

California State Treasurer's Office and California School Finance Authority

Affordable Housing Strategies for California Community Colleges April 15, 2021

[Editor's Note: This transcript has been prepared by the California School Finance Authority (CSFA) and it believes it to be a fair and accurate reproduction of the comments of the speakers. Any errors are those of CSFA and not the speakers.]

Title Slide — Affordable Housing Strategies for California Community Colleges

Katrina Johantgen: Good afternoon, hello, and welcome. My name is Katrina Johantgen and I'm the Executive Director of the California School Finance Authority. I want to thank you all for joining us today for our important discussion on affordable housing strategies for California Community Colleges. For today's discussion, we have gathered an esteemed group of stakeholders to discuss the critical issue of student and workforce housing.

Slide 2 — Welcome

0.32

Katrina Johantgen: Today's session will begin with opening remarks from State Treasurer, Fiona Ma, who will facilitate a discussion on student housing with our Legislative Update panel. The Legislative Update Panel will field questions received from our audience of over 250 stakeholders.

Following this panel, we will take a two-minute break, and then I will lead a case study discussion where we will learn about housing projects that are underway or already in operation. After this case studies panel, we will field questions from our attendees.

Before we get started, I want to highlight a few housekeeping items. Speaker bios on today's presentation can be accessed on the CSFA Events page, as well as included in the meeting chat.

If at any time during the meeting you experience technical issues, please contact GotoWebinar at (877) 582-7011. There is live captioning available during today's discussion. We encourage you to submit questions or comments, at any time during the program, using the box marked "Questions" at the bottom of your control panel. Lastly, your opinion matters; we want to get your feedback on today's webinar, so please fill out the exit survey upon leaving the meeting.

Slide 3 — Legislative Update Panel Discussion

1:46

Katrina Johantgen: Today, we will first hear from legislators and advocates, who will discuss recent and pending legislation aimed at alleviating the housing crisis. We're joined today by honorable Kevin McCarthy Assemblymember, representing the seventh Assembly District. As Chair of the Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education Finance, Assemblymember McCarty has made historic investments in public education, and is sponsoring legislation to do the same on the student housing front.

The Honorable Steve Veres serves as District Director for State Senator Maria Elena Durazo, and he also serves as a Trustee on the Los Angeles Community College District Board, where he has presided on over nearly \$4 billion in facility improvements across the district's nine colleges.

On behalf of the Community College Facility Coalition, we are joined by Nancy Chaires Espinoza. Ms. Chaires Espinoza advocates for adequate state and local revenues for facility construction, and also provides information on community college construction and funding issues. Welcome Assemblymember, McCarty, Trustee Veres and Ms. Chaires Espinoza.

Now it is my honor and pleasure to introduce California's State Treasurer Fiona Ma, who will lead our Legislative Update discussion. Treasurer Ma is our 34th State Treasurer. Most notably, Treasurer Ma is the first woman of color and woman CPA elected to this position. Treasurer Ma cares deeply about housing, the environment, and economic development. In her role as Treasurer she chairs the State's two housing financial engines, the Tax Credit Allocation Committee, and the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee. As Chair of these critical agencies, Treasurer Ma understands the challenges and intricacies of funding housing projects. Welcome Treasurer Ma.

Treasurer Fiona Ma: Thank you Katrina and thank you all for attending today. This is very exciting as we are all facing a housing crisis here in California and trying to figure out the best ways to solve it – and it's very complex and multi layered.

The California Community College system is the largest system of higher education in the country with more than 2.1 million students at 115 campuses. However, only 11 out of 115 campuses actually provide any type of student housing.

Several other community colleges have embarked or are looking into providing student housing – including the Santa Rosa Junior College and the Napa Valley College – and they will have speakers here talking about their endeavors.

In some cases, districts are also building below market housing for their faculty and staff, such as San Mateo County Community College District, which you'll hear from a little later.

Then there are innovative community partnerships that are also popping up. We will have the San Jose Conservation Corps here today discuss an innovative community partnership for housing and training transition aged youth.

Last year, our office held two virtual roundtables in Southern California with the Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing (SCANPH) and the City of Los Angeles, which culminated in a report. We will continue to assist community colleges with their housing needs and providing technical assistance to legislators and cities, and counties, and others who are interested in being in this space. This is our first virtual roundtable focused on Northern California.

We provide conduit financing for innovative projects such as the one coming up at Santa Rosa Junior College later on this year. We support utilization of surplus public lands for affordable housing projects. We support changes to financial aid packages for community college students to provide sufficient support to cover housing.

We also provide technical support to legislative efforts, to reduce up-front development and financing costs, and to provide new funding sources for project planning and development for student housing, such as AB 1377, authored by Assemblymember Kevin McCarty. We have been really privileged to work with Assemblymember McCarty on this innovative legislation, and we look forward to hearing about it.

Katrina Johantgen: AB 1377, authored by Assemblymember McCarty, would create a Revolving Loan Fund for student housing across all three systems. There would be an allocation to UC and CSU's as well as to the community colleges through the California Educational Facilities Authority and the California School Finance Authority. The program would prioritize projects that are ready to provide student housing. There are technical issues that still need to be worked through as it relates to priority, scale of the project, scale of the program, but we are working with the author's office to provide technical assistance. The bill was voted out of the Higher Ed Committee with an 11 to 0 vote and it now moves into Appropriations. Next slide. Thank you, Steve.

Slide 4 — Legislative Update

8:50

Steve Veres: Hi everybody, and thank you for giving us an opportunity to discuss SB 330. Let me start off by saying, you know, I sit in an interesting dual role. I have, for the past nearly 10 years, been a Trustee for the Los Angeles Community College District, probably the largest district in the state. While at the same time, I've been able to have worked on a number of pieces of legislation in Sacramento as a staff member to our former Senate President Pro Tem, and currently for Senator Maria Elena Durazo. With both members, and particularly with Senator Durazo, we've had a chance to dig deep into the basic needs concerns of community college students, and specifically, in Los Angeles.

I think we're all very familiar with the surveys that are performed by the State Chancellor's Office, and certainly we sort of pioneered some of those discussions about the status of our students. In Los Angeles, we deal with a very significant homeless population and in that homeless population it's varied and it's diverse, and certainly homelessness impacts our students.

We find that nearly a fifth of our students had experienced some level of homelessness or some definition of homelessness. It could be housing insecurity. It could be everything from couch-surfing, to not knowing where their next month's place to stay is going to be, and we've also had significant incidents within our campuses of students staying overnight on campuses and trying to utilize the facilities. And so, it raised the question of what to do and how to do it.

