Pismo Terrace:  
None.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to adopt Resolution No. 23-026, and Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

Mr. Navarrette introduced the second project requesting a supplemental bond allocation over the Executive Director's delegated authority, Friendship Senior Housing (CA-23-580). The project is requesting \$1.25 million in supplemental bond allocation. The project's original allocation was \$22.5 million, and it also received two previous supplemental allocations of \$1.35 million and \$900,000, which were both approved by the Interim Executive Director. The combined supplemental allocation request is \$3.5 million, which is 15.56% of the Committee-approved allocation, but the project meets the 52% basis limit. The project is a 50-unit, senior, new construction project, located in Oakland. The applicant is CMFA and the developer is Community Housing Development Corporation (CHDC).

Chairperson Ma invited representatives from CHDC to speak on behalf of the project.

Donald Gilmore, Executive Director of CHDC, said this project has been plagued by cost overruns, increased interest rates, and unexpected insurance cost increases in the wake of fires. These issues have been complicated by layered funding sources, but HCD has been cooperative, and this is the last hurdle the project faces prior to closing. Additionally, this project will be the first faith-based initiative to break ground, and hopefully it will set a precedent for more churches to repurpose their properties to create more housing.

Chairperson Ma said that has been a priority for many people.

Timothy Moreau, Project Manager at CHDC, echoed Mr. Gilmore's comments regarding interest rate and insurance cost increases. This is the project's last hurdle prior to closing, which is scheduled for next month.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments on Friendship Senior Housing:



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Sarah Reyes from the Department of Housing and Community Development in the City of Oakland expressed support for this project and encouraged the Committee to approve the supplemental bond allocation request. The project received city funding, and due to the challenging construction environment in Oakland and the Bay Area right now, it is an important project.

Chairperson Ma closed public comment.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to adopt Resolution No. 23-027, and Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

8. ***Agenda Item: Resolution No. 23-028, Request to Extend the Bond Allocation Issuance Deadline for Qualified Residential Rental Project and Request to Waive Forfeiture of the Performance Deposit (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, §§ 5052, 5100, 5101, 5132) – (Action Item)***

*Presented by: D.C. Navarrette*

Mr. Navarrette explained that La Guadalupe (CA-22-521 & CA-23-408) was originally allocated \$13,398,178 on December 21, 2020, which was issued on October 26, 2021. On June 15, 2022, the project received a supplemental allocation of \$1.9 million. On February 1, 2023, the project requested an additional allocation of \$3.58 million. According to supplemental Resolution Nos. 22-162 and 23-107, if the allocation transferred to the applicant has not issued bonds by August 7, 2023, the applicant shall notify CDLAC and carryforward the allocation to the next approved project to be awarded a bond allocation in accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 4, Section 5133. In a case of extreme hardship, the Executive Director may extend this date by up to five business days. The project is requesting a 90-day extension, which would extend the date from August 7, 2023, to November 7, 2023. La Guadalupe is a 44-unit, Special Needs, new construction project, located in the City of Los Angeles. The applicant is the City of Los Angeles and the developer is Many Mansions.

Chairperson Ma invited representatives of La Guadalupe to speak.

Rodney Thompson from Many Mansions explained that the project depended on additional funding from the City of Los Angeles in the amount of approximately \$2.89 million, through a program developed this year. Unfortunately, the city has to defer the award until later in the year, so in order to get the bonds closed, the developer has committed to making a \$3 million loan to the project in place of the funding from the city. All of this information was presented to the developer in late May, and approval had to be obtained from its board of directors in order to make the loan to the project. The Los Angeles City Council is currently on recess, so the approvals for the bond issuance cannot be presented, even though the funding gap has been filled. The project needs more time to get on the City Council's agenda. Many Mansions is committed to seeing the project through and will be loaning approximately \$3.9 million in total to the project.

Ms. Calvert asked Mr. Thompson to clarify if Many Mansions found out about the July recess in late May.

Mr. Thompson said Many Mansions found out that the city would not be able to provide the necessary funding in May, so the developer had to pivot and use its own resources for the project. It



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

was too late to start the transmittal process, which takes several weeks as it must go through the City of Los Angeles Housing Department, subcommittees of the City Council, the City Council, and finally the Los Angeles Mayor's Office. By the time the developer received all the necessary approvals to lend money to the project, it was too late to route the transmittal through the City Council for approval in time to meet the August 7, 2023, deadline. The developer learned about the funding shortfall in late May, then made the commitment to lend the funds and received approval from the board of directors at the beginning of June. At that point, it was determined that there was not enough time to get the transmittal completed.

