

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Housing Opportunity Fund Advisory Board for the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh. City of Pittsburgh YouTube channel.

July 1, 2021

Members Present: Oliver Beasley, Jamil Bey, Joanna Deming, Knowledge Build Hudson, Mark Masterson, James Myers, Derrick Tillman, Adrienne Walnoha, Kellie Ware (Chair), Megan Winters

Staff Present: Breanna Benjamin, Jeremy Carter, David Geiger, Vethina Hage, Victoria Jackson, Derek Kendall-Morris, Lisa Korade, Shaina Madden, Evan Miller, Brett Morgan, Jamie Reese, David Serbin

Others Present: Angela Collins, David Finer, Alexander Fisher, William LaMar, Michael Lasky, Ed Nusser, Liam Robinson, Celeste Scott, Heather Watson

A. Roll Call

Kellie Ware called the meeting to order. A quorum was present.

B. Review and Acceptance of Minutes from the June 3, 2021 Meeting

Adrienne Walnoha motioned to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2021 board meeting as written and previously distributed. Megan Winters seconded. Mark Masterson abstained. The motion carried.

C. Public Comment

Celeste Scott, Affordable Housing Organizer with Pittsburgh United, thanked the Housing Opportunity Fund staff and board for having them do the outreach plan for the Housing Opportunity Fund allocation plan 2022. She said that they looked forward to reaching out to all of their residents and community members so that they can participate in meaningful comments for the survey. She went on to say that they are doing public comments around the rental gap in the scoring criteria, hoping, that moving forward, there will be a polling criteria for development projects using a rental gap fund money. She stated that they are looking to close the 20,000 unit gap at 30% AMI or below. She said those are their two main things, as well as using money for emergencies with tenants. She went on to thank the HOF Board and staff, especially for the barriers they are breaking with the Housing Stabilization Program. She thanked Jeremy Carter and Vethina Hage for the outstanding work they are doing, and she looks forward to working with the HOF Board and Staff.

A. Walnoha responded with the comment that when we were in person, we had a wide array of public comments. She went on to say that it seems that as we have been online, that has dwindled, and she assumes that is due to barriers related to technology, maybe folks not understanding the process for registering to speak. She concluded by saying that she thinks that there are barriers that are keeping folks from participating, so it would be great for the board to think about how we can potentially do more outreach and how we can really facilitate that participation.

K. Ware agreed. She continued that she thinks it is an excellent opportunity, as we are doing outreach around the allocation plan and some other agenda items that are going to come later, to brainstorm and implement what those steps might look like.

D. Rental Gap Program - Sheptytsky Arms

B. Morgan presented on the rehabilitation of Sheptytsky Arms Apartments, comprised of 50 total units that serve residents aged 62 and older. Renovations to the existing structure are to include building exterior, unit interiors and common areas, and major systems replacement. The goal of the work is to improve the property's aesthetic appeal and overall quality, while simultaneously extending the lifespan of the existing affordable units. He recommended a HOF Rental Gap Program (RGP) loan in the amount of \$500,000 for the rehabilitation/renovation of the Sheptytsky Arms Apartments. This commitment will expire January 8, 2022.

B. Morgan introduced Michael Laskey and Liam Robinson of Salus Development LLC to discuss the RGP loan.

Liam Robinson said that they are looking forward to getting started on the renovation later this year; the expected closing with PHFA on the new first mortgage is October or November of 2021. He went on to say that they are very excited to be working with the URA on this Rental Gap Program and getting started on the renovation. He said that he knows the tenants are very much looking forward to it.

Michael Laskey added that they are both experienced in working in tax credits and home funds and these types of properties, although not in Pittsburgh, as they are a Cleveland-based company, with a dozen or so projects in Ohio, and are also working in Michigan and have in the past worked in New Jersey. He added that they look forward to this and feel that they are going to do a lot of good for the people who live in the building. He concluded by saying that they appreciated the Board's consideration of this request.