And, certainly – unlike some of our sister cohorts at the CSU and UC level, where housing, student, housing, and workforce housing has been part of their system for many, many years -- at the community college level there are very few examples. I know there's certainly some pioneers and some efforts that have taken place, but we worked with the Senator to identify what we thought were potential spaces to look at [in] the law, and reshape it, to understand the immediate realities of community college districts.

First and foremost, for those of us that endeavor to build on campuses, we're starting at times from scratch, not having programs to add on to, not having programs at all. We do generally get concerned about how to manage things like the Clery Act and the relationships we have and responsibilities we have on campuses. To establish housing management within our systems from scratch is a very difficult endeavor.

So, we took a good strong look and put forward SB 330 to look at a component of the Education Code that deals with joint occupancy, utilizing where there's a number of examples of joint occupancy and efforts that exist up and down the state. It is a tool in a structure that many districts are familiar with, but has not been utilized, essentially, for student housing.

So, the basic core of the bill is essentially to take a look at the joint occupancy structure to deal with a couple of features. One is the length of time for which you can do an arrangement. Most of us are familiar with the five-year limitation of doing ground leases, and joint occupancy. This bill proposes to extend that to 66 years.

And at the same time, there's an element of joint use or fair market rental space. This bill actually provides that it can happen for less than fair market value. So, in some cases, you can actually talk about a nominal fee in exchange for that benefit, to be able to provide to students.

And we're defining low-income students as essentially students that would qualify for Cal Grant program awards. And for employees, we often have employees in the district that would meet the standards of low-to moderate-income, which is 80% to 100% of the income in the Los Angeles area. In several other markets throughout the State of California, cost of living and housing prices are extremely expensive. And so, we need to be able to find a space to utilize – sometimes what could be identified as underutilized properties – in a way that facilitates the housing of low-income students and our workforce employees. And potentially, to be able to receive proposals on projects that are for building development and management, seemed to be a reasonable and an exciting potential endeavor to use to be able to close some of the market challenge.

So, I'll leave it at that and be around for additional questions. It's a basic change, essentially just being able – instead of charging the full market rate – to be able to take that savings of cost and apply it into low-income students and to low-income to moderate-income members of our workforces.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you, Steve. We're going to turn it over to Nancy. Thanks, Nancy.

Slide 5 — Legislative Highlights

14:52

Nancy Chaires Espinoza: Thanks, folks. It's good to be with you. My apologies to folks on the backend, helping me with some technical difficulties. So, I'm happy to follow Steve. I'm going to talk about some bills that should be on your agenda. Thank you so much for covering SB 330, and I understand we may have Assemblymember McCarty also discussing AB 1377.

So, I'm here today representing the Community College Facilities Coalition and first off, I want to talk about AB 306 by Assemblymember O'Donnell. This bill would exempt K-12 and community college employee housing from the Field Act and thereby exempting it from DSA review. There was directive, if you will, that was sent out by the Division of the State Architect on this issue. But a lot of folks in the field believe that there could still be additional clarification and really a

wholesale exemption of these projects. So, that is the purpose of this bill, and it would be very helpful to community colleges attempting to build housing. The bill is out of its first Policy Committee and in Assembly Appropriations.

A related bill, that would also help remove this type of barrier, is AB 70 by Assemblymember Ting, which would exempt school district employee housing from local zoning ordinances. So, what that would do is, if some area is not zoned for housing or maybe not for multi-family housing, the school district would be able to proceed and to build.

Currently, we are exempted as both K-12 and K-14 districts from local zoning when we are building educational facilities. So, this bill would extend that to when we are building residential facilities for our employees. I do expect that this bill is going to face a little bit more opposition than AB 306, because there's just been a long-running discussion between state and local entities. We saw that in Assembly Housing or Senate Housing Committee today. So, there's just a natural tension between folks who would like a state-level consistency, if you will, and folks who would like flexibility at the local level. This bill will become part of that conversation, but it is out of its first policy committee and in Assembly Appropriations, as well.

I don't believe we've had Mr. McCarty or a representative yet talk about AB 1377. Hopefully they'll be able to join us, but what this bill would do is two things: one, it would establish a revolving loan fund for all of the higher education segments to build affordable housing. So that is construction; the other piece addresses the pre-construction phase, which has particularly been an issue for community colleges.

So even if you're able to find your funding and cobbled together low-income housing and different sources for the construction phase, those sources typically can't be spent on pre-construction, and the feasibility study alone can cost \$100,000 and there are many other preconstruction expenditures. Right now, they're coming directly out of our general fund, so out of the classroom, if you will, out of direct services, so this bill would do those two things: Construction Loans from the Revolving Fund, and provide pre-construction grants.

Another thing I should mention in relation to these bills, is that there is an accompanying budget piece with this. Mr. McCarty chairs the Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education, thankfully, so he's well poised to have both sides of this conversation, the budget conversation and the legislative conversation. So, with the Governor's proposal of \$100 million for basic needs of community college students, the Community College Facilities Coalition has asked for \$5 million of that to be created as a revolving loan fund, and possibly address these grants as well. So those conversations are taking place. And we would encourage you also to contact Mr. McCarty, and other folks involved in the budget process. And please lend your support to that. We've already covered SB 330, very well. I won't attempt to add anything to that. If we could have the next slide, please.

Slide 6 — Legislative Highlights

19:17

Nancy Chaires Espinoza: A few more bills we want to put on your radar, and this will be my last slide. SB 234, by Mr. Wiener, would establish the transition aged youth housing program for housing and support for transition aged youth – 26 years of age or younger. This bill actually, just about 15 minutes ago, was approved on consent by the Senate Housing Committee, and that will be moving forward. Related to that, AB 413, by Mr. Ting would appropriate the money

necessary to provide those services in the bill I just mentioned, for \$8 million annually, to the Transition Age Youth Housing Fund, which would be appropriated through counties. That bill is already in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Two more bills: AB 775, by Mr. Berman would mandate basic needs navigators. This is a term of art – this is what we're calling them. The idea here is that community college student housing isn't just buildings, it's not just a place to sleep, it's that we want to use them as an opportunity to provide wrap-around centers and folks who can actually help students identify those other barriers to staying in college and completing their education. So, that's what these navigators do. And AB 775 would provide enough funding to put one of those folks in each campus and each site of the community college campuses. That bill is also in Assembly Appropriations.

