



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

901 P Street, Room 102
Sacramento, CA 95814

January 13, 2026

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 1:01 p.m. with the following Committee members present:

Voting Members:

Fiona Ma, CPA, State Treasurer, Chairperson
Malia M. Cohen, State Controller
Michele Perrault for Gavin Newsom, Governor

Advisory Members:

Gustavo Velasquez, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Director
Tony Sertich, California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA) Executive Director

2. *Agenda Item: Approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2025, Meeting*

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:
None.

MOTION: Ms. Cohen motioned to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2025, meeting, and Ms. Perrault seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

3. *Agenda Item: Executive Director's Report*

Presented by: Marina Wiant

Marina Wiant, Interim Executive Director, announced that CDLAC will be holding a virtual application workshop on January 28, 2026, which will include both tax credit and bond application information, primarily for the 4% tax credit program. Two registrants will be allowed per organization for capacity reasons, and registration can be completed online.

Ms. Wiant said the demand survey results were included with the meeting materials. CDLAC puts out a demand survey every fall, and there were fewer responses this year compared to previous years. There appears to still be very strong demand for the program across the board, and there were a lot of respondents in the exempt facilities and non-housing space. Some of this information has been incorporated in the staff's recommendations in agenda item 5.



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:

None.

4. **Agenda Item: Resolution No. 26-001, Adoption of the 2026 State Ceiling on Qualified Tax-Exempt Private Activity Bonds (Gov. Code § 8869.84 & Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, § 5001)**

Presented by: Marina Wiant

Ms. Wiant explained that the Committee sets the state ceiling every year based on the population multiplied by a per-capita amount, which is \$135 this year. This is \$5 higher than last year's amount, which was \$130. The 2025 census numbers are not available yet, so the staff is requesting that the Committee set the state ceiling based on the 2024 population multiplied by \$135, resulting in a total of \$5,323,220,505. Once the 2025 census population is certified, the state ceiling amount will be administratively adjusted. The staff expects that the amount will increase as a result of the population change, and any adjustments will be reported to the Committee at the next scheduled meeting.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:

None.

MOTION: Ms. Perrault motioned to adopt Resolution No. 26-001, and Ms. Cohen seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

5. **Agenda Item: Resolution No. 26-002, Adoption of the State Ceiling Pools and Application Process (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, §§ 5001 & 5101)**

Presented by: Marina Wiant

Ms. Wiant explained that the staff asks the Committee each year to determine if there will be either an open or competitive application process. Based on what the staff has seen over the past few years, along with the demand survey results, a competitive application process is recommended for this year. The staff expects that demand will decrease as a result of the 25% test, so it is still to be determined what next year might look like. However, for 2026, the staff requests that the Committee declare a competitive application. In light of all of the changes with the 25% test, the response from the demand survey, and stakeholder input over the past several years, the staff is recommending a few departures from the pattern of the past few years, including setting aside more resources for acquisition and rehabilitation projects this year. There is a breakdown in Exhibit A in the meeting materials.

Ms. Wiant explained that the staff is requesting that 3% of the total state ceiling be set aside for single family housing and 7% for non-housing uses, which will be broken down into categories for industrial development, solid waste exempt facilities, and non-solid waste exempt facilities. This will leave \$4.8 billion in the Qualified Residential Rental Housing Program (QRRP), \$1 billion of which the staff recommends setting aside for acquisition and rehabilitation. In order to accommodate that large increase compared to previous years, the staff made an even cut from all the other pools and set asides to 93% of last year's allocation. Combined with the 25% test, the staff still expects that new construction



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

will have the capacity to produce 75% more than last year. The state-funded Mixed-Income Program (MIP) is being cut significantly more than the other pools due to the fixed nature of the MIP subsidy and the state credit requests. Ms. Wiant has been communicating with CalHFA about that.