M. Masterson asked who the applicant is.

B. Morgan responded the Cardinal Housing Group, Inc. is technically the applicant, but they are also the owner of the general partnership, which is Sheptytsky Arms Chief LLC

K. Ware asked if the residents were living there through the renovation.

B. Morgan replied that the renovations will be to the unit interiors, common areas, and the exterior of the building and believes that there will not be any relocation.

L. Robinson added that they are planning on doing in-place renovation, and that there are some expected vacancies over the next six months. He also said that if there is a need for off-site relocation, they have a budget prepared for that as well.

M. Laskey said their plan is to move people around in the building, so empty out a stack of units, because that is the best way to do this renovation. He explained that they would do the renovation, move them back, and move on to the next step. He concluded by saying that, right now, they need one more vacancy, between now and the time that they start, to avoid having to temporarily put someone in a nearby hotel or another property, but they do not suspect that will be the case when they start construction.

K. Ware thanked them.

M. Masterson asked if the developer had been in touch with the local community organization, Brighton Heights Citizens Federation, to let them know the plans. He included that this is a great project to preserve affordable housing and much-needed elderly housing and inquired if they are aware that this project is happening.

M. Laskey responded that they had not. He explained that it is very difficult to have participation with people in the community through COVID. He said that they would do it in the time they close, so that everyone knew what they were doing and let them ask any questions but have not been able to do that over the last year.

M. Masterson clarified that he was not talking about a community meeting. He said there are a lot of community and neighborhood organizations in Pittsburgh, which may be different than how things are in Cleveland, and some of their other properties. He said he thinks it would be helpful for folks to know what is going on in their neighborhoods. He explained that he believed the intent was active participation by local organizations but guesses now they are settling for at least an awareness. He said that the folks that live around these projects should be aware that this is their tax dollars at work. He continued that we need more of these resources to continue to fund this housing, so it is incumbent on staff to make sure this stuff is happening; that is at least one Advisory Board member's position. He concluded by saying that he understands things are difficult with COVID, but it is not an excuse anymore to not meet with the community organization. He said that we are doing a terrible job at outreach to let taxpayers know that this is their money at work. He suggested let's shout if from the rooftops and make everyone aware of it.

A. Walnoha responded by saying that they have heard this issue come up in their public comment period, especially when they were in person, with folks really wanting to have an understanding of what is happening in their neighborhood. She said that she agrees across the board with them making sure that people understand what we are doing as an Advisory Board, what the projects look like, what is happening in their neighborhoods, and having a real and robust opportunity to intersect in that process.

K. Ware suggested putting a pin in the discussion for later, when they discuss the RFP process. She said it was an excellent opportunity for folks on the Advisory Board who are concerned about this to participate in the working group and highlight where that should fit in the RFP process.

Shaina Madden, from the URA Lending Team, thanked M. Masterson for bringing that up. She added that it is really helpful to have him reaffirm this concept of community participation, and it will be a focus for our team projects when we come to the Advisory Board for approval and review. She concluded that the comments are noted and appreciated.

M. Winters said she also agrees with M. Masterson. She added that she knows that the URA staff is doing their due diligence and talking to people who are applying for these funds, but thinks it is incumbent upon developers to know that these are public funds, so they should be contacting the community organizations and generally be interacting with the people who live in the communities they are going to be doing work in. She concluded by saying that she thinks a lot of the onus should be on the developers themselves.

K. Ware asked how many units are in here again.

B. Morgan answered 50 total, 49 affordable.

RECOMMENDATION 23 (2021)

Knowledge Build Hudson motioned to approve the HOF request for \$500,000 for the Rental Gap Program for the rehabilitation and renovation for the Sheptytsky Arms Apartments. Oliver Beasley seconded. James Myers recused himself. The motion carried.