Last bill to mention is SB 290, by Senator Skinner. This bill would provide density bonuses to community college housing projects. So, for those of you not deeply enmeshed in housing policy, you may not know what a density bonus is. But what they do is that a jurisdiction will provide flexibility to a project in exchange for providing more housing in a more dense setting. So, it would say that community college student housing projects would qualify for those density bonuses. What those look like on the ground are things like you might be able to say, “we're going to provide fewer parking spots because this housing is located next to light rail,” or things of that nature. Or it might be “we're going to let you have less of a setback on the back side of your project,” just things like that. That may seem insignificant, but what they mean is that we're able to provide more housing units. So, in the end, that is a very good thing, and that bill is in Senate Government and Finance [Committee] today. They may have already acted on it. My apologies. I was only able to watch one of those committees at a time, so, hopefully that bill is already out, but we'll get back to you on that. That is all I have, so, I'm happy to hand it to the next speaker.

Slide 7 — Legislative Update Panel Discussion

22:18

Katrina Johantgen: We had a few audience questions, Nancy. Number 1 pertains to how project maintenance costs will be addressed in Project Funding bills. On our Case Study panel, which is up after the break, we have a lot of practitioners there who can probably address the issue of how project maintenance costs are funded. Did Nancy or Steve want to touch on whether any of those bills include any type of reserve or funding for maintenance?

Nancy Chaires Espinoza: I will go first then Steve can speak to their current bill. My understanding is that these bills that I've mentioned do not contain any maintenance costs, but I'll defer to Steve on his bill.

Steve Veres: SB 330, it's what we would consider unrealized costs and expenses. It really depends on how the deals are set up. What it's envisioned to do is essentially have a joint partnership and somebody from the outside to be able to manage it as an entity. In that, part of the reason why we were blending student housing and workforce housing and the bill actually makes the standard of a majority of that housing is that we also wanted to build in some opportunity to allow the rental space to help manage and cover the cost. Reducing the fair market value cost is almost like taking that money and applying it to the project, in an essence. The idea is to not have additional burdens come onto the campus community and the campus budget.

If we were to do these ourselves, we would run them through our facilities master plans and establish them and the cost of managing and maintaining build. All of it would fall directly on the district, but I think if we utilize joint occupancy space, it gives some opportunity to not critically impact the budgets of the schools.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you, Steve. Nancy or Steve related to SB 290, the density bonus bill, is there any discussion about school districts getting added to that bill to allow for school district housing?

Nancy Chaires Espinoza: I'm not privy to any conversation around those lines. If folks are interested, we'd certainly be happy to take that discussion. We are seeing that there [is] simply more movement on the Community College side to build employee housing, but there certainly are a handful of K-12 districts that are very far along that line, obviously Los Angeles and San Diego. We know some others are interested. I would just say Community Colleges are a little bit farther along.

Katrina Johantgen: Thanks, Nancy. There was a question related to AB 1377 setting the rate on those loans lower than market rates. So obviously, I think that's part of the intent. Are either of you privy to that information? Obviously for a state subsidized program to work and create affordability, you might set interest rates to the cost of administering the program so that you're not losing funding or the corpus of your funding for projects, but not needing to make 5% or 6% or 7%. That was an audience question. We can certainly ensure that that question or advocacy for that gets to the author's office.

The Treasurer had some questions about multi-generational housing, as it relates to seniors and students, helping each other. Treasurer, did you want to speak to that?

Treasurer Fiona Ma: I know that there are innovative programs around the country where community college housing is being built, but because of the transient nature of students and funding repayment difficulties, they have moved seniors on to those properties. Seniors are either fixed income, social security, and the additional benefits of seniors being able to also take classes. Or perhaps provide childcare services to single parents who are going to school, [and] having young people take care of our older generation as they age in place. I was wondering if you all have any thoughts or any good models on this type of innovative funding [and] housing idea.

Steve Veres: Thank you. I will actually take a shot because we have been having that conversation in Los Angeles. First of all, on SB 330 [and] the blending of student housing with workforce housing, [the bill] is looking at that concept because of the student population being a bit more of a moving target versus a workforce being a settled target.

When we initially started a conversation about student housing, and this is something to the community college population, they are different than what would be the population of a UC – that are sometimes just out of high school, younger, and we can dorm them up, 3 or 4 to a unit, sometimes larger.

With LA Community College, for example, a third of our students are parents. And so, when we talk about housing, we're actually talking about family housing to a certain extent. And so, being able to understand the models and the approaches, we actually just found a lot of connection

with looking at how we house our workforce to be somewhat similar to how we can house some of our students, particularly student families.

And in terms of length of time and seniors, our average age of student is actually ranging, too. We have a mix of younger students, and we also have folks coming back to the workforce that are older. But this concept, Treasurer – of being able to stabilize the housing – is really critical and really important.

Most of the versions of UC or private college models tend to be “full cost” and using financial aid to defer the cost [paid by students]. We're actually starting with the motto of trying to make it low-cost, starting at building, and from all these resources, whether it's using land as a value, or whether it's lease agreements. So, we're starting with the lower end cost first and trying to stabilize that piece and blending it out with workforce or other kinds of strategies. But it's just trying to flip the script a little bit to know that we're not going to build it. I know there's a few districts that have already endeavored to build housing and some of them started off with a market rate value and are looking to those strategies that are much more similar to the private and UC and CSU system. I just think we need to envision and look at it differently, at the community college, because of the demographic and the economics of our students, and certainly our workforce.

Katrina Johantgen: Thanks, Steve. We are going to hear from Dorsey Moore during our next panel. They have an innovative housing project and program that they are utilizing in San Jose. That might be something that we can discuss as well in terms of their parking temporary housing, and it's kind of a win-win as it relates to that permanent unit and the temporary housing. Hopefully Dorsey can weigh in on that later in our panel.

Treasurer Fiona Ma: One last question. I know that we have better than expected revenues that have come in and the Governor is going to look at one-time funding for different programs and services. Just wondering what the priority is for the community college space, if you all are having any discussions or any ideas that are popping up to the top of the priority list?

Nancy Chaires Espinoza: For CCFC, we're trying to make the argument that we should try to stretch out the benefit of this one-time funding. Certainly, things like emergency housing and emergency assistance for students are appropriate use of that funding, but we are hearing from legislators – and we very much agree with them – that we should invest in things like the Revolving Loan Fund to provide housing capacity that's going to exist beyond this emergency and the recovery.

