Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

Minutes of the Hybrid Regular Board Meeting of the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh.

October 8, 2026 – 2:00 P.M., E.S.T.

Members Present: Zober, Lavelle, Powell, Williamson, Charland
Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Nemani-Stanger, Lane, Diersen, Wasler, Link, Carter, Hall, McMahon, Mathews, Bowman-Porter, Schacht

Chair Zober called the Regular Meeting to order and declared a quorum present.

1. General

   a. Roll Call

   b. Approval of September 10, 2026, URA Regular Board Meeting Minutes

2. Public Comment

   a. Steve Mazza, Council representative of Greater PA Council of Carpenters, was present. Mr. Mazza is in favor of the East Liberty – East Liberty Transit Revitalization Investment District – Phase III project.

   b. Deanna Davis, representing the Larimer CDC, was present. Ms. Davis spoke about the community input for the community benefits agreement regarding the Larimer – For-Sale Development Program – Larimer Affordable Homeownership board item.

   c. Jay Gilmore, Esquire, Executive Director of Operation Better Block was present. Mr. Gilmore asked the URA Board to consider and RFI for Homewood business and housing.

   d. Savannah Parson, of the Fair Housing Partnership of Greater Pittsburgh, was present. Ms. Parson spoke about the Housing Opportunity Fund and inequity in the housing market.

   e. Matty McGrady, Pittsburgh Housing Justice Table, was present. Ms. McGrady spoke about the future of the Housing Opportunity Fund.

   f. Dr Kimberly Ellis, see attached statement.

3. Announcements

   a. Chair Zober announced that an Executive Session was held on October 8, 2026.

   b. Housing Opportunity Fund 2027 Draft Annual Allocation Plan: Public comment period is open through October 30, 2026

   c. 2027 Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Pre-Application opens October 12, 2026, and closes November 9, 2026

4. Central Business District – 200 Ross Street

   a. Authorization to enter into exclusive negotiations for a period of six months with Beacon Communities LLC, or a related entity, for Block 2-J, Lot 164-2, in the 1st Ward.

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

Ms. Nemani-Stanger requested Board approval of the above item.

Laya Mathews, Senior Project Manager, Development Services presented that authorization is requested to enter into exclusive negotiations for a period of six months with Beacon Communities LLC, or a related entity, for Block 2-J, Lot 164-2, in the 1st Ward.

Beacon Communities, LLC is proposing to redevelop the historic building located at 200 Ross Street into a mixed-income residential development with a financing structure that includes 9% Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, historic tax credits, and amortizing debt. The proposed development will include a total of 88 units with 65 of the units being affordable and 23 at the market rate. The ground floor will include property management offices and common area space. The 13th floor (formerly used as a URA board of directors' conference room) will be utilized as additional community space.

200 Ross Street was constructed in 1908 as the headquarters of Jones & Laughlin Steel (J&L) and was designed by MacClure and Spahr Architects as an eight-story structure. In 1917, additional floors were added to the top, creating the 13-floor structure that exists today. John P. Robin, the URA Executive Director from 1948 to 1954, led the effort for the Elizabethan-styled building to be purchased and converted to public use, making it possible for J&L to move its headquarters to Gateway Center. In 1952, the building was donated to the Community Chest of Allegheny County, forerunner of the United Way, who co-owned it with the URA.

Across its ownership tenure, the URA has shared ownership with other entities, including the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh and the City of Pittsburgh. As a result of the shared ownership between these government entities, 200 Ross was rededicated as the John P. Robin Civic Building on July 11, 1983.

Beacon Communities LLC is a limited liability company located at 429 Fourth Ave, Suite 2010, Pittsburgh, PA 15219. Principal name: Michael Polite, Senior Vice President, Development.

Upon a motion to approve by Mr. Williamson seconded by Mr. Charland and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 142 (2026)

RESOLVED: That exclusive negotiations with Beacon Communities LLC, or a related entity, for a period of six months for the sale of Block 2-J, Lot 164-2, in the 1st Ward, are hereby approved.

