



METROPOLITAN HOUSING TRUST FUND COMMISSION MINUTES

September 24, 2024

2pm- 4pm

Members Present: P. Westerholm; K. Friskics-Warren; G. Emmanuel; M. Carmen-Jackson; A. Christianson-Galina; D. Moore, MIDDLEBROOKS Brandon Taylor

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: C. Middlebrooks (Planning Dept – Housing Division); R. Pardue (Planning Dept – Housing Division); J. Dean (Planning-Housing Division); T. Ortiz-Marsh (Metro Legal)

1) Welcome

Westerholm begin the meeting at 2:01pm by introducing himself, noting the date and reading the Metro code.

2) Approval of Minutes

Westerholm called for approval of the minutes. Emmanuel motioned to approve. Christina-Galina seconded. Pass Unanimously.

3) Public Comment

Westerholm called for public comment and asked if anyone signed up.

Pardue called Andy Zhu with MFX Ventures to step forward.

Andy Zhu with MFX Ventures shared we worked on several Barnes projects, I just know that there's a couple of items on the list on some of the policy discussions down the down the way, think potentially for future votes of like criteria of how things are scored. One thing that I would like to suggest for a potential consideration, is or perhaps to be an option or what it looks like if there's some legal threshold requirement for the 30-year requirement of affordability, but in terms of long-term preservation and all that kind of stuff. If there was a consideration that there would be voluntary points added or something like that in the scoring going forward. Or if you want to make it kind of longer term affordable and 99 years or 30 Land Trust or deed restrict that's something that I think could be reserve longer-term affordability. Another thought that I

had was looking, especially at the comparison between how some of the rankings are released from the Barnes fund, compared to some of the other organizations. I'm a member of the performance evaluation committee for the continuum of care that does some of the high funding and then you also look at how THDA releases its rankings and scores for LITHIC. I think for both as a recipient ,because sometimes as a recipient of being part of a project team that's won award, I'm not even sure like what the score was that we got on the application, was to receive, I just know we were eligible for I think public benefit and also for our private any applicants benefit, if there was an addition to hey here's all the people who were rewarded if there was like some sort of public ranking or something like that was released with scores or however, that may be made available, just seeing that that's kind of helps what we do on the on the peck with the COC and THDA awards, which always publishes like who is awarded in order here with the threshold cutoff. I think that would just be helpful for improving future projects making sure people know what they are doing.

Emmanuel said didn't we use to do that.

Friskics-Warren shared yeah that was kind of my same question sometimes we don't know what we're seeing up here and what's available publicly like why the rankings or the scoring, that sort of thing. She expressed that ESG, and other grants ranking were public, and that Barnes needs to think about that. She also encouraged experts in the audience to use two minutes in the public comment to continue to share ideas and stated it was underused. She iterated that the more the development experts share, the better the Fund would be.

4) Financial Update and Legislation

Middlebrooks stated the Budget to Actuals were in the commission packet and invited the commission to ask questions. She iterated the update had a new format.

Friskics-Warren this is another column that could be added after year today is percentage YTD. because that always helps if you know where you are in the percentage of the budget there that might have been on the old one.

With no further questions from the commission, Westerholm moved to items to vote.

5) Items for Vote

a) Round 10 Contract Amendments

Middlebrooks shared the following information regarding R10 Contract Amendments.

- i. Be a Helping Hand Foundation (BAHHF) is requesting an extension to secure additional financing to complete a projected located at 2124 14th Ave. North.

Vote-Westerholm called for a motion to approve. Emmanuel motioned to approve. Moore seconded. Passed unanimously.

- ii. Be a Helping Hand Foundation (BAHFF) is requesting an extension to secure additional financing to complete its project located at Robertson St.

Vote-Westerholm called for a motion to approve. Christianson-Galina motioned to approve. Carmen-Jackson seconded. Passed unanimously.

- iii. New Level CDC is requesting an extension for its 1827 Murfreesboro Pike project due to the time it is has taken to develop a site plan that meets the needs of the community. This has required multiple meetings with the community, planning, and the design team. The site plan process took longer than anticipated due to a desire to remain committed to meeting the concerns of community members and stakeholders.

Vote-Westerholm called for a motion to approve. Christianson-Galina motioned to approve. Emmanuel seconded. Passed unanimously.

- iv. Park Center is requesting an extension to its 4501 Gallatin Pike due to challenges faced during a change in multiple leadership positions during 2023, which have now been resolved.

Vote-Westerholm called for a motion to approve. Friskics-Warren abstained. Taylor motioned to approve. Christianson-Galina seconded. Passed unanimously.

- v. William Franklin Buchanan Community Development Corporation is requesting an extension to its 1026 Scovel St project due to a few unanticipated project delays that has set them slightly back on project completion.