E. Natrona Predevelopment

Victoria Jackson presented on the renovation of one (1) for-sale single-family home located at 5239 Natrona Way. While this request is only for one unit, these funds will be creating an affordable house for more than one family. Due to the community land trust (CLT) model, the loan will likely serve approximately 14 households over the course of the initial 99-year ground lease, based on the national average length of tenure in CLT homes. She recommended a For-Sale Development Program (FSDP) Predevelopment loan in the amount of \$33,000 for acquisition and predevelopment activities for 5239 Natrona Way located in upper Lawrenceville. This commitment will expire November 1, 2021.

V. Jackson introduced Ed Nusser and Angela Collins of City of Bridges Community Land Trust for questions.

M. Masterson asked if they are loaning funds out, what happens to this money when it is repaid.

V. Jackson replied that it will be returned to the Housing Opportunity Fund.

M. Masterson asked if the loans are going to be long-term, deferred mortgages on this program, or gap-filling grants and questioned if these funds mirror URA programs.

V. Jackson answered that one of the items that can be done under the For-Sale Development Program is a pre-development loan.

M. Masterson asked if, as this is repaid, could it go back out as a grant. He wanted to be sure that they were not setting up a specific designation of revolving loan funds.

V. Jackson replied that she did not think so but would defer to S. Madden.

Evan Miller interjected that he wanted to make it clear that the program guidelines for the For-Sale Development Program have not changed since the program started back in the Spring of 2019. He said that there have been several other loans that have been made out of it, both pre-development and construction, and when they come back, they come into the HOF repay account where they could then be redistributed in new projects under this program.

M. Masterson asked, if it is coming back in as a loan repayment, is the Advisory Board able to reallocate that if they wanted to put more in grants to something else besides For-sale Development, and they wanted to get more resources into affordable rental. He asked how the funds are getting reused, and how they get allocated again. He wanted to know do they stay in the For-sale Development revolving fund.

K. Ware responded that she thinks they come back into the general pot but did not think the URA received any money back yet to figure it out.

M. Masterson explained that is why he asked the question, to determine what they are going to do with the stuff that is out there, just to be clear as we are voting on this. He suggested that it might make more sense to ask the Land Trust to get a larger amount and then just give them the grant to cover the interest, and in effect, make it 0% interest, which leaves more to allocate to other projects. He said he is not trying to mess-up everybody's Plan A – he does not want to mess-up the development project but said there are a couple of ways to get to this. He suggested one way is to just give a grant for the interest costs and that would be it, and then PNC or someone else could do the whole thing. He concluded by asking what happens when they are repaid.

S. Madden said that is a great question. She went on to say that they have a HOF repayment account set up, and so she thinks that is a discussion that the Advisory Board needs to have as to what happens to that account, how is it built into the allocation plans, once it is at a level that that is meaningful to identify uses for.

J. Carter replied that it is his understanding that it is all going into one HOF repay account, and then it will be up to URA and the HOF Advisory Board to recommend priorities for the HOF repay, and for the URA to come back to the Advisory Board if HOF repay is used for projects. He concluded that he does not think that there is an actual allocation of the HOF repay.

M. Masterson replied that if that is the answer, he is fine proceeding. He just wanted to be clear that it will come back, and they will be able to recommend to the URA Board how those funds be used.

RECOMMENDATION 24 (2021)

M. Masterson moved to approve the For-Sale Development Program (FSDP) Predevelopment loan in the amount of \$33,000 for the renovation of 5239 Natrona Way. K. B. Hudson seconded. J. Deming and D. Tillman abstained. The motion carried.

F. Fineview Predevelopment

V. Jackson presented on The City of Bridges Community Land Trust's (CBCLT) request for Predevelopment funding for the construction of five (5) and renovation of three (3) affordable, for-sale homes on Lanark Street in the Fineview neighborhood. As CBCLT maintains a 99-year affordability period on their properties, the project will continuously provide affordable homeownership opportunities for families. She recommended a For-Sale Development Program (FSDP) Predevelopment loan in the amount of \$100,000 for acquisition and predevelopment activities for eight (8) units along Lanark Street. This commitment will expire November 1, 2021.