5. East Liberty – East Liberty Transit Revitalization Investment District – Phase III

   a. Authorization to adopt the East Liberty Transit Revitalization Investment District Phase III Implementation Plan, pledge the Phase III Implementation Plan parcels, and enter into related agreements.

Ms. Nemani-Stanger requested Board approval of the above item.

Mr. Tom Link, Chief Development Officer presented that Pittsburgh City Planning adopted the East Liberty Transit Revitalization Investment District (ELTRID) Planning Study in February 2012, establishing the ELTRID boundary. It was anticipated that the ELTRID Planning Study would be implemented in multiple phases to facilitate the redevelopment of East Liberty. Since then, the URA has implemented Phases I and II.

Walnut Capital Management, Inc. (Walnut Capital) acquired nine parcels, known as the Eastside Village Shopping Plaza and the former Club One health club, located within the originally approved ELTRID boundary. The district was formerly zoned as Highway Commercial; however Walnut Capital completed a Specially Planned (SP) District rezoning expansion to prepare the site for new housing, retail, and office uses, as well as high-quality public spaces.

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

The URA's proposed ELTRID Phase III Implementation Plan allows for the continued redevelopment of the area around the East Liberty Station located along the Martin Luther King, Jr. East Busway.

ELTRID Phase III will be completed in two subphases:

1.) **Phase A - Former Club One:**

- 5,000 square feet anticipated for office use
- 199 residential units
- Five percent of units rented at 80% - 120% AMI range
- Estimated total project cost: $92,641,500

2.) **Phase B - Eastside Village Shopping Plaza:**

- Mixed-use parcels for hospitality, retail, residential and office components
- Estimated total project costs: $90,000,000

A third party was contracted to undertake an IMPLAN economic impact analysis to evaluate and estimate the employment effects of the Phase III development project. The IMPLAN model estimated the creation of 540 direct, indirect, and induced full-time jobs during the construction period. These jobs are estimated to produce nearly $25 million of economic output for the Pittsburgh region. For purposes of TRID compliance, construction jobs are subject to Pennsylvania's prevailing wage regulations.
The IMPLAN model estimated the following annual employment effects at operational stabilization: 620 direct, indirect, and induced full-time jobs. These jobs are estimated to produce an annual labor income of $31 million. The 595 direct jobs come from the tenants and support employees directly working in industries like hospitality, retail, food service, fitness, office, medical office, and property management.

The total estimated Net Proceeds of the ELTRID Phase III are projected to be $10,065,000. Each borrowing will be guaranteed by the parent company, Walnut Capital.

The ELTRID Phase III Implementation Plan identifies certain projects on the development site that will be partially funded with TRID proceeds. For both phases, the on-site projects eligible to receive TRID proceeds are anticipated to be: (1) Brownfield Remediation, (2) Public Realm Improvements such as sidewalk improvements, urban open space, pedestrian improvements, landscaping, street furniture, lighting, etc. (3) Transportation and mobility-related Improvements, such as new traffic signals and crosswalk and street work in and around Penn Avenue and Shady Avenue, (4) Stormwater Management and Best Management Practices (BMPS), and (5) Pittsburgh Regional Transit East Liberty Garage and Larimer Station Master Plan Study.

For both phases, the off-site projects eligible to receive 10% of the TRID proceeds are anticipated to be: Site preparation and/or infrastructure needs related to housing in the TRID boundary.

The real estate tax increment generated from these projects will be split with 70% supporting projects within the ELTRID and the remaining 30%, plus current base taxes, remaining with the three local taxing bodies. The projected annual real estate taxes within the TRID after full development (after 5 years) is $1,320,000.