Ms. Perrault thanked Ms. Wiant for the thorough explanation and for the staff continually monitoring needs and thinking about where CDLAC can have the greatest impact. However, as she has said previously in response to other changes, the state is in the process of standing up the new Housing and Homelessness Agency and continuing to work toward greater alignment across the housing finance system. Some of the proposals were put out in the Governor's budget last week. The Committee should continue to monitor these changes, along with the implementation of the 25% test, to ensure they are hitting the mark for the maximum impact. Ms. Perrault appreciates the staff keeping an eye on this and coming up with ways to maximize the allocation.

Chairperson Ma asked if there would be an opportunity to reallocate the bonds if things were to change around the world or with the federal government.

Ms. Wiant said that would be possible, although the staff would probably recommend waiting until after the first two rounds to make changes because those rounds will have state tax credits.

Chairperson Ma asked for confirmation that the allocation pools could be adjusted after the second round.

Ms. Wiant responded affirmatively. Additionally, the staff is requesting that if the population increases, the increase will be distributed proportionally within the QRRP pool.

Ms. Cohen said now is a great time to invest in existing housing projects.

Chairperson Ma asked Ms. Wiant to explain how the supplemental allocation can be used.

Ms. Wiant explained that the supplemental allocation has historically been set aside for when projects needed additional state ceiling to meet the 50% test. The supplemental allocation has been reduced this year because of the 25% test. There are projects that were allocated last year and will be closing this year that will now be subject to the 25% test and should not need a supplemental allocation, so the demand for the supplemental pool is a bit reduced compared to previous years. The pool exists for projects that need a little bit extra to meet the 50% test from older bond issuances. If there were other issues that needed to be accommodated, it would be appropriate to do so at the end of the year. There has been a struggle to place equity for projects that were awarded in Round 3, and most of those projects should return their allocation if they are not able to move forward and come back in Round 3 this year for the appropriate allocation that they need.

Mr. Sertich thanked the staff for the discussions they have had with CalHFA about the MIP pool. He appreciates the thoughtfulness about the ways to use the bonds for preservation and rehabilitation. This is important because the past few years have been tough for projects in need of rehabilitation, so the more allocation that can be dedicated there, the better, within reason. Mr. Sertich would also like to



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

keep focus on maximizing the leverage from the 4% tax credits, so he appreciates 90% of the bonds still going toward affordable multifamily housing.

Mr. Velasquez echoed the support for the increase in the acquisition and rehabilitation pool. Three or four years ago, when the state was enjoying a big surplus, the Governor substantially increased funding for preservation of projects that had HCD funding. That funding was in the order of \$300-350 million, and the money flew incredibly fast. The demand from projects with affordability restrictions expiring within the next few years has been incredibly high. Mr. Velasquez applauds the Committee's focus on projects that are at risk, projects that have covenants expiring soon, and legacy projects that have been funded by the state. The decrease in the homeless pool needed to happen in order to increase the rehabilitation pool, but Mr. Velasquez knows the Committee is committed to continuing to look at ways to fund the segment of the market that is least performing, which is units for the homeless population and ELI/VLI. Nonetheless, the data speaks for itself in terms of the need to recapitalize projects that need to be preserved.

Chairperson Ma said she has been saying that for seven years, so she is glad the Committee is finally able to focus more on acquisition and rehabilitation projects. She hopes this year goes as planned.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:

Cherene Sandidge from the Black Developers Forum (BDF) expressed appreciation for the emphasis on acquisition and rehabilitation because there were a lot of projects that were built when she was a little girl and are now in desperate need of a lot of work. However, she cautioned the Committee that there is now a conflict in the application process that needs to be addressed. Typically, these projects are not in affordable Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) areas, and they will lose points to newer projects somewhere else. Ms. Sandidge is sure there are people in San Francisco on the call who can speak to that, as it is the issue Ms. Sandidge experienced in the city. Projects in neighborhoods such as Hunters Point are not in AFFH areas, but they are definitely in need of acquisition and rehabilitation. The Committee needs to look at that and make sure they are aligning with their goals.

Kate Rose from the California Coalition for Rural Housing (CCRH) said her organization is a statewide nonprofit advocacy organization that works specifically with rural, tribal, and farm worker communities. The proposal to reduce all pools and set asides evenly by 7% from 2025 levels to fund the new acquisition and rehabilitation pool will have a disproportionate impact on the rural pool because it is the smallest. CCRH respectfully requests that the rural pool remain unchanged.