Vote-Westerholm called for a motion to approve. Friskics-Warren abstained. Christianson-Galina motioned to approve. Taylor seconded. Passed unanimously.

- vi. Urban Housing Solutions (UHS) is requesting an extension to its 2121 26th Ave. N. project due to not beginning construction yet. They have been working to identify the right balance of housing for the "missing middle" community. They have identified the need for 2–3-bedroom units in the targeted community and their original design of 16 townhomes did not maximize that in the best way. UHS has restructured their design and decided that 18 3-bedroom stacked flats would maximize the need while staying within the budget. They plan to begin construction in the next few months and anticipate completing this project by Winter of 2025.

Vote-Westerholm called for a motion to approve. Emmanuel abstained. Friskics-Warren motioned to approve. Moore seconded. Passed unanimously.

b) Round 15 timeline

Westerholm invited the Barnes Fund manager to walk the commission through the recommended timeline for consideration.

Middlebrooks shared that since February 2023, the Barnes Fund has issued four (4) funding rounds (Rounds 11-14), making over \$76 million in Metro operating and ARPA funds available. Funds have been awarded to 34 projects that will result in the creation and preservation of 2,071 affordable homes. During this same time, staff continued to perform day to day duties, such as processing invoices, responding to recipient questions, preparing grant contract amendments, and providing administrative support to the Commission. Also, during this time, the Housing Trust Fund Manager has transitioned twice. There are only two full-time staff dedicated to performing administrative and programmatic functions; the third full-time staff is focused on compliance.

Given the intensity of the past year and a half, the exponential growth in the Fund, and staff transition, the proposed Round 15 timeline is designed to give the team the opportunity to address outstanding organizational and data needs and develop/tighten standard operating procedures. In addition, the timeline allows the opportunity for the Commission to proactively guide the policy for the next funding round rather than react to a staff developed policy. Draft recommendations from the Unified Housing Strategy will be available later this fall to help inform policy priorities. Finally, the timeline aligns with the release of the \$16.4 million surplus funds, which is most of the funding for FY25. Staff request approval of the Round 15 timeline as presented.

Round 15 Timeline Date	Role	Action
Dec. 2024 HTFC Meeting	HTF Commissioners	Establish Round 15 grant priorities, policies & evaluation committee criteria
Dec./Jan.	HTF Staff	Prepare Round 15 grant policy, scoring matrix & contract templates
Jan. 28, 2025	HTF Commissioners	Approve Round 15 grant policy, scoring matrix & contract templates
Feb. 10, 2025	HTF Staff	Open Round 15 application window
March 2025	HTF Staff	Hold information sessions (specific dates to be included in final grant policy)
April 7, 2025	HTF Staff	Closes Round 15 application window
April 8-18, 2025	HTF Staff	Threshold review
April 21-May 14, 2025	HTF Staff & Evaluation Committee	Evaluation period
May 27, 2025	HTF Commissioners	Recommend awards
July 1, 2025	Council	Approve grant contracts

Westerholm stated he appreciated the memo and the background information on what has been done this past year.

Vote-Westerholm opened the floor for questions or a motion to approve. Christiana-Galina moved to approve the timeline. Carmen-Jackson seconded. Passed Unanimously.

c) Progress Report Policy and Template

Westerholm invited Middlebrooks to walk the commission through the recommended template. He stated this was also included in the attachments.

Middlebrooks shared staff had prepared a draft policy and a reporting template for grantee progress reports. Staff request the Commission adopt a formal policy and reporting template to provide staff with clear expectations on what information is to be provided to the Commission at certain times throughout the year. Any changes to the draft policy and template presented at the September meeting will be incorporated into the final version and signed by the Chair unless the Commission votes otherwise. **The final policy and reporting template will be distributed to each Commissioner.**

Middlebrook reiterated the Housing Trust Fund staff shall provide the Housing Trust Fund Commission with quarterly progress reports beginning October 2024. Reports shall be in the form approved by the Housing Trust Fund Commission. Changes to the reporting form must be approved by the Housing Trust Fund Commission at least three months prior to the next reporting cycle.

Middlebrooks shared that we had been providing draw reports in the past and that this is how we were going to get away from that. This would be what we would do starting next month, and we will send the commission quarterly progress reports to let you know how all the grantees are doing and provide the necessary information to know how each project is doing and how far they've come.

Westerholm noted he saw in the memo that the reporting form must be approved by the Commission three months prior to the next reporting cycle. So, essentially if we just determine that there's a piece of information we would prefer to be included or excluded or portrayed differently, we will decide so in one of our meetings, and then in three months' time when we have another progress report, we will have that information.

