City and County of San Francisco
Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee Meeting
January 28, 2016

Partial Verbatim Transcript of
Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee Meeting

January 28, 2016

Transcription from MP3 Audio Posted on SOTF Web Site
by Patrick Monette-Shaw

Note: Material contained in bracketed text — [between brackets] — includes elliptical inferences made by various speakers, or include explanatory information added by the transcriptionist. Any errors in transcription are unintentional, given Monette-Shaw's life-long hearing loss. The footnotes place comments into context. Information contained in the extensive footnotes offer clarifying rebuttal information, that should be read closely.

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
37:41	Maura Lane, Secretary to CGOBOC	Item 4: Presentation from the Mayor's Office of Housing regarding the Affordable Housing Bond, and possible action by the Committee in response to such presentation.
38:32	Michael Seville, CGOBOC Chair	Good morning, and welcome.
38:34	Kate Hartley, Deputy Director of Housing, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Good morning, Committee Members. Thank you. My name is Kate Hartley. I'm the Deputy Director of Housing, at the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). We thank you for having us here. [Ms. Hartley had provided the CGOBOC members and members of the public with copies of an 11-page undated report titled "*2015 $310 Million Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond Report*" containing an "Executive Summary." The "properties" of the PDF file show it was created on 8/31/2015, and was updated on 1/19/2016. Ms. Hartley also presented a 15-page undated PowerPoint presentation titled "*San Francisco 2015 Affordable Housing General Obligation Bond: Assessing Our Needs*." The "properties" of the PowerPoint file show it was created and modified on 1/19/2016. Hartley spoke briefly, summarizing each of the PowerPoint slides — not transcribed here in full — prior to CGOBOC members beginning to ask questions.]
52:05	Hartley	We are working with the Office of Public Finance now on the first bond issuance. We are looking at our existing pipeline funds so we don't go out and request too much, too soon, so that we don't incur unneeded interest expense. But we do have a pressing mandate to get out there as soon as possible, especially for example the Mission [District] neighborhood housing, because maybe there could be opportunities that are available ***right away*** to purchase a site for future development. And we are working with the Mission

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		neighborhood and community in that effort. So we expect the first ***tranche***[1] ("slice") of bonds to be issued soon — the first or second quarter, probably the second quarter of 2016. And, inn order to accommodate the possibility of not letting a good deal go before the bonds are issued, we are also working on a Reimbursement Resolution if we want to bridge some of those funds. And that is the conclusion of our presentation, and we're happy to answer any questions you have.
53:26	Chair Seville	Thank you for that [presentation]. I'd like to open it up to any [CGOBOC] Committee members to ask any questions, especially from the [CGOBO]} liaison.
53:35	Larry Bush, CGOBOC Member	Thank you very much for the presentation. I have a number of questions. [Bush asked a series of questions, which Hartley responded to sequentially. The entire exchange is not transcribed here.]
59:02	Unknown CGOBOC Member	I had a question. When this was proposed and passed … [The principal question asked was since this bond is unlike other City bonds, how will oversight be structured as a "programmatic approach" such as "who is going to be the designated project manager?," and "who is going to be the designated construction manager?," and how is the whole program going to be structured? Hartley responded that MOHCD has a "tried and true" framework that these buildings — ostensibly the public housing and RAD housing projects — that structure the loans. The entire exchange is not transcribed here.]
1:02:54	Same Unknown CGOBOC Member	Lastly, what are the other [City] departments that comprise the Citywide Loan Committee? You said there were various departments.
1:02:59	Hartley	The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), and Tiffany Bohee the Executive Director attends that, and the Human Services Agency (HSA), and the Department of Public Health (DPH), and the San Francisco Housing Authority. So we typically … almost always partner with either DPH or HSA on our developments because we serve … typically Very Low Income people who need [supportive] services and most of our developments have a set-aside of 20% of the units for formerly, chronically homeless individuals. So if we build any 100-unit building that we help to build with our lending, 20 of those units will be devoted to homeless households, and then HSA or DPH will provide the funding for the [supportive housing] services and the operating expense.
1:03:57	Same Unknown CGOBOC Member	Thank you.
1:04:05	Robert Carlson, CGOBOC Member	Thank you. As I read through the documents [Hartley had presented] and this is kind of new to me since I'm more used to the construction building, what I see …What I ***don't*** see are any sort of metrics by which this Commission [CGOBOC] or citizens can kind of judge the impacts of the $310 million in terms of producing affordable housing or preserving affordable housing. Is there … has any … does that exist somewhere … I mean the new housing units