A. Walnoha asked if there were any Advisory Team members abstaining from the vote on this particular project.

J. Deming abstained from the vote.

D. Tillman abstained from the vote.

RECOMMENDATION 25 (2021)

A. Walnoha moved to approve the For-Sale Development Program (FSDP) Predevelopment loan in the amount of \$100,000 for the acquisition and pre-development activities for eight (8) units along Lanark Street. K. B. Hudson seconded. J. Deming and D. Tillman abstained. The motion carried.

G. Advisory Board Administrative Items

1. Committee Updates
2. Summary of the RFP Session hosted on June 8th

E. Miller reported that, on June 8th, the URA hosted a Special Session for interested Advisory Board members to go over the RFP process for HOF development-focused programs at HOF. He said the biggest takeaway was that there will be an RFP working group that is created as the URA and Housing Opportunity Fund work to re-release these development RFPs with updated guidelines in quarters three and four of this year. He concluded by saying that if there are Advisory Board Members that are interested in being on that working committee to help with those considerations, and shape the overall focus of RFPs, please reach out to him or anyone on the staff, and they will make sure to include interested members as they set up some meetings over the next few months.

K. Ware thanked Evan. She also thanked the URA Team for explaining the RFP process.

3. Summary of HSP Session hosted on June 21st

J. Carter provided an overview of what was discussed in the Special Session. He started off by saying that this is about the HSP transfer that the URA is discussing. He listed the three core reasons that are driving the decision. First, he explained, that HSP, at its core, is a social service program and is comparable to other HUD Homeless Assistance Programs which provide the same services. He continued that the URA is an economic development agency of the City, so it is not a typical entity to administer eviction prevention and rental assistance programs. He went on to say that it is in the best interest of the URA to divest of administering HSP and hand it off to an entity who is best equipped to operate these programs long term, so that the URA Consumer Housing Lending Unit can focus on its mission of homeownership services. He said it is important to note that, although they are looking at transferring the administration of the program, the program itself is not going to change. Second, he said, HSP is a homeless prevention Rental Assistance Program and deserves to be embedded within the continuum of care with the rest of the region's rental assistance programs. He explained, currently, HSP exists as a standalone program operating outside of the realm and system of the continuum of care. He furthered that the continuum of care exists to streamline the rental and homeless assistance programs under one unified system, so this is easier to administer at a city and county level, provides unified data to inform government and community partners, and supports providers with trainings. He said that imbedding HSP in the continuum of care would benefit the region, and most importantly, it would be easier for consumers in need to access HSP or any other housing assistance that they may qualify for. Third, he explained that transitioning to Allegheny Link for coordinated entry would be beneficial. He said there are concerns that many people are not receiving referrals due to not being able to navigate the 211 system, not getting referrals when they should have, and not getting referrals because of long hold times. He went on to say that switching coordinated entry to Allegheny Link would result in lower hold times, more calls being screened, more successful referrals, and a coordinated approach for other rental and housing

resources that the caller might qualify for. He said that they have been in talks with the Department of Human Services at Allegheny County who would be taking over the administration of the program. He concluded with saying that in the next couple of months they will be requesting HOF authorization on a few things, including program guideline changes to make it more feasible to run within the county system, which would remove city tax check verification, as well as external inspections. He added that the other item they will be seeking authorization for in the future would be a Master Agreement with DHS to actually transfer the program. Lastly, he said URA staff would make a comment about how the public can submit their comments and questions about this transfer.

D. Tillman said he had a comment to make. He said, that, understanding all the different metrics, and what the continuum of care does, and also considering the URA's focus, he thinks it does make a lot of sense for the program to be transferred. He continued that from a high-level perspective, it makes a lot of sense and will help the program to hopefully even run more efficiently. Lastly, he stated that he was aware that there have been some challenges with funds being administered as soon as possible.