Mr. Johnson asked staff to confirm if this resolution would approve the extension, the waiver of forfeiture of the performance deposit, or both.

Mr. Navarrette said this resolution would approve the extension. The waiver of forfeiture of the performance deposit would occur if an extension was not granted.

Ms. Burgos clarified that these issues can be addressed separately or together.

Mr. Johnson said this extension is important and he supports it, but he asked staff what the volume of extension requests is now, compared to the height of the pandemic when there was a lot of uncertainty.

Mr. Navarrette said the extension requests have slowed down, and staff is not receiving very many anymore. At the height of the pandemic, there were more extension requests.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:

None.

Mr. Johnson said the Committee should maintain pressure on the timelines, but at the same time, developers should not be penalized for delays beyond their control. Developers can use the timeline as a tool to move projects forward. He will be concerned if the Committee continues to see a steady flow of these requests.

Chairperson Ma said there were a lot of extension requests in the first year, and many of the projects coming from the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles were denied because their staffs were not working collaboratively and efficiently with CDLAC to meet the deadlines. However, with the city closures occurring now, it is a different situation which the Committee will need to take into consideration along with rising interest rates and construction costs. She thanked Mr. Johnson for his comments and expressed that the Committee's goal has been to hold everyone accountable, but there are many outside factors now that are causing difficulties. The Committee is trying to be as flexible as possible.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to adopt Resolution No. 23-028.

Ms. Calvert asked for clarification that Mr. Johnson's motion is to approve both the extension and waiver of forfeiture of the performance deposit.

Mr. Johnson responded affirmatively.

Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.





**9. Resolution No. 23-029, Approval of Emergency Rulemaking to CDLAC General Provisions and Qualified Residential Rental Projects (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, §§ 5000-5241) – (Action Item)**

*Presented by: Emily Burgos*

Ms. Burgos explained that the emergency regulations package is presented to the Committee today for two reasons. First, there is some technical cleanup that is fairly minimal. Second, staff wanted to give Other Rehab and Preservation projects an opportunity to be awarded from the surplus pool at the end of the year. At the end of last year, two projects applied in the Other Rehab pool but could not be awarded because that pool was too small. They appealed to the Committee and requested to be awarded from the surplus pool. There was a discussion at the Committee level that led staff to determine that this pool should be opened up at the end of the year. When the regulations were written to create the surplus pool, there was a heavy emphasis on new construction and new units, so all other types of projects were excluded from the surplus pool. There has now been a shift, so staff felt that it was prudent to remove the new construction requirement for access to the surplus pool, recognizing that now that the scoring criteria has changed, Other Rehab and Preservation projects will always score lower than new construction because they are not eligible for the same number of points. Therefore, new construction is still prioritized, but this change will give developers and sponsors some assurance that if there is money at the end of the year, there will still be access to allocation for Preservation and Other Rehab projects. This regulation change does not alter the tiebreaker or scoring system.

Ms. Burgos reminded the Committee that the CDLAC's regulations cannot be amended as easily as CTCAC's. The last CDLAC regulations package presented to the Committee was permanent. The package presented to the Committee today is an emergency package. The package was posted to the CDLAC website as notice must be given before the package is submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). If the Committee approves the package, it will be submitted to OAL, where it will be approved within 10 days. At that point, the regulations will become active. That will allow between six months and one year for the regulations to be made permanent. If the Committee approves the package, it will be submitted to OAL and be enacted, and then it will be submitted to the Committee again to be made permanent, most likely without changes, unless there are significant comments from the public suggesting that changes should be made.

Chairperson Ma said she has supported Acquisition/Rehabilitation projects since day one, and in the past four years, while the Committee has been solely focused on new construction, these buildings with a lot of wear and tear have not been addressed. It is not right because the tenants of these buildings deserve high quality housing. If there are extra funds available, the Committee should make sure older buildings remain affordable and are not subject to market rate developers who want to take them over.