[1] **Definition of *tranche***: "A division or portion of a pool or whole; specifically: An issue of bonds derived from a pooling of like obligations (as securitized mortgage debt) that is differentiated from other issues especially by maturity or rate of return."

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		you are hoping to produce, the number [of units] you're going to preserve, the number you are going to rehabilitate, the number of units you make affordable, how many teachers get into housing, how many veterans get into … There needs to be, I think, in all the various programs broken down with some kind of metrics so that when you come back next time [to update CGOBOC] and report, you can say "We've done this, we've done …". But I don't see that. Is … and when you set this up, were there any kind of goals … Any kind of metric goals out of these various programs?
1:05:03	Hartley	Yes. That's a really good point. Really fair point. We typically don't define specific metrics because we are so dependent on the market and the leveraging of funds, and the availability of outside sources to supplement what we are putting in. So that in … for any particular development [project] the cost of that development and how many units that you can build for every $100,000 of City funds is going to depend on what the low-income tax-equity market is, whether or not the developer was successful in securing additional funds, and the cost of construction at that time. Also the cost of land. So, for example, yes, we absolutely have goals. To take just one category: A hundred million dollars in low-income housing. We are going to go out and … let me back up a second. We would like to devote 20 million dollars … set that aside for the acquisition of rent-controlled properties to stop "*vacancy decontrol*" and help low-income people stay in their homes without threat of displacement. So that leaves 80 million dollars for this category. We want to devote that through the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) to what we hope are three, hundred-unit projects, so that would mean roughly … after you take off administrative costs, there would be about 25 million dollars in gap funding for each one of those [three] developments. That would mean that we want and are hoping for and have some reasonable expectation that this will occur, that the developers who respond to our NOFA will be able to come to us without the added cost of acquiring land. And so that all we would have to put into the deal is the cost of vertical construction as gap funding, in conjunction with other sources of funds. Now, we'll see if we can hit that three, hundred-unit goal with the $80 million, but we'll have to see what the submissions are.
1:07:25	Carlson	And I understand that. But I think we need … you need to have some kind of goals, just to be able ... So I don't know … the next time [you present to us] you make a presentation you can kind of lay out the $310 million. And, for example, the $20 million for the purchase of rent-controlled units, when we … when you purchase that with these bond funds, who owns that building?
1:07:32	Hartley	So … the non-profit developers would own the building, we would make the loans. We hope to limit the per-unit costs to somewhere between $250,000 and $300,000 and that would be leveraged with a new first mortgage, that should …
1:08:12	Carlson	So, we're going to loan the bond funds to a developer, and then they'll pay them back?
1:08:19	Hartley	Um … well … there's [giggled] technically, Yes. [giggled] But because … in order to serve very-low income people, you have to structure those kind of loans as something called "*residual receipts*." And that means if there is … after you pay your operating expenses, if there are leftover funds, then a portion would go back to repay us. But we typically don't have an expectation of repayment [to us] over time, because … in order to demand repayment and