Joanna Ladd, Associate Director of Housing Development at Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) in San Francisco, thanked the staff and the Committee for doubling the bonds for acquisition and rehabilitation. As others have stated, this is sorely needed, especially since rehabilitation projects have barely been able to be funded over the last five years since bonds became competitive. CCDC has projects in need of renovation that have either applied multiple times and have not been funded, or they did not even apply because they knew they would not be competitive. This is really amazing and will be transformative for a lot of residents who have been dealing with buildings that are in need of renovation for a long time. Ms. Ladd supports the allocation as proposed.



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Bronson Viscarra, Project Manager at EAH Housing, echoed the other comments in support of the increase to the acquisition and rehabilitation pool. A lot of nonprofit developers have aging portfolios that are desperately in need of reinvestment.

Karla Guerra, Policy and Advocacy Senior Manager at the Unity Council, said her organization is a community-based nonprofit organization that has been active in real estate for the better part of its 60-year history in California. They work on new construction, adaptive reuse, preservation, commercial, and community benefit projects. To date, they have built or preserved over 600 apartments with another 550 units currently in the pipeline. As developers with a long history of developing and preserving affordable housing and advancing economic opportunity in Oakland's Fruitvale district specifically, as well as across the East Bay in California, they are thankful to the Committee for doubling the amount of bonds for rehabilitation and fully support the allocation for the acquisition and rehabilitation pool as proposed. Preservation is not optional; it is essential to preventing displacement and protecting residents.

Courtney Pal, Policy Manager at Resources for Community Development, echoed the strong support for the proposal to double the bond resources for acquisition and rehabilitation projects. This is the right time to prioritize investment in existing affordable housing properties. As other speakers have mentioned, the affordable housing portfolio is aging, and many properties have significant physical needs. Many properties have deferred rehabilitation for years when they could not compete for scarce bond allocations. The extended resources that are now available will finally give these homes a viable path forward, which will protect thousands of units and the families that depend on them. The adjustment is a smart short-term response to address the backlogged demand for rehabilitation, and it does not lock the Committee into future allocations. Ms. Pal voiced her strong support and asked the Committee to approve this increase to take advantage of this critical moment.

William Wilcox, Bond Program Manager at the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), expressed his support for the allocations. This is a fair and excellent way to invest in the existing portfolio. As others have mentioned, the lack of investment in recent years due to the limited bonds available has meant that projects have deferred reinvestment and resyndication, which has led to compounding challenges. MOHCD estimates that there are at least 1,200 units in San Francisco that are in need of a major resyndication, and these investments need to be made now before there are greater physical needs across the portfolio. This is owed to the residents of these properties and is the only way to ensure a long-term stable program. The public housing program across the United States did not reinvest in capital, and the LITHC program should not repeat those mistakes. Mr. Wilcox is happy that the Committee has decided to make these valuable investments.

Caleb Smith, Senior Policy Analyst at the City of Oakland Housing and Community Development Department, thanked the Committee for considering this increase in the resources available to address the needs of existing affordable housing. Oakland is planning on making an investment of some of its local funds into similar kinds of rehabilitation, and it is exciting to see that the state is going to be a strong partner in that effort so that the city can spread its local dollars as far as possible. Hopefully the state's investment will encourage other local governments to make similar investments in the future.



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

This existing proposal is fabulous, but if any further adjustments are being considered, Mr. Smith can see how there could be an advantage to only pulling allocation from the geographic regions rather than the rural, homeless, and ELI/VLI set asides. However, the proposal on the table would be a very exciting opportunity for California, and Mr. Smith is excited to see the Committee consider it today.

Elizabeth Selby, Director of Housing for the Los Angeles Housing Department, echoed the previous comments in support of an allocation for acquisition and rehabilitation. The City of Los Angeles is days away from awarding over \$30 million in acquisition and rehabilitation funding to projects, and it is exciting for the development community to have some dollars to leverage against at the state. Ms. Selby thanked the Committee for this proposal.