Steve Veres: Treasurer do you mean in terms of housing, or do you mean in terms of return to in person and some of the challenges we have? I know statewide some districts are experiencing up to 25%-30% decline in enrollment. In Los Angeles we're at about 16%. We have a couple within the nine campus districts that are a little bit above 20% so blending it altogether, that's 16%.

[One challenge is] trying to get students to feel like they can come back in and [another challenge] may be facility management. I know for those that have had a chance — [like those at] Orange Coast down in the Southern California area — to be able to have the confidence to come back into [campus] utilizing the resources that are there is important.

We [LACCD] have made an early decision to partner with non-profits, for example, The Shower of Hope is one that we've done a great partnership with. Right now, they are limited as to the strategies. It used to be a few students that are able to be in a space, but because of COVID the protocols and the additional stress on infrastructure — on campus and off campus — we're really trying to understand [ways of] applying whatever monies we received from the federal government and everything at the state to be able to make an investment that's a permanent type of investment.

We have construction programs that continued to be able to [proceed] under safety protocols. We've had great success to continue those build outs, but we're starting to look at design. Is the way we've done air filtration the best way? Do we need to revisit that quite a bit? Most of them are where they take outside air and bring them in and you're filtering up. A lot of the return to in-person conversations we have with our negotiating and bargaining units tend to be about sanitizing and cleanliness — when air filtration is key — so, what are we doing about upgrading that? Maybe there's some air purifying systems inside the classrooms and common areas that need to be invested in as opposed to just changing out the filter.

On the front burner is really how we can deal with our enrollment decline that we're all experiencing and get back to in-person. We've seen our biggest declines in career, technical education, because most of it is just hands-on physical. Prior to this, the top issue for us was basic student needs. Not that basic students' needs have gone away. COVID has underscored the equity challenges that our students are facing. Any one-time funding, it's a little bit about getting in person, making it feel safe, and comfortable, and dealing with our long-term student needs.

Treasurer Fiona Ma: Thank you Steve and Nancy, for a very informative panel. I'm going to turn it back over to Katrina.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you so much. Steve, for the colleges, at least LACCD, what are you guys doing to reach out and bring back that 16% in terms of engagement?

Steve Veres: First and foremost is we have to finish up our negotiating with bargaining units to make sure that they feel safe coming back. We've actually already started some in-person with hard to convert classes, things that didn't lend themselves easily to remote environment. It's just going to be the new normal. Prior to COVID we had about 18% of our classes being distance learning. In the fall, we're shooting probably for 50% scenario, and then thereafter, we're actually sort of long-term estimating 30% to 40%.

We're trying to get the students who were with us, because we were seeing surges of enrollment. We had a 1% increase last year, pre-COVID. To be able to capture those students who were once touched to come back, and [also] reset with the K-12 students, because, certainly, all those students that had to go through a virtual graduation experience, and their post high school education space hasn't [included] lots of great choices.

Being able to target them, to bring them back, and to let them know that — with our first-year and second-year College Promise options — we're still the best and most affordable way to get back to going to school for their careers. Those things are really important.

As we all prioritize investing in resilient career options for folks that might have been blown out because of COVID shutdowns, [they] may want to consider going to career options that are a little bit more resilient and [we want to be] able to provide that education platform and space. It's going to take a lot of [work] ensuring that the campuses and environments are safe.

More than anything, we don't want to open and have to close for any particular reason. Being thoughtful, smart in the approach, is critical — to know that we have it under control, and we're utilizing all the state-of-the-art.

We distribute vaccines at four of the nine campuses, and want to ensure that's a long-term commitment for all that want to get vaccinated. We have to be involved in our county Public Health Education pieces for all those that are hesitant to take the vaccine, because that's still, essentially, the safest option on the table — to take the vaccine and be able to return to the campus.

Katrina Johantgen: That's great. Thanks so much, Steve. There were a lot of technical questions that were added to the chat. We're going to try and see if we can include some answers to those questions. Some are very technical, related to legislation. We will be getting those questions to Nancy, Steve, and to McCarty's office, to see if we can turn around some answers to those questions. I did want to thank the Treasurer, Trustee Veres and Ms. Chaires Espinoza. We look forward to collaborating with your offices. We are now going to take a two-minute break. We will reconvene at about 12:45 pm to begin our case study panel. Thank you all, and we'll see you back here in about two minutes.

Slide 8 — 2 - Minute Break

38:16

Katrina Johantgen: We're going to reconvene now. If we can turn to our case study panel slide.

Slide 9 — Case Studies Panel Discussion

41:42

At this time, I'm pleased to present our case studies panel. I invite you to turn on your web cameras and microphones as I call your name.

Bob Parker serves as the Vice President of Administrative Services at Napa Valley Community College. Mr. Parker previously served at San Diego Community College.

Dr. Pedro Avila, serves as Vice President of Student Services and Assistant Superintendent at Santa Rosa Junior College. Dr. Avila joins us to discuss the Student Housing Project he is shepherding at Santa Rosa Junior College.

Barbara Christiansen joins us from San Mateo County Community College District, where she served as Director of Community and Government Relations. During her tenure, she shepherd through three facility and staff housing developments. We look forward to hearing from Barbara about her success stories.

Dorsey Moore joins us from San Jose Conservation Corps and Charter Schools. Dorsey is going to share with us the Corps' Youth Housing Promise Program. We invite you to view the speaker bios on CSFA's Events Webpage. At this time, I'd like to invite the group to discuss how they identify the needs to be filled with each of their projects. Bob, do you want to get started?

Bob Parker: Sure, thank you. We had been talking about housing for quite a few years here at Napa Valley College, and back in 2018 we engaged the services of the Scion Group to assist us in doing a feasibility study and a demand study. Through doing our own surveying of our students, we felt that there was a need and a demand. We knew that housing was quite expensive in Napa County and felt very strongly that students would benefit. Through that study we were able to determine that the demand was there and more importantly, what students were looking for in terms of their idea of affordable rents and more importantly, the type of housing that they were looking for.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you so much. Dr. Avila?

Dr. Pedro Avila: We've been working on this project since 2017, after the fires in Sonoma County destroyed over 5,000 homes. We had about 1,000 students that lost their homes in that fire. We have been experiencing a lot of issues with housing insecurity here in Sonoma County. About 22% of our students are housing insecure. That is higher than the state average of 19%. It's been a project about addressing that issue with our students and providing them support.