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		make it a "hard loan" with mandatory debt service, that would require incomes at a certain level that we can't typically support.
1:09:05	Carlson	So, what's to …
1:09:08	Hartley	And, as Ben [Rosenfield, City Controller] is saying, the purpose of the loans are to reach the lowest-income people and enforce affordability. And there's really no market … there's no opportunity for those households to operate in a market environment where you have a mandatory loan repayment structure.
1:09:27	Carson	But, what's to keep the new owner of that we paid for with **<u>bond</u>** funds from ten years from now just going market rate?
1:09:36	Hartley	Um … permanent deed restrictions on the property.
1:09:40	Carson	So, I guess that's part of my problem. The $310 million is going to be spent in different ways, it sounds like. A lot of it through loans. And I don't understand … I personally don't understand that. Is there some clear, simple way where we can break [out] how this money is going to be spent, and how that works?
1:10:00	Ben Rosenfield, City Controller	I was going to suggest … um … in addition to kind of clarifying what the reporting is going to look like in future meetings in line with your points, Mr. Carlson, it's probably worth it when next time [when we have them] back having a more detailed conversation how this delivery model differs from the classic instruction that this Committee is used to seeing. Because it is a different delivery model. **<u>We're not going through a process of bidding out and paying a private contractor to deliver a project which we own</u>**. Here you are using non-profit entities loans. You're using the loans to enforce the affordability. The loan terms itself avoid some of the conditions you are worried about here, which is kind of how we ensure the non-profit won't flip it for profit. It's probably worth a little bit more of a discussion and briefing for the Committee …
1:10:47	Carlson	I'd appreciate that a lot. Because, again, I think that … I think at the end we want to know that we're getting more affordable housing.
1:10:54	Hartley	Absolutely. We have no problem doing that. **We have the data**. We'll … and… we … um … hopefully, we'll have some very concrete information as a result of our outreach and first steps to give you. But, yes, we will do that.
1:11:09	Carlson	Thank you.
1:11:11	Brenda Kwee McNulty, CGOBOC Member	I have a comment that's really related to what was being discussed. I was motivated when I was looking at the presentation material, that the particular chart where you separate the four categories [Slide #10 in Hartley's PowerPoint presentation] and you look at the way you've allocated the $310 [million] into these four different categories, and different amounts or different rationale, I was struck by the way that … you used four categories of investments. I'm from an investment background. And when you have an investment, you tend to really think of investment in return. Obviously these are going to be in ***social*** returns. But I was curious, at least in this early stage of the whole program, whether you and your team have thought about … um … and specified certain returns, which is related to some of the metrics. Some of them are goals of number of units … there could be some other return category that may not be financial or statistical. But I think it's helpful to be able to at this early stage of the game [to] lay out those areas, or categories of return. Number 1, so that we can go back and evaluate how successful … what our return was for the whole bond program. And more importantly, and it's not a secondary objective, as to how well we have allocated almost a third, for example, to affordable housing. So the relative returns of these categories will also shed some light into whether or