Friskics-Warren asked what status means on the report.

Middlebrooks shared project status could be preconstruction, under construction or completed.

Christianson-Galina stated he'd like the commission to track where projects are getting stuck. He noted if there was a hold up like say with codes or storm water staff could put that in the comments.

Middlebrooks agreed that would be probably something staff could put in the notes. She furthered, so sometimes when we are running into problems with some of these projects needs an extension and there's a specific reason like some of these ones needed extensions

today, that would be a good place for us to put comments for something like that for the commission.

Emmanuel shared, in the past where staff sort shares the status and state the reason for the extension, if it was a codes reason or if it was an issue with title, I think that's really when you go through each of these. These ones were more straightforward but the temperature.

Westerholm asked for further questions.

Vote: Westerholm requested a motion. Taylor motioned to approve. Carmen-Jackson seconded. Passed Unanimously.

6) Items for Discussion

a) Commissioner appointment update

Westerholm moved the next agenda item, he directed commissioners to their packets to the memo about the new commission appointment update. He furthered, let me just start by expressing #1, Khaki is leaving us and #2 we should celebrate khaki for all her years served and contributions.

Westerholm furthered, I know that for the commission and for me, we appreciate the work that you provided, not just to this Commission but to our community. In the years I've known you, I've always been sort of awestruck by your passion or dedication to improving everyone's lives, we are sad to see Khaki leaving us. He also shared that there will be a move by council to assign another commissioner and that person may be seated by the October meeting. We look forward to going through any questions comments from the commissioners.

MIDDLEBROOKS presented Friskics-Warren with flowers and a certificate of service. She reiterated staff's appreciation for all Friskics-Warren has done.

Westerholm segways into the next agenda item.

b) Policy Discussions

i.) Count bedrooms instead of Units.

Westerholm noted some policy discussions included counting of bedrooms instead of units.

Christianson-Galina shared after receiving community feedback indicated concern with the focus being on unit counts and not bedrooms. As Urban Housing Solutions found, there is a huge need for 3- and 4-bedroom units or family housing. and I

didn't look in this scoring and ranking I don't see where we are tracking bedrooms and I'm wondering if there's a way we could deliberately and looking at that.

Friskics-Warren it would be not an “instead”, but an “and”, that we attract both, because it's in scoring whether it's explicit. I know that when I've scored applications, I was mindful of who had multi bedrooms that would accommodate larger families. I took that into consideration in my scoring, it wasn't necessarily prescript but it's what we did. I think we did both the information unit and bedrooms would be helpful.

Emmanuel noted commission would determine policy items while discussing the next funding round at subsequent meeting. She noted when we do the funding round there are different things that give more weight, like whether a development is near transit corridor, or lower income threshold or bedroom count, it is just a way to push that more, but I think it should say that.

Friskics-Warren Green space also counted in scoring.

Westerholm noted the commission can explore weight and consideration to bedroom and units in the round 15 policy discussion.

Middlebrooks agreed the Round 15 policy discussions would be the best place to discuss the matter to determine what it wants.

Westerholm stated in that with every round the commission has some leeway in determining how to score different features of a particular proposal, that includes everything from green space to public gathering spaces, etc. We have we truly understand that and perhaps this is our first to try to get that somehow baked into the process a bit more deliberately. I think you're trying to figure out if we have prioritized in some ways the number of units and project that's one of the key things we look at when we're describing them and is that is your question, that by emphasizing one, that are we deemphasizing the projects that are prioritizing more bedrooms.

Christianson-Galina so like the urban housing solutions knew what they know now, and they have both potential proposals, and they were thinking which one we are going to send to the Barnes fund that they know that we you're looking at the better would count for something and not just optimize for more units.

Friskics-Warren noted the scoring you know it seems to me scoring there are objective so it's almost like a formula that that on the staff scores those pieces and then there's the part that the committee scores that's more subjective and it brings in a lot of different things. She noted an additional decision would be where do you see that falling? Is it an objective or subjective scoring because it's more subjective

because each development is unique objective. So, seeing them as a as opposed to each other might not give us that holistic perspective that we're looking for.

Westerholm noted that it could be part of the analysis that we request and that the commission would like to see both. He furthered he agree with what being said and, in some cases, there is there is a dependency on the project itself and what it's trying to achieve. Sometimes there is a good reason why they're emphasizing single units or single bedroom units. There may be a good reason why another project is prioritizing multifamily units. If it's not too much of an ask for staff in the review to put together a cost funding per unit as well as per bedroom.

MIDDLEBROOKS Agrees it depends on project, we need to look at pop and where we are building, where are the projects being built and who is it for. For example, senior housing might use single units, yet large families would use bedroom counts. She agreed staff could provide requested data.