Nevada Merriman, Vice President of Policy and Advocacy at MidPen Housing, echoed the previous comments. In 2020, many of the Committee members were in the room when the bonds became competitive and the path to rehabilitation was all but eliminated. There have been some ways of redressing that over the years, but this is an issue that MidPen has flagged for the past six years and has asked the Committee to look at. Ms. Merriman hopes that this can move forward at this time. It is the right time now that the industry has received the once in a decade expansion to the tax credit and bond program at the federal level. She is happy to see this being elevated as a top priority in this moment and fully supports the staff's recommendation.

Shreya Shah, Associate Director at the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC), echoed the previous comments. She appreciates the Committee for doubling the amount of bonds for rehabilitation and fully supports the allocation to the acquisition and rehabilitation pool as proposed. This will help TNDC's aging portfolio and give it some much needed resources.

Jayleen Solorzano-Diaz from MAAC Project in San Diego thanked the Committee for doubling the amount of bonds for rehabilitation. She fully supports the allocation for the acquisition and rehabilitation pool as proposed.

Chairperson Ma closed public comments.

MOTION: Ms. Cohen motioned to adopt Resolution No. 26-002, and Ms. Perrault seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

6. ***Agenda Item: Resolution No. 26-003, Adoption of the Minimum Point Threshold for the Qualified Residential Rental Program (QRRP) New Construction, Rural, Acquisition/Rehabilitation, and BIPOC Pools for the 2026 Program Year (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 4, § 5101)***

Presented by: D.C. Navarrette

Mr. Navarrette explained that the CDLAC regulations require the Committee to establish a minimum point threshold for the new construction, rural, acquisition and rehabilitation, and BIPOC pools. This year, the staff is recommending a minimum point threshold of 97 points for new construction, rural and BIPOC; and 81 points for acquisition and rehabilitation. This is an 8-point reduction from last



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

year's minimum and reflects the removal of leveraged soft resource scoring. The maximum that a project can score this year is 112 points.

Chairperson Ma asked, in reference to Ms. Sandidge's prior comments, if there is a mechanism for older projects to score competitively.

Ms. Wiant explained that what was previously the 120th point for projects in high and highest resource areas will now be the 112th point, and it is only available to new construction projects. The only issue would be in the tiebreaker, and the staff is looking across the board at whether there is a more appropriate tiebreaker for rehabilitation projects generally for 2027. However, it should not be a problem. She hears the concern, but because that determinative point is not available to acquisition and rehabilitation projects, a more minor adjustment happens in the tiebreaker for projects in high or highest resource areas or neighborhood change areas.

Chairperson Ma said that what Ms. Sandidge expressed was a desire for older buildings requiring more repairs and maintenance to have priority over newer buildings.

Ms. Wiant said the priorities were set with the regulations package that was approved in December 2025. Projects that have higher rehabilitation needs, legacy projects, and at-risk projects are prioritized through the point score. The lowest scoring projects are those that have not received tax credits within 20 years. Newer projects would not score in that category.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:
None.

MOTION: Ms. Perrault motioned to adopt Resolution No. 26-003, and Ms. Cohen seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll call vote.

7. **Agenda Item: Supplemental Bond Allocation Request Above the Executive Director's Authority (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, § 5109)**
Presented by: D.C. Navarrette

Mr. Navarrette explained that Section 5109(b) of the CDLAC regulations delegates authority to the Executive Director to award supplemental bond allocations to projects that were awarded an allocation subject to the limit set in Section 5108(a) and that issued bonds prior to January 1, 2026, where the total delegated supplemental requests are no more than 10% of the project's Committee approved allocation and no more than 52% of the aggregate depreciable basis plus land basis. When a request exceeds those limits, it must be approved by the Committee. La Guadalupe (CA-26-401) is 100% complete and is requesting \$2.5 million in supplemental allocation to meet the 50% test, which it is still subject to because it is an older project.



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Chairperson Ma asked if staff recommends approval.

Mr. Navarrette responded affirmatively.