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		not we made the right allocation decisions. [Unintelligble … "I'm" ?] ready for your comment.
1:13:10	Hartley	Yes. There's basically two categories of return that we will present to you and we will talk about. The first is the number of households served. Actually, I'll make it three categories. The number of households served. And income levels. We know that if we are serving homeless households, there's no financial return attached to that effort. [giggles] But if we get homeless households off the street that is a significant return. That is a significant achievement. And we will be counting that number of households that we serve. That's true of homeless households, of low-income working households, of seniors, etc. So we'll come back to you with that number. Now the public housing sector has a slightly different return, because the existing infrastructure at Sunnydale and Potrero is terrible. It cannot continue, as is. So we're going to use some Prop A [bond] funds to replace that infrastructure. Now you can attach a particular number of units to the new infrastructure, which we'll do and we'll report to you on the number of units affected. But really, in the Sunnydale and Potrero context, we want to talk about how fast we're accelerating the developments there. We're going to use Prop A funds so that these developments don't have to wait 20 years to finish their build-out. And that's currently *without* Prop A funds, that's where they were: 20 year build-outs.
1:14:52	Unknown CGOBOC Member, Possibly Carlson	So on that point then, we should see a schedule, so that you can show us that you [inaudible]?
1:15:00	Hartley	Yes, absolutely. And just to … I mean we'll talk about this at length, I know. But just to give you an idea of the complexity. Beyond just putting the money available to the cost of new infrastructure, or vertical housing development, for Potrero and Sunnydale we have a very important element that will inform that schedule and that is the relocation of existing residents. We don't want to lose one household of existing residents there. So we have to move people around. A much more complex version of the relocation [plan] I described for RAD. Because in RAD we're just fixing the units up. We're not tearing them down and building new ones. So we have to layer in how to relocate all the residents [at Potrero and Sunnydale] without causing anybody harm and still accelerate the construction schedule as fast as we possibly can. So those are the challenges that we face and they're ***not*** insignificant.
1:16:05	Bush	I'm sorry. I'd like to tag along with what Commissioner Carlson is saying. When you do the metrics it would also be very helpful if you gave us some sense of the populations that need to be served and the populations you'll be able to serve. So when you're looking at what is the senior population that you are looking at, or the disabled, or the veterans, that we have some way of seeing what are we doing to close that gap? And I think, as well, while the challenge is great in terms of moving people around, for example in public housing, there isn't a lot of experience with that. With North Beach, for example, when North Beach was torn down and new housing was built, they moved people around from one part of the property to another part, and then it turned out to be a pretty terrific set of public housing. The last time I checked, there were more than 200 units of public housing that were vacant because they are uninhabitable. And so when you're talking about building 300 units for $80 million and you're looking at existing vacancies of

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		200 units in public housing now, you're also going to be adding new units because of new construction in the new configuration under RAD. So we should be coming out substantially ahead of those numbers.
1:17:23	Hartley	Yes, and I … we will absolutely provide you with that information about the various populations. Just a couple of things to note: Although I agree with you completely about North Beach. It's a wonderful development. Um … it wasn't without cost that we are wanting very seriously to avoid at this point, because there were people who were permanently displaced from North Beach, involuntarily. And that has been the case in public housing rebuilds across the country. And we know that when those people were displaced and had to just leave their communities without services, without safety nets, oftentimes it wasn't great for those households. So …
1:18:11	Bush	I would suggest that you take a look at what happened at Geneva Towers. Because that's where they voted … the residents themselves [voted] to tear down those buildings. And in the interim, there were funds that were made available not only for relocation of the tenants, but to keep them connected to the neighborhood associations so that they could return. And it was a very high rate of return there.
1:18:30	Hartley	There are ways to deal with those issues, and we're … um … incorporating all of that in our current Sunnydale and Potrero renovation plans. And then I had another point, but it just escaped me. But, yeah, we will get you that information. Oh, I did want to say that … um … the vacancy rate at Sunnydale and Potrero right now is less than 5% because the City put resources in the last two years into fixing up all the uninhabitable units. That work is now done. Those units are leased up. They were leased up to formerly homeless families and so we're starting with about a 98% vacancy rate at those developments.
1:19:15	Chair Seville	I want to open it up to anyone else that hasn't had an opportunity to comment. I'm sure everyone does. So everyone who wants to comment on this.
1:19:22	Another Unknown CGOBOC Member	Just really briefly, as an organization that actually works with HOPE [SF] and RAD, I think it would be great if we could get a slide or two on those two programs, just so my colleagues can be informed about that, and I don't want to belabor it because I think that's one of the things you are hearing and its always been a concern in the community, as we go back into public housing and do some redevelopment to just make sure that folks aren't displaced. And while we're talking about dollars per unit, we know that there are San Francisco residents that are attached to those units and we want to make sure that they stay there and they have the opportunity. And we've seen that with the 40% neighborhood preference by Supervisor [Malia] Cohen and Supervisor [London] Breed, so we definitely … if we can talk a little bit about next time too about the effort just to ensure that residents are going to be able to stay in their residence, that would be great, too.
1:20:06	Chair Seville	Anyone else?
1:20:07	Mike Garcia, CGOBOC Member,	Yes. If you accept as a premise that the cost of housing in San Francisco is a function of demand, but also the cost of building a house, is that a reasonable premise?
1:20:20	Hartley	That … the cost is a function of demand and construction …
1:20:26	Garcia	… and the cost of construction o housing. And you mention the fact that right now we have a 12% inclusionary housing requirement. And that there's a push … and it sounds as though you are saying … that the Mayor's Office of Housing is pushing for greater inclusionary numbers? And what I've often wondered about is … there has to be at some point which — as you push those numbers up — you are giving an incentive to developers to build more expensive housing because they are going to have greater opportunity for