Ms. Johnson Hall expressed that this is the best and right thing to do, and she fully supports this change. She said she understands that this change will ensure Other Rehab and Preservation projects have access to allocation at the end of the year if there is availability, but she asked Ms. Burgos to clarify if this is a permanent regulation change.

Ms. Burgos said it will be made permanent, but presenting it first as an emergency change allows for it to be enacted immediately.



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Ms. Johnson Hall suggested pushing back the application deadline in order to allow more time for developers to submit applications.

Ms. Burgos said staff can accommodate a later deadline if the Committee is flexible about when awards are made. However, she has not heard any public comments to that effect, so she would like to know how developers feel about this issue. Staff would need to present an updated calendar at the next Committee meeting in August, which would allow for the application deadline to be pushed back by two weeks. Staff would prefer to keep the December 6, 2023, award date for now, and if necessary, request a two-week extension from the Committee in November. Logistically, that makes the most sense for staff. Pushing both deadlines out by two weeks would put the award date too close to the end of the year, when there are many other things that need to be done.

Ms. Johnson Hall expressed that she would like to look ahead and anticipate the needs of the developers.

Ms. Burgos encouraged members of the public to provide comments on this issue.

Ms. Johnson Hall suggested pushing the deadline out now, and if the extension is not needed, the Committee can revert back to the current deadline.

Ms. Burgos said the extension cannot be done today. It would need to be presented as an agenda item at the next Committee meeting, so there is time to receive feedback from members of the public. Additionally, staff will have time to receive applications and assess whether the December 6, 2023, award date is still feasible.

Chairperson Ma asked about excess bonds for Exempt Facilities, such as garbage and recycling projects.

Ms. Burgos said she does not know if this is the appropriate agenda item for that discussion.

Chairperson Ma said the Committee is discussing regulation changes.

Ms. Burgos said a regulation change is not needed to manage excess bonds for Exempt Facilities. Typically, excess allocation is given to housing at the end of the year, but staff has received some public comments about adding an additional round for Exempt Facilities and Industrial Development Bonds (IDBs) before the end of the year since there is approximately \$350 million remaining in the Exempt Facilities pool and approximately \$25 million remaining in the IDB pool. If there is support from the Committee and an appetite from the public, staff could propose a scheduling change at the next meeting to add an additional round for those projects.

Chairperson Ma asked if any excess allocation will first go toward new construction projects and then Acquisition/Rehabilitation, for at least the next year. She does not want to have a huge carryforward; that is not acceptable or efficient, so it is important to push out as much allocation as possible every year. If the allocation cannot be used by housing this year, the Committee cannot keep rolling it over and waiting. That caused trouble in the last audit during the previous administration. It is important to think ahead on this.





## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Ms. Burgos said staff understands that CDLAC is not a housing agency, and their job is to get the allocation out the door. Housing is a priority right now and it is helping to improve the state, but staff wants to take every opportunity to use the allocation. There should not be an expectation that CDLAC will carryforward a billion dollars every year and be able to spend it. Staff can accommodate an additional round for Exempt Facilities, and Ms. Burgos has received public comments in support of an additional round, but she cannot guarantee that any projects will apply. It would not hurt to give those projects another opportunity to access allocation because there will most likely be a significant carryforward again this year.

Mr. Johnson asked what the alternative would be to adding an additional round, and if those funds could be moved to a different pool instead.

Ms. Burgos said that if another round of applications is not added for Exempt Facilities, the extra allocation in that pool will be put into housing before the end of the year, and it will most likely be carried forward into next year.

Mr. Sertich said he does not oppose this change, but it is important for the Committee to be thoughtful about the value of broadening the use of the remaining allocation. If there is a billion dollars of extra funds, a lot of that could end up going toward resyndicating projects, which may not be the best use of the funds. That occurred frequently in the early 2010s. Carryforward is not the worst thing in the world, and although it is important to use the funds, they should be used as efficiently as possible. He would not like to see a billion dollars' worth of bonds going toward projects that do not necessarily need rehabilitation. Instead, it could be carried forward and used better next year. The issue with housing bonds right now is a lack of gap financing, and it is unknown if that financing will ever return.

Ms. Johnson Hall said that is why she asked if this regulation change will be made permanent.