We have conducted three market studies, all three of which supported demand of 500 beds. Our project is going to provide 352 beds, but we're also considering a phase two project, as needed. Again, this is something that we are doing to help our students and our main concern is just the amount of housing insecurity that's happening in Sonoma County, and is devastating after the fires.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you, Dr. Avila. Dorsey Moore?

Dorsey Moore: We are in the center of Silicon Valley and affordable housing is really non-existent here. About three years ago we realized that a number of our students were getting displaced, having moved to the Central Valley or to the Stockton Area. We realized if we didn't do something quickly, we wouldn't have a program in about 3 to 4 years. About 30% of our students — there are 200 students that we serve — at any given time are housing unstable, most couch surfing, some living out of their car, some living on the streets. We realized that we needed to take action because our usual non-profit housing partners just didn't have the capacity.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you. Barbara?

Barbara Christensen: Our experience goes back to 2000, when the College District was experiencing difficulty recruiting employees and people who were offered jobs from out of the area wouldn't take those jobs. We did surveys in 2002 and in 2007 that confirmed that the inability of employees to find or afford housing was the problem. In one survey, 18% of employees indicated they were going to leave in the next three years and 61% of them said it was because of the cost of [housing]. We knew we had a problem we had to solve for our employees.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you so much. We are going to actually turn it over to Bob, who's going to present some slides on their projects. Next slide.

Slide 10 — Napa Valley Community College District

46:40

Bob Parker: I'm very happy to be here today to talk about what we're doing here at Napa Valley College. And so, could we move to the next slide.

Slide 11 — River Trail Village at Napa Valley College

46:55

Bob Parker: Our project is River Trail Village at Napa Valley College. We've been discussing housing here at the college for many years, but the movement for this project started in 2017. We did an RFQ for a developer qualification. In 2018, we did an RFP for a market study and selected Scion Group and they assisted us with identifying the level of demand and, more importantly, the demand for types of units.

Our particular project is on the Napa Valley College Campus and sits at the north end of campus, near our main entrance. It will actually be three buildings with a total of 528 beds: one building which is a more traditional residence hall; one building which is furnished apartments; and then the third building which is unfurnished apartments. The project meets all of the demands that were identified from our student population in terms of more entry level housing and more established housing. Finally, the unfurnished units are specifically designed for students with families.

Construction should begin in October of this year, we're currently in DSA review. The amenities that will be included in this project include are study rooms, a community gathering space and there are kitchen facilities in the residence hall, as well as bike parking and bike storage. Next slide.

Slide 12 — River Trail Village at Napa Valley College

48:43

Bob Parker: There's an overview of the three buildings and what that's going to look like. As I said, we're currently in plan review with DSA but we expect the DSA review to be completed by the end of the summer and financial close and construction to be in the Fall. It's a public-private partnership structure with a number of partners that we're working with. As I said earlier, the Scion Group is now providing advisory services. The Martin Group is our developer. We have Clark Building Group as the Construction partner; HPI Architects; Greystar, our management partner, will be managing the property once it's open; and working with Citibank (financing); and NCCD as the non-profit owner. We expect to be leasing these units for the start of the Fall semester in 2023. That's a little bit about our project. Thank you for the opportunity, and now we can move to the next speaker.

Slide 13 — Santa Rosa Junior College

49:55

Dr. Pedro Avila: Thank you Bob. Next slide, please.

Slide 14 — Santa Rosa Junior College Student Housing

50:01

Dr. Pedro Avila: This is our project. It is a five-story building on our campus and it will house 352 students. We share a lot of the same partners that Napa Valley Community College is utilizing. Scion is also our advisor and they've been critical in helping us navigate student housing. [For] those of you that are looking at building student housing on your campus, you'll quickly realize that you don't have the expertise to take on a project of this nature. Scion has been instrumental in helping us navigate and keep it as organized.

The project is going to house 352 students. We have a demand of about 500. We also don't have a lot of land options. We're limited on our options [as to] where on our campus we can build.

We are going to start construction in August, and we're looking to open in Fall 2023. Total cost of the project should be about \$48 million in hard costs.

Most of the rooms are traditional doubles and singles — and the reason we chose that is because, during our market study, our students told us that affordability was their number one concern. Going into this project we were very upfront with our developers, with everybody who submitted a Proposal, that affordability was going to be our number one goal for the project. Our partner, Servitas, has been working with us to make sure that we keep rent as low as possible.

One of our goals was to make sure that we had our more traditional rooms below \$1,000 per month. We are still staying between the market rate of \$1,000 per month because it was really important for us. Because we are doing a market investment, these rents are driven by that. We're financing it through the market; we're issuing bonds at market rate. The rents are based on how much we are borrowing, and the public market interest rates.

I'm really excited about all these bills that are being proposed, because I think those of you that are coming behind — those that are going to be taking on these projects — if you have other options of securing the low interest loan, your rents are probably going to be better than ours. That's a really good thing going forward, and I want to encourage that.

For us, our project got delayed by a year because with COVID the interest rates went up for student housing. Last year, we were getting ready to close and start construction and we decided it would be best to delay the project for a year to allow COVID to be mitigated. Sure enough, interest rates have dropped again, and we're getting ready to break ground and close financing. Next slide.

Slide 15 — Santa Rosa Junior College Student Housing

53:06

Dr. Pedro Avila: There's a look at the inside of the building; we do have a multi-purpose room for students. We're going to have study rooms on every floor and there will be kitchens on every floor.

This is a public-private partnership. It's based on private financing. We did get a \$1 million donation from Kaiser Permanente that helped close the financing gap. This is about affordability and addressing housing insecurity, so we're almost aligning it with our priority registration process where tier one goes to low-income students, first generation students, veterans, foster youth, or international student athletes. We have already identified our priorities. We're still working with our students, but we have a pretty good idea on how we're going to prioritize the rooms. A lot of sustainability that's been implemented into the building really mirrors the culture in Sonoma County. We're very green here in Sonoma County. We have a food pantry. We have probably one of the most comprehensive physical and mental health services in the State that's going to be wrapped around our services for these students. We have free public transportation and we also have on-campus police, which is located within very close proximity of the building. This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

Slide 16 — San Mateo County Community College District

54:41

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you. Barbara?

Barbara Christensen: Next slide.