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		[making more] profit. And there's also a point where that's going to be self-defeating and counterproductive to continue to have those types of [inclusionary housing] numbers. And I've noticed that lately that the Planning Department has done something about the DUM policy [Dwelling Unit Mergers], where they've made it more difficult to do that. And I'm just wondering who — or if anyone — has analyzed at what point we start hurting ourselves as we increase the demand for inclusionary housing?
1:21:29	Hartley	Well, as you may know, there are currently competing ballot measures in play. Um … One seeks to increase the inclusionary requirement across the board to 25%, and the Mayor has put forward a ballot measure to conduct a feasibility analysis to see what is the point at which you start to actually …
1:21:59	Garcia	… [unintelligible] inhibit the rate of return?
1:22:00	Hartley	… inhibit housing production. Right! So … um … we are very much in the thick of getting that feasibility analysis done, [and] done well, done quickly, because as you've suggested that is essential to making a decision about what is any right revision to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.
1:22:30	Controller Rosenfield	It's a fascinating topic, and luckily this is not a topic this Committee is going to have to grapple with in years ahead. [Group laughter.] But as Kate mentioned, there are a number of different ballot proposals pending on the second floor of the building [City Hall Office of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors offices] at the moment. There are a number of different parties doing [feasibility] reviews of some of the questions you are asking, Commissioner Garcia. Our Office of Economic Analysis [under the City Controller's purview], the Planning Department, proponents and opponents of both [ballot] measures, frankly, are doing the exact form of analysis you are talking about. There's a lot of work and a lot of thinking going into those questions, as we speak.
1:23:04	Garcia	All right. Rather than keep going down that path I have one quick question having to do with … on page 6 on the other [full] report [not the PowerPoint presentation] that you included with this, there is a section that has to do with housing programs that serve vulnerable San Francisco residents, and you list people … Where would someone who is **not** homeless and has diagnosed mental illness, would that fall under disabled individuals? Or how are they provided for?
1:23:27	Hartley	That would fall under … that would be a disability. We have some housing that, for example, is funded with the Mental Health Services Act specifically for people with diagnosed mental illness. And … um … so there are some resources there. I mean, I would say not enough [resources] but there are some resources there. It's one of the purposes of our Affordable Housing portfolio to really be able to reach people who, for a variety of reasons, need assistance. And that is one of the areas where people really need assistance.
1:24:12	Another Unknown CGOBOC Member	As far as eligibility for some of the programs, is there any residency requirement? In other words, if someone were to come to here from … Nevada … Iowa … saying "God, I'd like to live in San Francisco, but it's expensive." We don't know … do we do anything for them immediately? Or do people who are already here have some definite and enumerated priority over them?
1:24:36	Hartley	We do, as a City, apply occupancy preferences to our buildings. The first is people who have a Certificate of Preference [COP] — that is, they were displaced previously by government action get first priority to our housing. And that was … people who have COP's typically were displaced because of [previous] redevelopment activity in the '50's, '60's, and '70's, so they're first. Second, we have a Displaced Person's Preference that was recently approved by the Board [of Supervisors] and it's people who have been displaced via an