M. Masterson asked how this change will impact the community outreach that we were trying to do. He said he knew this was going to change a lot of things, but one of the things that we were doing okay, was that we had boots on the ground locally that were helping folks get into the system. He inquired what happens to that outreach and boots on the ground piece.

J. Carter responded that when we do the transfer, the program will be able to utilize DHS's existing resource navigators who are constantly boots on the ground, going to neighborhood groups, and a lot of times going directly to courts to meet with people and connect them to rental assistance at that time. He said that they will be able to also do that for HSP since it will be under the same umbrella of programs. He added on top of that, we will coordinate and plan additional outreach with DHS, because with the transfer, we want to make sure that it is clear to the public, and those who need it, where to turn, and actually go to Allegheny Link instead of 2-1-1, so there will be a coordinated and immediate push to make sure that is very clear. Additionally, he said, as you know, we launched the Legal Assistance Program in May, and that will also follow the transfer a little bit later.

K. Ware asked if that would also be shifting to Allegheny Link for intake.

J. Carter replied that the Legal Assistance Program has its own intake/coordinated entry, but the administration of it would transfer to DHS.

M. Masterson asked what is the timeframe for shifting.

J. Carter answered we are working through contracting issues with the city, but we are looking at potential Board action items in August or September for an actual transfer to happen around September.

M. Masterson asked if there is still time for public input.

J. Carter answered definitely.

A. Walnoha said to M. Masterson's point that it is going to be important that this will be a contract that we are holding with the Department of Human Services, the HOF Board needs to make sure that we are still responding to local trends, issues, items that are emergent, that are brought to us by the community to make sure that the program is responsive and hitting the high notes of expectation from this funding and also from the community.

J. Carter responded to that point, saying that we are coordinating with DHS on what those metrics will be so that we can continue to report out routinely to both the HOF and URA Boards. He added as we try to finalize that, we will run it by the Advisory Board and make sure you all are comfortable with that level of data.

D. Tillman concluded with proposing a consideration to have, as the Housing Stabilization Program and Legal Assistance Program transition out, the Small Landlord Fund would transition into the Housing Opportunity Fund.

J. Carter replied that he that we would just need to have a conversation between URA and HOF about that and would need some kind of action, approved by HOF and the URA Board to make that happen.

K. Ware said, so as we go through our allocation plan this year, that would be potentially a new program to just add in to bring that under our umbrella.

J. Carter affirmed.

D. Tillman said he knows right now there are other funding sources that contribute to it and asked if those funds would still be a part of the allocation plan that we are helping to develop.

J. Carter answered that they would not be part of the allocation plan since they are not HOF funding, but the funds would follow the program.

J. Deming inquired about HSP items. She asked if coordinated entry would be improved and if a representative from 2-1-1 would be joining the HOF Advisory Board meetings to report out on HSP.

J. Carter responded that we fully expect coordinated entry to improve significantly. He said we have reports that people are waiting anywhere from 30 minutes to 2 hours on hold with United Way. Since the beginning of the calendar year, Allegheny Link's average hold time is about one to three minutes. He added additionally they have 18 full-time staff taking those calls that are specialized at taking housing and rental assistance screenings. He said we think every part of that system is going to greatly help the success rate of the referrals. He went on to say, in terms of a DHS representatives, he thinks that is definitely possible. He explained we have not reached that point yet in discussions, but based on our discussion so far, it seems likely they would definitely be open and willing to collaborate with us on the reporting, and explained that Advisory Board members would be able to ask them direct questions about operations.

J. Deming said thank you. She added that wait time is horrible, no one should have to wait that long.

H. 2022 Annual Allocation Plan (AAP) Community Survey

V. Hage presented the 2022 Annual Allocation Plan (AAP) Community Survey. The HOF Community Feedback Survey is open now until July 30th. Responses are being collected via over the phone and online. HOF is partnering with Hilltop Alliance and Pittsburgh United on the survey. Hilltop Alliance and Pittsburgh United will both host community meetings.