Slide 17 — Faculty / Staff Housing

54:50

Barbara Christensen: The purpose and benefits for our program is that it improves recruitment and retention, and improves the quality of life, because 61% of our residents are walking to work. It improves student engagement, because people aren't commuting an hour or two each way, every day. They are right there on campus. This says 42 residents have moved out, but that number has gone up since that statistic was done. I have been retired for four years, so I don't know how many have moved out, but I do know that during my tenure, one resident lived in the facility for seven years. He graduated from college. He got married. He had a baby, and he bought a home. All in the seven-year period. The College District also offers a \$100,000, 10-year second loan for purchasing a home. It is interest- and payment-free for the first five years and it has a shared appreciation component. The eligibility for this is faculty and staff. We do about 50/50 — 50% faculty, 50% staff. First-time homebuyers can rent a unit for seven years and they're supposed to be saving for a down payment. These rents are also out-of-date. I'm sure it's up over \$1,000 for a one-bedroom and probably over \$2,000 for a three-bedroom, two-bath. You can see that the numbers are very low. It's not taxpayer funded. The rents pay back costs of construction, financing, operations and a capital reserves study, which is required every three years for long term maintenance. Next slide.

Slide 18 — College Vista – San Mateo, CA

56:43

Barbara Christensen: This is College Vista and it overlooks the Bay. It opened in December 2005 with 44 units. It will be paid off in less than 20 years from when it started. So, by 2025, it will be paid off. You may ask how we can do all of this. We have no land costs. We have tax-exempt financing. We did COPs, we have no property taxes, and we have no profit motive, so those four things help to keep the rents very low. All of our units are luxury, market rate kind of units. They are not like the affordable housing that you would think of. Units have wood entry floors, nine-foot ceilings, large windows, patio decks, washers, dryers, most have a private garage and many have views of the Bay or the woodside. Next slide.

Slide 19 — Canada Vista – Redwood City, CA

57:43

Barbara Christensen: This is Cañada Vista and it opened in August 2011 with 60 units. These have a view of the Bay on one side and on the other side they have a view of the open space district. That concludes my presentation.

Slide 20 — San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School

58:11

Dorsey Moore: Great, thanks Barbara. I am Dorsey Moore and the CEO of the Conservation Corps Charter School. We are a non-profit organization that serves the Silicon Valley area. We serve about 200 18-25-year-old youth of transition age. We have both a charter high school — which is really a safety net high school for a lot of the public school districts in our area — then we also do paid job training and environmental careers, such as trail construction; trail maintenance; and doing defensible space. One of the statistics I didn't mention earlier is that in our community of Silicon Valley, or even just San Jose, the fastest growing segment of our

community is transition-aged youth. That's really sort of a frightening statistic. As folks complete their high school diploma or their secondary credential, it is our attempt and hope to transition to a local community college. We have six in our local area. With our challenge of finding housing and keeping people from getting displaced, we really needed to come up with something that was creative. We've tried to figure out our capabilities. We also had to figure out something that was low cost of construction and also that we can build on quickly — not in years, but months, maybe even weeks.

In Silicon Valley, one of the things, I guess if there is a benefit of urban sprawl, it is that you have a lot of deep rectangular lots. Consequently, we thought we are going to ride the wave of the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) legislative state statute changes. Most folks can't afford an ADU — they are \$200,000 - \$250,000 in our area. We thought, why don't we build tiny homes on wheels? We also call them portable dwelling units.

Slide 21 — Youth Housing Promise

59:58

Dorsey Moore: We were on our way to build these. Our model is to put them in backyards and really try to find fixed income seniors, low-income families, and pay them passive income for \$500 a month to put our units in their backyard and then place two of our students in them to live while they're enrolled in our program. Each student — as they are enrolled in our high school diploma program, and working for us, so we have this earn and learn model — they would pay us \$500 a month in rent, \$1,000 per unit. We take \$500 of that rent to income and pay a homeowner \$500. That's how we are hoping to operate this.

One of the challenges is we had to do the zoning code adjustments to allow them to be occupied in backyards. We did that just about exactly a year ago, unfortunately, as the pandemic hit; it has made it hard. Currently we don't have any in a backyard, but we have had six on our campus. We have 12 students living in them and we really made a lot of design changes in those units with the lived experience of our young adults. They have actually helped redesign our units from a design standpoint. Think of this almost as a portable dorm room. With this, we've been able to make this work. We had some initial capital investment from a local foundation. We can build each of these units for around \$50,000. Moving forward, we are hoping to really benefit from using private lands and also the rental income that we get to continue to build more. We need about 30 of these units to meet the needs of our students, and also our staff. Next slide.

Slide 22 — Youth Housing Promise

1:01:42

Dorsey Moore: Some of the benefits here is that we can put these in clusters and do it on commercial property, churches, on school campuses, like our own, or also put them on a community college campus if there's land. You can put them on public or private land. We chose to go with backyards on private land because, at the time when we started doing this, there was some resistance to new development. We figured it would be tough to do a cluster. That's why we went to almost a neighbor-to-neighbor approval, and then, trying to get a whole community somewhere. We can build these quickly and the rents are truly affordable for our students. I'll wrap it there and turn it back over to Katrina.

Slide 23 — Case Studies Panel Discussion

1:02:26

Katrina Johantgen: Thanks, Dorsey and welcome back Bob. Those are really great highlights. I'm sure we have a lot of great questions that have come in. We did want to spend a little bit of time talking about project affordability and we will talk about affordability—we talk about “lowercase affordability” because it's a relative term. You're all in regions of the State that trend more expensive. How did you all reach your affordability objectives? I know Barbara talked about issuing COPs for 25 years. Was that the general fund that was as a backstop to you, for the rents that were paid on those units?

Barbara Christensen: Yeah.

Katrina Johantgen: That's fantastic. Dr. Avila, you talked about keeping the mark below \$1,000 for those double units. Do you want to touch on how affordability played into your project design?

Dr. Pedro Avila: Definitely. We are being really careful not to add anything to the project amenities and luxury. First, our students were saying we really need a place where we can live and be on the campus. We were very careful with that. We are still very protective of the quality of the project, making sure that it is something that it is going to be on-going. We are going to be very proud of this beautiful building. We are very, very proud of the product.

The affordability does not end now. Affordability for us continues. Part of what we are doing right now is creating an endowment that's going to further lower the rents for students. Even if you are a homeless student, even if you're offered a room below market rate, can you really afford \$950 a month? It's going to take donors and take us creating an endowment to further lower those rents and that's what we are going to be doing between now and opening date. We have a couple of years to draw that endowment. We are doing naming rights throughout the building. Our board did a special exception and allowed for that building to have an external naming if there's a donor. Typically, our buildings are named after our board members, and this is an exception they made, because they understand that there's a need for us to lower rent. We still have a lot of work to do to lower those rates. That's our approach for affordability.