Mr. Velasquez said that after the devastating wildfires in Los Angeles, Governor Newsom proposed a little over \$100 million for shovel-ready projects in close proximity to both Palisades and Altadena. Through great partnership between Azure Development and Many Mansions, this project has been awarded. The idea is to make sure that there are as many new housing units available as possible, potentially for survivors or people who were affected by the fires. The state has fully supported this project all along since its inception, and it is a great project. Mr. Velasquez congratulated the partners on this project.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:
None.

MOTION: Ms. Cohen motioned to approve the supplemental bond allocation request above the Executive Director's authority, and Ms. Perrault seconded the motion.

The motioned passed unanimously via roll call vote.

8. **Action Item: Request to Waive Negative Points and Forfeiture of the Performance Deposit for a Qualified Residential Rental Project (QRRP) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, §§ 5006, 5011(b), 5105)**
Presented by: Christina Vue

Ms. Vue explained that pursuant to Section 5006 of the CDLAC regulations, applicants bear the risk of forfeiting all or part of their performance deposit if the allocation is not used in accordance with the conditions and/or timeframes set forth in the CDLAC resolution. In addition, pursuant to Section 5105(m)(4), ten points may be deducted for failure to comply with any provision of the resolution for a period of three years. Sandstone Valley Apartments (CA-24-481) is requesting waiver of forfeiture of the performance deposit and negative points assessment.

Chairperson Ma asked if the staff recommends approval of this request.

Ms. Wiant responded affirmatively. Over the past year or two, CDLAC has been trying to beef up the way developers are held accountable for performance. Part of the regulations package in the fall decoupled bond issuance deadlines with readiness to be able to better hold developers accountable when they claim readiness. Moving forward, Ms. Wiant hopes to see less of this and more strict penalties that come with failing to meet readiness, which is a point score requirement as opposed to a threshold requirement. At the last meeting, the staff recommended that the Committee require that a project forfeit the performance deposit for failure to meet the required deadlines and return bonds.

Ms. Wiant said that this project's circumstances are slightly different compared to projects that do not do anything to make progress toward completion. This project had building permits, but then the local government pulled the rug out from under it regarding a grading permit. The project came to the



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

Committee many times and was working closely with CalHFA on how to resolve this issue. Ms. Wiant believes these circumstances were outside of the control of the developer.

Chairperson Ma asked if this was an issue with the City of Murrieta.

Ms. Wiant responded affirmatively.

Chairperson Ma said the Committee is putting the city on record.

Mr. Sertich said CalHFA worked closely with HCD's Housing Accountability Unit to look into this issue, which delayed the process. As soon as CalHFA received feedback that there was going to be no enforcement action, the developer decided to give back the bonds quickly. Mr. Sertich thinks everyone acted in good faith.

Ms. Perrault said she appreciates the comments. Typically, the Committee wants to make sure they are grounded in consistency and fairness. She appreciates the staff noting the extenuating circumstances around this particular project. The Committee does not want to necessarily punish developers for something that was not in their control. This is a somewhat unique situation, and she appreciates that staff noted that.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:

None.

MOTION: Ms. Cohen motioned to approve the request to waive negative points and forfeiture of the performance deposit, and Ms. Perrault seconded the motion.

The motioned passed unanimously via roll call vote.

9. **Action Item: Recommendation for Award of Single Family Housing Program Allocation to the California Department of Veterans Affairs for the Veterans Home Loan Program (Gov. Code, § 8869.85; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, §§ 5010 & 5290)**

Presented by: Christina Vue

Ms. Vue explained that pursuant to Gov. Code 8869.84 and 8869.85, CDLAC is allowed to determine the allocation of bonds for certain categories and determine the entities that can apply for allocation. Section 5290 of the CDLAC regulations explains the Veterans Home Loan Program. CDLAC received a request from the California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet) for \$150 million. The staff is recommending an award of allocation of \$150 million to CalVet for its Veterans Home Loan Program.

Chairperson Ma asked a representative from CalVet to speak about the program and how many veterans it has benefitted.