I. Programmatic Expenditures and Impacts

J. Carter provided an update on the Down Payment and Closing Cost Assistance Program. He explained as home prices continue to increase and stock continues to decrease, we are seeing our lower/moderate income homebuyers be priced out of bidding wars and have seen that in the amount of requests that have come in lately. He offered the example that in March, April, and May, we had eleven closings each month, in June we had four. He concluded by saying that it is slowing down quite a bit and we believe that is a major factor.

J. Carter provided an update on the Homeowner Assistance Program. He announced last week we did close the waiting list. He went on to detail that we sent out 207 applications, and so far, have received 120. J. Carter stated that staff have reviewed 40 of those applications so far, and approved 30, and are reviewing applications weekly. He confirmed that we are expected to be fully committed in funding. Additionally, he added, for Homeowner Assistance Program, we are in the midst of Roof-a-Thon, and that is projected to wrap up at the end of the month. He explained it is assisting 24 homeowners with roof replacements and other needs. J. Carter confirmed that yard signs have been displayed.

J. Cater presented on the impacts of For-Sale Development and Rental Gap Program. He said, so far, we have funded 40 units for For-Sale Development and over 400 units for the Rental Gap Program.

V. Hage presented a slide on overall spending to provide an overview of potential projects and commitments that are coming down the pipeline for HOF and to show how those funds may be committed in the next six months. A memo was sent out to the Advisory Board explaining the unencumbered funds.

J. Deming commented that she was a little confused about the additional allocation, and asked V. Hage to clarify if encumbered versus unencumbered means committed versus uncommitted.

V. Hage answered that we changed the wording to be a little bit more clear. She explained that encumbered is the same as closed, so closed/committed has been replaced with encumbered funds, committed has been replaced with unencumbered funds.

M. Masterson responded that is not making it clear. He added that makes no sense and suggested maybe we can work to find a better word because that is going to be confusing to the general public and it is important that they know what is going on with their tax dollars.

J. Deming asked would it not be like closed and then committed, but not closed and then there would be a third column or something for that which we have not committed.

V. Hage replied that we can go back to the original if that is less clear. She said that is certainly the goal to make it as clear as possible, so we can go back to the original wording. She continued that the additional HOF 2021 allocation was the funding from Councilman O'Connor that we received, and the additional resources with the CDBG funds and the foundation funds that we received in 2021.

J. Deming asked was that Recovery Act funds or through the federal stimulus.

J. Carter Yes

M. Masterson clarified I guess you are saying that you have got deals that are in your pipeline for Rental Gap, that will exceed this 7.46 million, and you are likely to be close to running out. He said he thinks he heard that on the For-Sale, but the development program as well. He went on to say that he was looking at the competitive RFP process that we are going to be talking about and by the end of this year we will be down to fumes in those two from what you're seeing. About the Rental Gap Program, he asked is that predominantly the low-income Housing Tax Credit projects that we have gotten the extra one for, and this was sort of counted on as part of that, the mixing and matching of putting the financing together for the applications, originally. That's correct.

V. Hage deferred to S. Madden and E. Miller.

S. Madden said that is correct.

K. Ware said this is my recruitment piece for our RFP working group because it is going to need to be more of a competitive process to access funds and we want to make sure that we have those guidelines and updated RFP in place before we run out of money so that we are able to be competitive and really maximize our the our desired benefits for that funding cycle when we are when we in fact run out. She reiterated again, it is my pitch for why that is a working group instead of a committee, because it's just really important to get in there and make it competitive and implement that scoring.

K. B. Hudson asked, given some of this money is already allocated, will the RFP process go into place after that, or are we saying that we would implement it to determine if those funds go to those.

K. Ware responded it would be for the next round. She explained we always have kind of operated at a surplus, and that will stop, because we got all these deals. She said that is going to deplete us and so now we don't have a surplus and we don't want to be a first-come first-served type of funding mechanism, when we really could be more competitive, and maximize the affordable housing and fair housing and community benefits to folks, because of that scoring metric and competitive process so this would be essentially for those 2022 funds that this would be in place for the next round of folks.