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		Ellis Act eviction or owner move-in [eviction]. We have a new Board [of Supervisors]-approved preference, as one of your Committee members just said, for a neighborhood. So if you live in the neighborhood, you get a preference to that housing, ***if*** you are income eligible. And you ***could*** have just moved there, you know, recently. Um … so there's no tenure [residency length of time] attached, but you do have to live there absolutely, a bona fide … and demonstrate your residency. And then we have, basically a live -work preference for San Franciscans. So if you live in San Francisco, or you work in San Francisco, you get the next preference. And after that, it's everybody else. But we often times don't even get to the live-work preference, because the other preferences take the units. And as I also mentioned, we have … **typically a 20% set aside <u>in all of our buildings</u> for homeless households**. Those referrals come from DPH or HSA, and so that's a special set aside.
1:26:21	Unknown CGOBOC Member	So the 20% set-aside for homeless households, does that have a residency requirement?
1:26:26	Hartley	Um … You do need to be referred by HSA and DPH, and so that means you are in the … you know, you are working with those agencies, you are in their system, and you're here in San Francisco.
1:26:28	Garcia	I'm not sure that I understood his question, or your answer. If you get off the [Greyhound] bus [from another jurisdiction] today, are you a resident of San Francisco?
1:26:49	Hartley	If you get off a bus today, and you sign a lease and you have a utility [bill] and you sign up …
1:26:55	Garcia	What if you are homeless?
1:26:57	Hartley	Um … If you are homeless and you approach DPH and you are here … You approach DPH and HSA and you … become … you are entered into the system, and you start working with their case management program, etc. you can get referred to a homeless unit.
1:27:14	Garcia	Is that what you were going after [to other Commissioner]? I didn't mean to jump in?
1:27:23	Same Unknown CGOBOC Member	Yeah,. I was. A big part, for sure.
1:27:24	Controller Rosenfield	Again … a bit out of field, for the Committee, some of these points, but there's a complicated answer to the questions that are being asked here that relates to how HSA and Public Health prioritize services within … kind of the homeless spectrum … just … I don't want to leave folks with what might feel like a simplistic answer there. And if Committee members are interested in following up with … fine, I can certainly arrange briefings on it. But it's a fascinating world for how do you prioritize scare resources and scarce services — whether it be supportive housing units, or affordable housing units, or just access to substance abuse and mental health … how do you prioritize that within a population that can be so transient, and where we do have people that are literally just off of a bus here, but then we also have people that have been homeless and on the streets here for 10 or 20 years. It's an interesting discussion, and I can certainly arrange for an off-line briefing for folks.
1:28:22	Unknown CGOBOC Member	I'd like to hear it.
1:28:23	Another	And I also think — just really quick — in this arena and in this area as well,