Bill Feigles, Deputy Secretary of the Home Loan Program at CalVet, explained that the program serves only veterans and their families. The program finances only owner-occupied residences of multiple types, including condos and home loans on land. The demand for the program has been skyrocketing,



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

and in fiscal year 2024-2025, CalVet funded almost 700 loans for \$245 million. That is an increase from \$200 million the year before and \$180 million the year before that. The growth has been substantial, and the demand continues today. The program uses two different types of bonds to finance all its loans: a Qualified Veterans Mortgage Bond (QVMB) program that is authorized by the voters of California, which is a general obligation bond, and the revenue bond program through CDLAC, which fills a gap left by the other program and is a big and meaningful portion of CalVet's business.

Mr. Feigles explained that one of the requirements of the QVMB program is that a veteran must have had active-duty service and been discharged less than 25 years ago. There are a lot of veterans in their 40s, 50s, 60s, and older who fall outside of that parameter. The revenue bond program picks up those veterans, and because of income limits and purchase price limits, tends to serve lower income veterans. It meets the highest need veteran population at meaningful numbers. In fiscal year 2024-2025, CalVet funded over \$70 million worth of these loans, accounting for 29% of its dollar loan volume and 36% of its unit loan volume. It serves a meaningful piece of the population.

Chairperson Ma asked Mr. Feigles to confirm the total loan volume for last year.

Mr. Feigles confirmed it was \$245 million for 700 loans. The average loan size is slightly higher because CalVet does a small number of home improvement loans.

Chairperson Ma asked for confirmation that the program does not serve only first-time homebuyers.

Mr. Feigles said that is correct.

Chairperson Ma asked if someone could be purchasing their third or fourth home.

Mr. Feigles said yes, as long as the loan is for the veteran's residence.

Ms. Cohen asked what the interest rate is.

Mr. Feigles said CalVet meets weekly and reviews interest rates. The rates are based on the cost of funds as a baseline, but the market is also considered. CalVet tries to keep its veterans below market rate, which it has been able to do for the past couple of years because of the craziness in the mortgage rate market. Today, the interest rate for this program is around 5.125%.

Chairperson Ma said that what makes this program different is that it is not based on FICO scores. Rather, it is based on the veteran's ability to repay the loan.

Mr. Feigles said that is correct. CalVet has to follow VA guidelines, but within those guidelines, they try to stay as flexible as possible for the veterans. CalVet is a dinosaur in a good way in that they hand underwrite every loan; nothing is done with algorithms or programs. They sometimes work with veterans for months or a year to help them get credit ready if they come to CalVet when they are not credit ready. It is a different kind of 50-year-old lending. CalVet never bases an approval or turns down a



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

loan based on credit score. Credits scores are used to stratify risk for pricing, but that is all they are used for.

Ms. Perrault said she appreciates the background information. She thinks this sounds like a much-needed program that is very successful and expanding. She asked for confirmation that this request usually comes to CDLAC every other year.

Ms. Wiant responded affirmatively.

Ms. Perrault asked if the program may potentially need more bond allocation from CDLAC to supplement the other bond program since the demand is increasing. She wonders about cost pressures and if CalVet anticipates needing additional funding more often or at a greater level.

Mr. Feigles said he does not anticipate needing funding more often. Both the market and internal constraints based on staffing at CalVet will dictate that. CalVet has built some growth into this request, which will probably get the program past next year or maybe two years. They will probably be back on the schedule of requesting an allocation every other year now.

Ms. Perrault said she appreciates the background information. She asked how long the program has been allocated every other year.

Ms. Wiant said it has been allocated every other year since 2016.

Ms. Perrault said she is not questioning the worth of the program; it is a good program, but the Committee is allocating funding of limited private activity bond resources, and it is a competitive program. The impact of the 25% test remains to be seen, and she would like to continue to monitor the growth trajectory of the CalVet program.

Mr. Feigles said CalVet can manage that growth. There are levers that can be flipped in the mortgage business to regulate volume. The demand has been strong, and Mr. Feigles thinks it will continue to be strong. This piece of CalVet's program fits the highest need portion of the veteran population. The program was founded in 1921 and is 105 years old, meaning it existed before CalVet was actually founded. The program also operates without taxpayer dollars; there are no general fund contributions.