Katrina Johantgen: That's wonderful.

Bob Parker: I would echo what Dr. Avila just said. We are currently in the process of doing our follow-up market study in preparation for doing financing and issuing the bonds. We have virtual focus groups going on at this point and we will be doing a general survey of our students starting next week. We had certain lower-than-market rate or the affordability targets in mind from the first survey and we are confirming them using this second survey. In order to hit those targets, we are building it on the land that we already owned. As Doctor Avila said, we are maintaining the quality of the project. We are also examining the things that have been added or would potentially be added to the project with an eye toward making sure that we can maintain those more affordable rents that came out of those student surveys.

Katrina Johantgen: That's great. Dorsey, I know you touched on affordability. Do you want to highlight how your board made the decision to move?

Dorsey Moore: Our students are working an unpaid job training program and, in some cases, working a second job, and some type of gig economy job. So, we are trying to get down to and

keep it at \$500 a month rent so they can actually be a young adult focusing on school and not have to work every waking moment outside of class. That's how we really came up with a \$500 a month rent.

Katrina Johantgen: LAUSD has a question about how you valued your land contributions. Barbara, I think you guys use District Land? How did that equity into your project help in terms of affordability? Or anyone else on the panel [can comment].

Barbara Christensen: Buying land in San Mateo County is very expensive. I'd also like to add that the 44 units that we built in 2005 cost \$8.5 million. The 60 units built in 2010 cost about \$11.5, \$12.5 million. We're planning and we got approval for 30 units at Skyline College. We're about to start construction and the cost is \$20 million – and that's on our land. The land savings is a huge deal – what you save from not having to buy a piece of property. We are lucky that we've got parking lots that were not used – with great views.

Katrina Johantgen: As your boards approve these projects, was there any discussion of the kind of ancillary benefits – cutting commuter time and having more quality time and less stress – were those kinds of ancillary benefits part of the board determination?

Barbara Christensen: No, I think that, in our case, the survey results were so compelling – that 18% were going to leave us in the next three years and 61% of them said it was a cost of housing. I think that's all it took for the board to say, let's go ahead and do this. We were not the first in the State. Santa Clara Unified School District built housing and in fact, I went down and visited with them to find out how they did it. All of our projects go through the local cities. They don't go through the Department of State Architect.

Katrina Johantgen: Yeah, correct, so you have some opportunity and savings there. We wanted to spend the next couple of minutes talking about project milestones and key lessons learned. I'm sure there are a lot of folks listening that are looking for a champion like yourselves to move these projects forward. For instance, Bobby talked about Scion and how they've worked with you. There was also a question about the flexibility of these feasibility studies and cost analyzes. You guys approved a feasibility study or cost estimate pre-COVID and now we're back to maybe a new normal. How flexible are these feasibility studies? Do any of you want to touch on that? Then also, talk about the champion of your projects. I know they are the students and the workforce, but I mean behind the scenes, moving this forward.

Bob Parker: I'll jump in here just to say that in terms of the champions of the project, certainly our President has been a real driving force behind the project, but also our Board of Trustees. They were very supportive and very interested in us moving forward into the faculty.

The same thing with our students. Our survey results indicated that not only were our students interested – it's expensive to live in Napa – there are students who are traveling great distances to come for some of the programs that we have here that are unique to Napa Valley College and they're interested in cutting down that commute time, having the opportunity to live and work in Napa and would increase their course load, and go from being part-time to full-time, if they have the ability to live on campus.

We also see that having students on campus 24 hours a day is really going to inject energy and make a campus more active and lively throughout the day, and will impact the services that we provide on campus, as well. We are taking into account the fact that housing will result in some

additional expenses to the college, in terms of potential additional security, but more importantly making services more available. We have services now, but making them more available as we move toward having more 24-hour-a-day activity on campus.

Barbara Christensen: In our case, we needed to keep our staff informed about our plans. After the board approved us to move ahead we kept the staff very much informed. We had joint City Council / Board meetings to explain to them and tell them the results of our surveys, that said housing was such a problem for our faculty. We talked to thought leaders throughout the community. Before we ever went to the planning commission and the City Council we held many community meetings with homeowners' associations, and PTAs, and neighbors and other affiliated groups to discuss the plans. Then, when we went to the Planning Commission and when we went to the City Council, I made sure that we had a bunch of faculty and staff in the audience. San Mateo told us that we had the fastest approved housing project ever in the City.

Katrina Johantgen: That's fantastic.

Dr. Pedro Avila: I'll share lessons learned for us, or advice I would give. One of the things that we did well was from the very beginning we put together a student housing workgroup. That included all of our constituents — the Academic Senate President, our Union President, Student Government President — we basically had all the leaders of the college, trustees, everyone in the room, working on this project and they were all championing this project. There's a lot of ownership within the institution. We really didn't run into any barriers with anybody pushing back because of that approach.

The other advice I would give is it's really important that you involve student services early on in your project because this is your student services project. At some point early on, you also need to involve your student services and also finance as soon as possible. For our team in Santa Rosa, it is the Vice President of Finance; the Dean of Students as part of this project champion group leading it; our Director of Capital Projects; and then myself. You're going to get to a point where a lot of it is about contracts and finance, and it's going to be really important that your Vice President of Finance is really committed to this project. Student Services is also a very important part. That would be my advice, to make sure that you have the right people leading it very early on in the project.

Katrina Johantgen: Do those conversations and planning also contemplate services going forward in terms of programming and all of those costs?

Dr. Pedro Avila: You talk about what does this do to your library costs because now you have students on campus, 24/7, and student life in general. Buildings are going to have to be open longer hours of operation. If you have on-campus police, I believe in a year that's probably going to increase your cost. Also, food services...these are all the things that we've been talking about and we've been planning for the last couple years.

Katrina Johantgen: Because the CSUs and UCs have been doing this for so long, did any of you partner with a local UC and CSU to get lessons learned or feedback, as it relates to housing and — to your point Dr. Avila — 24/7 student activity on campus?

Dr. Pedro Avila: For us, it wasn't a partnership, but we did have a call with Dr. Castro, who is President at Fresno State, as they did a P3. We did have a call with their team, and they were the first ones that gave us a framework of the P3 model, and we took it from there.

