

2. Nowicki confirmed the Housing Authority has already identified a consultant willing to provide technical assistance for the conversion of housing vouchers to project-based vouchers. The proposed consultant has submitted a project proposal for this work and a quote of \$7,000.
 3. Frank Connel and Greg Rittchen shared a presentation about the Caritas Comunidades' mission to support individuals and families earning roughly 30% AMI, and provided further background about the 423 Eastern Ave project. Connel and Rittchen explained that inflation has contributed to the costs of capital maintenance outpacing the organization's financial capacity. According to the presenters, donors have contributed roughly \$150k to the building to support renovations to the roof, siding, and other internal repairs such as updated bathrooms and hallways. They explained that project-based vouchers are vital to the stabilization of vulnerable renters within the building as they help Caritas avoid rent hikes.
 4. Chairperson DeYoung requested clarification about the benefit that project-based vouchers would provide for residents at 423 Eastern Ave. Rittchen responded that project-based vouchers would effectively wipe nearly 80k in financial deficits. Connel added context about the kind of residents that would be stabilized, sharing that 5 residents within the building are elderly, while an additional 5 will be elderly within the next two years. Connel highlighted that one of these individuals is still working due to his Social Security and retirement checks not being enough to sustain his living costs, which highlighted the importance of financially stabilizing the building's tenants as quickly as possible. Lastly, they explained that project-based vouchers prevent the naturally occurring affordable rental costs from being converted to market-rate.
 5. Colleen Kelley expressed appreciation for Caritas Comunidades supporting individuals earning 30% AMI. However, Kelley asked for clarity around the need for funding from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Board for a consultant. Nowicki responded that the Housing Authority currently administers 1,100 vouchers, but has not administered a project-based voucher in over 30 years. He reiterates the need for a consultant to develop an administration plan for the voucher conversion process. In addition, Nowicki shared that hiring a consultant ensures that the Housing Authority administers the project-based vouchers in a legal and time-efficient manner.
 6. Chairperson Gary DeYoung thanked Rittchen, Connel and Nowicki for sharing their presentation and answering the Board's questions.
- C. 41 Orange St. Comunidades Enraizadas and Habitat for Humanity Land Disposition Approval (LDA)

1. Chairperson DeYoung asked board members one by one for questions or suggestions about the LDA based on their review. The board's intentions were to discuss the LDA in detail during this meeting before ultimately transmitting the document to Comunidades Enraizadas and Habitat for Humanity for their review. Board members shared and briefly discussed the following questions:
 - a) Could the Chairperson's signature suffice for the entire board? (The LDA currently prompts a signature from each board member).
 - b) Who would be the successors and assigns? (Board members discussed the condo association possibly being the successor and assign but wanted confirmation).
 - c) What exactly does the board's signature on the LDA entail? (Board members sought clarity around implications and liabilities associated with signing off on the document).
 - d) Who would be responsible for monitoring affordability restrictions on the units moving forward?
 - e) Could a monitoring agency be contracted to monitor the unit resale process?
 - f) How can the board require an annual report, narrative, or some other deliverable to ensure ongoing affordability?
 - g) Why is the LDA clear on the project being restricted to certain incomes, but not affordable sales prices?
 - h) What happens in the case of reversion or foreclosure?
 - i) How much local preference could be leveraged on the project before Habitat for Humanity's state and federal financing structure is impacted?
 - j) How can the LDA guarantee affordability restrictions be placed in perpetuity?
 - k) What is the board's role in determining restrictions around use and design, such as the number of units allocated to the project, level of ADA accessibility or adaptability to accessibility, etc.?
 - l) How binding is the Request for Proposals (RFP) that Habitat for Humanities responded to? In other words, does information on the RFP have to be repeated in the LDA for it to truly count?
 - m) What suggestions for the LDA were shared during June or July AHTFB meetings, and how can we ensure these elements are included?
2. Vote: Chairperson DeYoung motioned to shelf the questions and discussion due to the limit of time during the meeting, and hold an interim

meeting on March 26th with City Solicitor, Cheryl Watson Fisher present to provide clarity about the LDA and approve it pending necessary changes. The board voted unanimously in favor (7-0-0). However, due to scheduling issues, an interim meeting did not take place and continuation of the discussion will occur in April during regular meeting time:

- a) Gary DeYoung: Yes
 - b) Ned Keefe: Yes
 - c) Alexis Turgeon: Yes
 - d) Colleen Kelley: Yes
 - e) Crystal Carillo-Gamboa: Yes
 - f) Teri Weidney: Yes
 - g) Kelly Chamblee: Yes
3. Jim Kostaris provided insight about Habitat for Humanity to ease some confusion expressed by board members. Kostaris shared that the organization abides by national policy that requires residents of 41 Orange St. to be first-time homebuyers and clarified that units at 41 Orange St. cannot be rented. Further, Kostaris expressed the belief that since deed restrictions are recorded, and the building sits upon property owned by a land trust, these tools are sufficient to ensure ongoing affordability. Ultimately, this would guarantee that a lien is not needed. Lastly, Kostaris clarifies that 100% Chelsea preference is not possible since some units have to be available to buyers throughout greater Boston.
 4. Caroline Ellenbird assured the board that both Habitat for Humanity and Comunidades Enraizadas will partake in reviewing the LDA after the board, allowing further opportunity for clarification. Ellenbird raised consideration for maintaining an income eligibility minimum, and/or a first time home buyer restriction.

D. Finalizing Funding Criteria

1. Evaluation criteria presented to the board were divided into three categories: Acquisition/Predevelopment, Development, and Community Housing. Chairperson DeYoung allowed board members to review and comment upon the evaluation criteria for each category.
2. For Acquisition and Predevelopment:
 - a) Chairperson DeYoung suggested having the least advantageous column count as 1 point rather than 0 points.
 - b) Chairperson DeYoung proposed adding affordability terms to the threshold criteria. Threshold criteria determines the minimum criteria project proposals must meet before being deemed eligible for board review.

- c) Chairperson DeYoung suggested that the minimum affordability terms for housing projects be at least 15 years.
3. For Development:
- a) Alexis Turgeon suggested cleaning up affordability terms and clarifying why or how Chelsea-based developers receive board preference. Chairperson DeYoung agreed that allocating too much local preference may be counter-intuitive to the board's goals. Further, Colleen Kelley shared that the specification may limit other qualified developers based outside of Chelsea from being considered for funding. Turgeon advised that a compromise may be to allocate preference to developers that have demonstrated a history of serving the city of Chelsea rather than being Chelsea-based.
 - b) Turgeon highlighted a criterion that would provide preference to projects that "...[minimize] impacts on the built environment such as accessory apartments, small infill developments in existing neighborhoods, buy-down initiatives that convert existing housing into affordable units, or similar projects as determined by the board." Turgeon shared the belief that this would disadvantage larger projects and effectively limit the number of affordable units in Chelsea.
 - c) Further, Turgeon highlighted a criterion that would provide preference to project proposals that "...[contribute] to the vitality of the community and [preserve] Chelsea's unique character." Turgeon asked for clarity on what it would mean to contribute to Chelsea's vitality and unique character. In response, Kelly Chamblee shared that the unique character of Chelsea is what drew her as a new resident to the city, and attests to the need to preserve its character. Chamblee was a proponent of maintaining both the criterion that Turgeon highlighted as is.
4. Chairperson DeYoung recommended that the board share the rest of their feedback to Bianca Mercado and Ben Cares so that the criteria can be updated for April's meeting. This includes final review of the Community Housing category for evaluation criteria.

V. New Business

- A. None.

VI. Meeting Adjournment

- A. Vote: Chairperson DeYoung moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:39 pm. Kelley seconded the motion. All members voted in favor to adjourn the meeting.
 - 1. Gary DeYoung: Yes

2. Ned Keefe: Yes
3. Alexis Turgeon: Yes
4. Colleen Kelley: Yes
5. Crystal Carillo-Gamboa: Yes
6. Teri Weidney: Yes
7. Kelly Chamblee: Yes