Ms. Perrault said she appreciates Mr. Feigles's comment about having levers, and she understands CalVet is seeking a balance. Serving the highest needs of the lower income population is important.

Mr. Feigles said CalVet's mission is to serve every veteran they can possibly serve.

Ms. Cohen asked how CalVet conducts outreach.

Mr. Feigles said there are a number of ways they conduct outreach. Within the department, there is a veteran services division that reaches out continually to veterans by conducting seminars about other benefits, such as college tuition and disability benefits. The Home Loans Division piggybacks on those



California Debt Limit Allocation Committee

seminars, and that is their main form of outreach. They also do some limited social media outreach, but they do almost no traditional media because it is too costly.

Ms. Cohen asked what other services they offer and if they offer personal loans.

Mr. Feigles said they do not offer personal loans. They offer purchase money loans and home improvement loans that are attached to purchase money loans. They do not offer standalone home improvement loans. They also insure most of the properties that they fund. They have fire and hazard insurance that is very low cost in today's market and has a low deductible. When Mr. Feigles joined CalVet seven years ago, he thought the insurance program was really nice, but now he believes it is the premier benefit that they have to offer in California.

Ms. Cohen asked if CalVet offers homeowners insurance.

Mr. Feigles responded affirmatively.

Chairperson Ma said her understanding is that there are certain real estate brokers around the state who know about this loan product and specialize in these transactions.

Mr. Feigles said real estate brokers and realtors both know about the product, so when they have a veteran buyer, they tend to turn to CalVet.

Chairperson Ma called for public comments:

Patricia McAlister made a comment pertaining only to CTCAC. Her comment has been recorded under general public comment on the CTCAC meeting minutes for January 13, 2026.

Chairperson Ma closed public comments.

MOTION: Ms. Perrault motioned to approve the recommendation for award of Single Family Housing Program allocation to the California Department of Veterans Affairs for the Veterans Home Loan Program, and Ms. Cohen seconded the motion.

The motioned passed unanimously via roll call vote.

Ms. Cohen asked Mr. Feigles what happens if a veteran with a home loan or insurance through CalVet passes away.

Mr. Feigles said the law defines the succession. If veteran has a surviving spouse, the spouse retains the property. If not, the property goes through the probate process.

Ms. Cohen asked if the children of the veteran benefit from that or just the spouse.

Mr. Feigles said only the spouse benefits. Additionally, CalVet cannot make loans to children of veterans. The veteran must qualify on their own.



10. Public Comment

Ms. Cohen said it has been brought to her attention that John F. Mealey, the founding Executive Director of the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition (CVHC), passed away. Mr. Mealey was hired to direct the newly formed CVHC in Riverside County in 1982 with nothing more than a phone and a \$10,000 grant. By the time of his retirement in 2016, the coalition had developed and managed over 5,000 units of affordable housing serving farm workers, seniors, veterans, and low-income families in Riverside County and Imperial County. Mr. Mealey was truly a pioneering giant in the provision of attractive, safe, and affordable housing for hardworking low-income people. His passing last week leaves an impressive legacy.

Cherene Sandidge said that a few years ago, someone came before the Committee and talked about Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCCs). She does not want the Committee to leave that conversation because it is going to be very necessary to provide some sort of assistance for young buyers who are priced out of the market. Ms. Sandidge has been a real estate broker for 40 years, and she has never seen such turmoil with young people and their ability to purchase houses. One of the BDF members is going to be working on a large housing project that will be a conversion of public land. Years ago, there used to be for-sale housing that looked like a long-term lease-to-own using CDLAC money. Ms. Sandidge wants to bring that type of opportunity to the table. It is going to take a lot of creativity to move housing forward – especially for-sale housing – in the next generation. The Committee may be seeing some different types of projects because there is a need for the labor pool to stay in California, as well as a need for incentives for people to stay and participate in the community.

Chairperson Ma said she agrees. There are a lot of complaints from parents whose kids cannot afford housing and are moving to other states, taking jobs in other states, and not coming back because they cannot afford it.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:54 p.m.