Barbara Christensen: One other thing I'd like to add is that our board was concerned about that, if a tenant had a leaky toilet, they didn't want them coming to the board meeting to complain. So, they appointed a non-profit board that includes: two board members (the head of the Academic Senate and the head of the classified staff); two property managers from the community; a lawyer from the community; and a finance person from the community. That's the group that all the complaints go to, the group that determines the budget for the project, that orders the maintenance survey that you're required to do every three years when you build housing, etc. It's worked out extremely well.

Katrina Johantgen: That's a great idea. Primarily for Dr. Avila, Dorsey and Bob, what does your next year look like in terms of key objectives? You're all kind of in a similar position. Bob, you guys are getting ready to issue debt. Dr. Avila, you're getting ready to issue debt and start construction. Can you forecast what your next year looks like? Maybe Barbara can give you some pointers.

Bob Parker: I would love to hear any pointers that Barbara can give us. We're looking to start construction in October. There will be quite a bit of activity here on campus as we move forward with the actual construction. Then, within a year, we will be looking at setting up some sort of a leasing office or sample units that we can use to start getting student interest and identifying students who will be occupying those units when they become available for the start of the fall semester in 2023. We've spent all of these years surveying and designing and talking about housing. It really becomes a reality in the next 12 to 24 months.

Dr. Pedro Avila: I think for us it's very similar to what Bob said. We spent three years working on design and financing. Now it is shifting gears and transitioning from that into construction. I don't think reality has hit us yet – that portion will be over. Now it is about construction management and it's a whole different skill set. This is where it is important that you have an advisor that is going to help you navigate all that. For us, just focusing on identifying donors so that we can grow that endowment and lower our rents, and really offer rooms that are the lowest possible rate in Sonoma County for our students, that's really going to be our focus along with the construction.

Katrina Johantgen: When you talk about donors, are there community collaborators? I know you talked about Kaiser. The endowment is going to rely on donors, but in terms of developing a capital stack that might have some county funding – when you built your capital stack – is that something that you guys want to share with the audience?

Dr. Pedro Avila: The Kaiser donation was a donation to the cost of the construction. That \$1 million went directly to lower cost of construction so it had a direct impact on rents. There was a gap financing to be able to make sure the project was financeable. The endowment is going to be mostly private donors. We do have a foundation executive director, who is actively working right now, and he's amazing at identifying donors. We have a few donors lined up and that is going to be the focus for the next couple years.

Dorsey Moore: For us, we are an outlier here. I love all these projects that you guys have already done or are implementing and will implement, and I can't wait till they come online. Unfortunately, our option is more of an interim housing model and we're looking to scale here, locally. As I mentioned, we have six local community colleges that our students sort of transition to. So, we just can't wait the five years that it might take to plan and build these [traditional

student housing]. We are looking forward to hopefully partnering with our local community colleges to see how we can meet their needs; and also trying to guarantee our students housing for two years until they can finish their post-secondary degree or credential with a local community college, and so we can guarantee that housing for two years. That's our next step; we're actually looking to scale right now to build really 60 over the next year.

Katrina Johantgen: I was going to ask, I know Dr. Avila talked about a phase two and Dorsey, you are talking about future planning. Are you trying to kind of piggyback for economies of scale? Or are you going to try and see how the first phase goes? Are you trying to build on the momentum that you've achieved?

Dorsey Moore: Yeah, so, momentum and hard learned lessons that we've gotten along the way around design, and also kind of setting them in backyards or clusters. That's not easily done; every location is different, with a lot of challenges at every site.

Katrina Johantgen: Dr. Avila?

Dr. Pedro Avila: Yes, we identified a demand of 500 and we were very conservative with our number of beds being 352, knowing that we wanted the project to be successful. When you do a P3 model, you have to hit a fill rate. So, we need to have a 95% fill rate for all the numbers to work out. So, that plays into your decision on how many units you're going to build. We saw the 352 was not going to be an issue for us to fill. But also, during our planning, we have identified land adjacent to phase one where we could expand after we are successful with the first project.

Katrina Johantgen: That's great. Thank you. Does anyone have any last remarks? I think we're going to wind down here in a minute or so. I want to thank Nick Jiles. He's with the Foundation, the Community College League Foundation on student housing issues and he has worked with us on developing this roundtable, and I know he advocates with many of you in Sacramento. Thank you to Nick, and he's available to provide technical assistance to any panelist or attendees, so we will be sharing this information later. Did anyone want to make any last remarks?

Barbara Christensen: I will. I have had calls from many community college districts who want to build housing for their faculty. None of them have gotten started, yet. I give them all the advice that I can about finding a developer who's going to hire the architects, hire the engineers, to get the project moving even though the college person needs to be the front person before the City Council and before the community to sell the project. You have to have that kind of background help. I'd be happy to share with anyone – I think my e-mail is somewhere in the paperwork – the surveys that we did; I can give you the full PowerPoint of what it takes to build, what kind of person you need to have as your front person, what kind of developer do you need, that kind of thing. I'd be happy to share that with anyone who's interested.

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you for that. If your contact information is not in your bio on the webpage we'll be sure to add that, Barbara. Thank you for that offer.

Dr. Pedro Avila: Same here for Santa Rosa Junior College and my team for anyone who needs information. We've learned a lot from the last three years so we're wanting to share everything, all of our lessons learned. We have a crisis, right, and this is about students and it is about helping students. Whatever we can do to help, please reach out.

Webinar Transcript

Katrina Johantgen: I know we glossed over AB 1377, but there is the Technical Assistance Grant component that's going to be very important to develop any expanding housing on community college district land. That is something that we are going to be tracking and providing technical assistance. We welcome you all to be part of our stakeholder group, should that bill come to fruition. Next slide.

Slide 24 — Closing Remarks

1:26:13

Slide 25 — Thank You

1:26:18

Katrina Johantgen: Thank you all for joining us today. We hope that you found this roundtable helpful and informational. Our gratitude also is extended to our panelists: Steve Veres, Nancy Chaires Espinoza, Bob Parker, Pedro Avila, Barbara Christiansen, Dorsey Moore, and last and most important, State Treasurer Fiona Ma for her opening remarks and her leadership on this important issue of student housing and workforce [housing]. Materials from today's presentation can be found on CSFA's Event webpage, and we encourage you to provide feedback via the exit survey so that we can improve on our roundtables, and many thanks. So long and farewell to all of you. Thank you.

[End]