CM Taylor noted an analysis could be found through MSS or MAC of needs for development.

Emmanuel noted we should have data to determine what's needed. The commission did use those data sources at some point.

CM Taylor noted it helps applicants' development relevant projects based on what Metro really needs.

Westerholm shared he think it's extremely important and he appreciates the input from CM Taylor. He wondered if some of the reports we got from Metro Social Services tied in with the community's evaluation and if it was at a certain time prior to funding rounds kicking off so that the information was fresh for commission consideration. He shared he certainly thinks that any data points we can get from MSS, or even Imagine Nashville, or from Unified Housing Strategy. Anything that informs us, I think that we as commissioners, should try to make that into how we design that funding round. He concluded, the commission we're happy to work with staff to identify sources to be taken into consideration.

Emmanuel in the past staff would provide five- or ten-minute presentation to keep the commission informed.

Friskics-Warren noted the commission needs information to form policy. She warned nonprofits are working with variables, too much prescriptive may be ineffective overtime. She advised the commission to push to keep policy broad to allow developers to continue to produce best product. The concluded that nonprofits are the experts. The commission can't define what it right for the whole county by designing applications to be restrictive.

Westerholm asked so our discussions that's taking place today, will staff then take this conversation and put it into a draft what are recommended policies for Round 15.

Middlebrooks noted that staff will have a conversation, get with director, and move forward with putting together the Round 15 application. That would be the first step.

Westerholm asked for further comments. With none, moved on to the next agenda item.

ii.) AMI thresholds

Christianson-Galina noted his concern is the city being so far behind on affordable housing units and more people are being pushed out of the city, which has the unintended effect of raising the AMI. As it keeps rising rent numbers are starting to get like market rate housing and one, we're talking about like 80% AMI \$1500 for rent. I'm worried that or I guess I'm just concerned I'm thinking about how like where we should put the AMI for thresholds and future projects as it's going up and if there's something we can do to avoid getting stuck in this AMI getting cycle.

Westerholm noted that was a fair question as we adhere to AMI standards, due to how it's changing, it is leaving folks out.

Christianson-Galina noted that current trends will have a HH paying \$2000 per month as standard for Barnes.

Friskics-Warren noted the fund could provide points for lowering AMI or MHI, standard that has higher income.

Westerholm noted the AMI is derived from MSA, include areas outside of Davidson County.

Westerholm noted the commission is sensitive to the idea as its unattainable for a population that needs to be served, whether converting to MHI or other measure, any change needs to be carefully deliberated.

Emmanuel added a larger discussion needs to include nonprofits, and commission should not make changes without developer input.

Friskics-Warren pointed out there were only two meetings before the next round.

CM Taylor inquired if having a workshop and inviting the public might work.

Ortiz-Marsh noted other boards do community or listening sessions.

Friskics-Warren recommended a public survey.

Westerholm noted careful conversations would be had for R15; however, he wouldn't want to make changes in that short of a time frame, if interested we could look at potential changes, in the future, are these numbers having us to have the most effective input.

Emmanuel pushed for further discussion.

Christianson-Galina noted he was not pushing for a particular round; he just wants the commission to start thinking about it.

Carmen-Jackson noted the commission need to know where we are going, recording.

Westerholm noted these were all good comments, thanked the commission and audience and noted as we get into the UHS presentation- some of the questions may be answered.

iii.) Future policy topics

Friskics-Warren shared she mentioned two things which are 1.) retention of affordability cause for our early grants permit we're reaching the big point of their retention requirements expire, so in that's that kind of makes it real that that with the 30-year retention that doesn't last very long in this environment and the other is 2.) We need to clarify nonprofit owned and for profit owned, what that means and even the language, I think in in our policy, is it owned is it controlled and what does that mean and just really zooming out and saying, what are we trying to achieve by that. It is important but we need to define it.

Middlebrooks noted staff including herself and Hubbard are collecting policy topics, inquiries. She asked the commission to continue to send in suggestions. Staff will discuss and devise commission training whether that is from staff or subject experts.

Ortiz- Marsh speaking Legalese, or policy needing to be updated going forward, refresh or change, please send suggestions to staff.

Westerholm thanked staff and moved on the doodle poll for the joint meeting.

c) Doodle Poll for combined November/December training.

Middlebrooks asked whether the commission would like to choose between the dates of Nov 26th or Dec 3 during the meeting or have staff send a doodle to allow everyone time to check calendars prior to committing to a decision.

The commission agreed a survey would be best.

Middlebrooks asked the commission to respond no later than September 30th.

7) Announcements

None

8) [Unified Housing Strategy Roundtable](#)

9) Adjourn

With no further business the meeting was adjourned.