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
	Unknown CGOBOC Member	and I'll open it up to my [CGOBOC] colleagues as well, too … my organization is actually a General Managing Partner for 60 units of affordable housing up on the Shipyard. So we're currently going through … we're doing everything that we are kind of discussing now [unintelligible].
1:28:43	Chair Seville	[To Ms. Hartley] Thank you for coming and presenting. And I'd like to open it up to public comment.
1:29:00	Patrick Monette-Shaw	Thank you. I'm Patrick Monette-Shaw. This initial presentation [from MOHCD] sounded more like a sales pitch than a [status] report. I realize there are different metrics involved in this particular bond [measure] compared to your previous bonds building hospitals and parks. But I remain concerned as [CGOBOC] Member Carlson is, about the lack of metrics. If you look on page 9 of the Executive Summary it has a breakout of these four [main] categories [of bond spending]: [Category 1: Public Housing, $80 million; Category 2: Mission [District] Affordable Housing, $50 million; Category 3: Low-Income Housing, $100 million; and Category 4: Middle-Income Housing, $80 million.] And you'll notice the Middle-Income Housing category [$80 million] at the bottom [of the table] that there are four subcategories [Subcategory 1: DALP Loan Expansion; Subcategory 2: Teacher Next Door; Subcategory 3: Middle-Income Rental Program; and Subcategory 4: Expiring Regulations Preservation), but there's no breakout of how ***that*** $80 million is going to be split up. I've tried placing public records requests with MOHCD about the DALP loan programs and the First Responder DALP program. And it's like pulling teeth from those people to get data. They apparently operated for 12 years without putting the DALP loans into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The records appear to be kept on paper. The Civil Grand Jury has been very critical of MOHCD's performance [regarding recordkeeping]. And I think this Committee needs to be in the driver's seat of developing those metrics, and not just leaving it up to MOHCD's whim on what they are going to measure, and what they're ***not*** going to measure. They should have handed out, at least 10, by now, First Responder DALP loans, and I think that number is more like five or six [First Responder loans]. Maybe it should have been 15 or 20 [First Responder] loans. But getting them to provide data to members of the public has been almost impossible. I think as part of the reporting requirements to this oversight body that MOHCD's construction management team should be required to report to you, so that you get something more than just a rehash [in] every quarterly presentation resembling another sales pitch. How much of that $80 million in the Middle-Income Housing [category] are they going to dedicate to expanding the DALP program? How much of it is going to be dedicated to the Expiring Regulations Preservation of existing housing? You need to develop those metrics and you need to bird-dog them on getting answers over the life of this bond. Because — after all — if there's not going to be any [loan] repayment, I think Member Carlson makes a good point that you are investing $310 million, and you don't ***really*** know what kind of return there is going to be on that investment for the City long term. It's a big

Hour:Min:Second on MP3 Audio	Speaker	Verbatim Text
		problem. Had you told the voters … had MOHCD and Mayor Lee told the voters that the vast majority of this $310 million bond was ***not*** going to be repaid, but handed out in what is essentially forgivable loans, do you really think voters would have passed the bond?
1:33:03	Chair Seville	Thank you for that. Is there any other public comment? Seeing none, Colleagues, could I get a motion to accept the [MOHCD] report?
1:33:11	Unknown CGOBOC Member	So moved.
1:33:13	Chair Seville	Is there a second?
1:33:14	Unknown CGOBOC Member	Second.
1:33:17	Chair Seville	There's a second. Colleagues, can we do that without objection?
1:33:20	Chair Seville	Thank you, next item. END OF AGENDA ITEM 4.

In the interests of my time moving on to other projects, the transcription stops here. The full MP3 audio file of CGOBOC's January 28, 2016 meeting can be found on CGOBOC's web site at:

http://sfcontroller.org/cgoboc-audio-recordings?page=469

Any errors or omissions in this transcript are unintentional, and the fault of the transcriptionist.

In addition to my oral testimony on January 28, I also submitted 150-word written testimony for inclusion in CGOBOC's January 28, 2016 meeting minutes based on things I heard and learned during the hearing:

Written 150-Word Public Testimony by Patrick Monette-Shaw for Minutes of CGOBOC Meeting January 28, 2016:
Agenda Item 4, MOHCD Affordable Housing Bond

MOHCD's report reads like a sales pitch, not a report on uses to date of the $310 million bond.

Page 9 of the Executive Summary doesn't itemize the $80 million allocation to the "Middle Income Housing" category's four subcategories: 1) "DALP Loan Expansion," 2) "Teacher Next Door," 3) "Middle-Income Rental," and 4) "Expiring Regulations Preservation" programs. Since the bond was passed in November, are we to believe MOHCD hasn't yet determined precise dollar amount allocations to these four subcategories?

CGOBOC should develop — quickly — the tracking metrics categories and spreadsheet reporting formats for each of the four main planned uses of the bond and various subcategories, and not allow MOHCD to develop the metrics of reporting.

It's shocking hearing Kate Hartley report 20% of the bond — $62 million — will be allocated to housing the homeless, which voters weren't told about. Had voters been told beforehand, the bond might not have passed.