K. B. Hudson asked if it is not going to be first-come first-served, will we just hold the funds until we have a certain amount.

K. Ware clarified that it would still be first-come first-served, but it would be on the scoring metric. She explained the scoring process, providing an example that someone that has involved the community would most likely score higher than someone who has not.

K. B. Hudson asked if there is only one project, is there a limited score that you have to reach in order to get approved.

K. Ware replied that those metrics will be what the working group will do. She went on to say that is what the goal is, to do that in advance of running out of funds so that we are being really strategic with HOF funds.

Jamil Bey commented that he did not want to lose the point that M. Masterson brought up earlier. He went on to say that if a developer does not have a local community partner, we cannot hold them to a standard that we do not have in writing, but at a minimum, we need a letter of support from that community organization. Lastly, he said that it is important that at least the local organization has been connected to and is aware of what is happening.

K. Ware affirmed.

M. Masterson asked if folks are interested in serving on this committee, who should they reach out to.

K. Ware asked J. Carter is that you specifically.

J. Carter answered if it is going to be a working group, the Advisory Board needs to establish that, appoint a chair, and then no more than five members would be a part of that working group. He continued that you would have to establish who the chair is, and then the chair would organize that.

K. Ware asked do we have to do that for working groups and for committees.

J. Carter confirmed.

K. Ware inquired do we have a motion to formally establish the RFP Working Group working group.

RECOMMENDATION 26 (2021)

M. Masterson motioned to formally establish an RFP Working Group. A. Walnoha seconded. The motion carried.

K. Ware asked if anyone wanted to volunteer to Chair said committee

A. Walnoha recommended that M. Masterson be the Chair.

M. Masterson responded that he is interested but is worried about the time commitment.

A. Walnoha volunteered to be the RFP Working Group Secretary.

M. Masterson agreed to be the RFP Working Group Chair on the condition that A. Walnoha would serve as Secretary, if the HOF Advisory Board agreed.

K. Ware said that we may have a Chair and Secretary duo and asked if we need to vote on the Chair formally.

J. Carter responded that he does not believe a vote is necessary.

K. Ware instructed those who are interested in participating in the RFP Working Group to reach out to M. Masterson and A. Walnoha.

M. Masterson asked if we could have up to three more people serve on the RFP Working Group.

D. Tillman asked the Chair of the RFP Working Group if he could share the meeting date with the group.

M. Masterson asked if there were any Advisory Board members interested in serving on the RFP Working Group.

M. Winters stated she was interested in serving on the RFP Working Group.

K. Ware added that she would like to be involved in the RFP Working Group.

K. B. Hudson stated interested he was interested in the RFP Working Group.

M. Masterson confirmed those are the official five members and the meeting date(s) will be publicized so there will be an opportunity to participate.

V. Hage presented a breakdown of dollars and units of HOF funds.

J. Announcements

- I. Homeowner Assistance Program (HAP) waiting list is now closed.
- II. HOF survey is now open. Complete the survey and submit feedback on how you would like HOF's 2022 funds to be spent. Also, if you would like to submit feedback on the transfer of the HSP program, or about HOF in general, you may submit your feedback via the survey.
 - Call 412-477-7519 or online at www.tinyurl.com/hof2022.
- III. The next HOF Advisory Board Meeting is Thursday, August 5th, 2021 at 9:00 AM.

M. Masterson asked when do we HOF Advisory Board meetings will resume in-person meetings again and if a hybrid model will be implemented.

J. Carter replied that the URA is not resuming in-person meetings at this time. He continued that we are phasing going back into the office starting this month but we're following both URA and City guidance on in-person meetings and at this point don't have the green light.

David Geiger confirmed this is accurate.

K. Adjournment

D. Tillman motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.