Ms. Burgos clarified that the package presented to the Committee today is an emergency package, and the Committee does not have to approve it as a permanent change. However, staff intends to present it in the future as a permanent change. Public comments have indicated that it is more difficult for resyndication projects to receive allocation with the current scoring system.

Chairperson Ma said the Committee also sets requirements, such as \$60,000 in hard construction costs per unit.

Ms. Burgos said that is correct, and there are also minimum point thresholds. Those are other mechanisms where adjustments can be made. The industry needs to know that certain opportunities are available, and it takes a while to complete these projects. As Ms. Johnson Hall stated previously, making adjustments every year does not give developers adequate time to prepare their projects.

Chairperson Ma said she would like to think ahead and leave some flexibility so the Committee is not stuck if extra allocation is available. She encouraged the Committee and members of the public to look ahead and be prepared to use as many bonds as possible.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

William Leach from Kingdom Development thanked staff for their work on this issue because there is pent up demand from developers for Acquisition/Rehabilitation projects that need significant work. He understands Mr. Sertich's concern about making the best use of the allocation, but there are certainly a lot of projects that do need the funding and will make good use of it. Mr. Leach encouraged everyone to advocate for more state tax credits; the \$500 million state tax credits were a perfect tool for the bond allocation to be used more effectively, and if the credits could be increased to \$1 billion or \$1.5 billion, it would be wonderful for the bond program. When redevelopment agencies existed, \$2 billion per year was provided to them for affordable housing.

Chairperson Ma said she has been trying, but this is not a good year.

Sarah Reyes from the Department of Housing and Community Development in the City of Oakland thanked staff for their work on this important change. Oakland has a large number of projects in need of rehabilitation, and due to the competitiveness of tax credit financing and a large portion of Oakland being in a high opportunity area, those projects have not been funded. This is a great opportunity for these projects to receive funding and produce much needed housing in Oakland.

William Wilcox from the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) expressed support for this regulation change. Rehabilitation work is vital to ensuring tenants can continue to live in high-quality, safe, affordable housing. The new threshold requirements for \$60,000 in hard costs per unit in Other Rehab ensures that these funds will only go toward priority projects rather than cash-out resyndications. There is adequate demand for rehabilitation projects to use the full amount of bonds within the next year or so, and MOHCD would not support allocating excess bonds to Exempt Facilities or IDBs. Allocating carryforward to housing will ensure that all the carryforward is spent the following year, whereas there is much more risk in allocating carryforward to Exempt Facilities or IDBs, which led to losing carryforward in the early 2010s and the findings of the audit. MOHCD does not believe an application deadline extension is necessary for Other Rehab projects because two weeks will not make a difference in their readiness to apply. These projects need to get a capital needs assessment, financials, and appraisals, so keeping the current deadline would best meet the needs of Oakland's projects. MOHCD supports this change and believes it will be a great way to meet tenants' needs.

Adrienne Gemheart from California Housing Partnership expressed support for all the proposed regulation changes.

Ben Barker from CMFA thanked the staff for presenting this regulation change as it is an important measure to use up the remaining allocation. Historically, there were years when CMFA was using carryforward from two to three years prior, and a large amount of carryforward kept rolling forward repeatedly. It is best to avoid a billion dollars or more of carryforward at the end of the year, especially if there is still a continued downturn and fiscal instability in the market going into next year. If there are feasible projects, CMFA would like to move them forward and use up the allocation. Additionally, there is still approximately \$300 million in the Exempt Facilities pool, and while Mr. Barker would love to fund as much housing as possible, the Exempt Facilities projects are important because they collect trash and provide jobs. CMFA supports funding Exempt Facilities projects this year, but not carrying forward hundreds of millions of dollars into the Exempt Facilities pool next year.



## California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Marina Wiant from California Housing Consortium expressed support for the proposed regulation changes.

Ellen Morris from Eden Housing said her organization supports all of the proposed regulation changes, particularly the change that would allow funding additional resyndications. Eden Housing has a project in Pleasanton that applied in the 2019 round, which was first come, first served, and the project did not receive an allocation. There are a couple of other projects with similar stories that serve seniors and would benefit from ADA improvements and other improvements to their units. These projects could update their applications, be ready to apply, and would benefit from awards.

Chairperson Ma closed public comment.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johnson motioned to adopt Resolution No. 23-029, and Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

### 10. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

### 11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 a.m.