Parcels to be Pledged for Development	Parcel	2026 Assessed Value
Penn-Shady Mixed-use	0084-G-00360-0000-00	$32,400
Penn-Shady Mixed-use	0084-H-00121-0000-00	$306,600
Penn-Shady Mixed-use	0084-H-00123-0000-00	$173,600

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

Penn-Shady Mixed-use	0084-H-00160-0000-00	$258,600
Mixed-use Plaza	0084-H-00125-0000-00	$4,331,500
Mixed-use Plaza	0084-H-00270-0000-03	$64,800
Mixed-use Plaza	0084-H-00135-0000-00	$195,500
Mixed-use Plaza	0084-H-00174-0000-00	$8,408,200
Mixed-use Plaza	0084-H-00195-0000-00	$2,800,000
	Total 2026 Assessed Value	**$16,571,200**

The project is proposed to be funded by a combination of private debt, private equity, Pennsylvania's Redevelopment Assistance Capital Program, ELTRID, a Multimodal Transportation Fund grant, and other sources.

Walnut Capital Management, Inc. is a Pennsylvania corporation, located at 5500 Walnut Street, Suite 300, Pittsburgh, PA 15232. Principal: Todd E. Reidbord, President

Upon a motion to approve by Mr. Lavelle seconded by Mr. Williamson and unanimously carried, the following resolutions were adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 143 (2026)

RESOLVED: That the East Liberty Transit Revitalization Investment District Phase III Implementation Plan is hereby adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 144 (2026)

RESOLVED: That the Phase III Implementation Plan parcels are hereby pledged and the entering into of agreements for the East Liberty Transit Revitalization Investment District is hereby authorized.

6. Allentown – Scattered Site Proposal Response from Module Design

   a. Authorization to enter into exclusive negotiations for a period of six months with Module Design, Inc., or a related entity, for the sale of Block 14-E, Lots 214, 231, and 232, in the 18th Ward.

Ms. Nemani-Stanger requested Board approval of the above item.

Julia McMahon, Senior Project Manager, Development Services presented that authorization is requested to enter into exclusive negotiations for a period of six months with Module Design, Inc., or a related entity, for the sale of the three City of Pittsburgh owned parcels, for the sale of Block 14-E, Lots 214, 231, and 232, in the 18th Ward.

Module Design Inc, is a Pennsylvania limited liability company located at 4933 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15224. Principal: Brian Gaudio is CEO.

Upon a motion to approve by Mr. Charland seconded by Mr. Williamson and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

RESOLUTION NO. 145 (2026)

RESOLVED: That exclusive negotiations with Module Design, Inc. or a related entity, for the sale of Block 14-E, Lots 214, 231, and 232, in the 18th Ward, for a period of six (6) months, are hereby approved.

7. Allentown – Scattered Site Proposal Response from RE360

a. Authorization to enter into exclusive negotiations for a period of six months with RE360 LLC, or a related entity, for the sale of Block 14-A, Lots 338 and 339, and Block 14-E, Lots 173, 174, 306, 307, and 318, in the 18th Ward.

Ms. Nemani-Stanger requested Board approval of the above item.

Maya Fews, Project Manager, Development Services presented that authorization is requested to enter into exclusive negotiations for a period of six months with RE360 LLC, or a related entity, for the sale of the seven City of Pittsburgh owned parcels for the sale of Block 14-A, Lots 338 and 339, and Block 14-E, Lots 173, 174, 306, 307, and 318, in the 18th Ward.

The seven parcels, located on Manton Way, Climax Street, Industry Street, and Millbridge Street, are adjacent to or near properties that RE360 owns in Allentown. RE360 plans to build four multi-car parking pads for surface parking and community events. The estimated total development cost is $153,927, and the proposed funding source is cash.

RE360 is a Pennsylvania limited liability company located at 829 Industry Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15210-1640. Principal: Joe Calloway is CEO/Founder.

Upon a motion to approve by Mr. Charland seconded by Mr. Williamson and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 146 (2026)

RESOLVED: That exclusive negotiations with RE360 LLC, or a related entity, for the sale of Block 14-A, Lots 338 and 339, and Block 14-E, Lots 173, 174, 306, 307, and 318, in the 18th Ward, for a period of six (6) months are hereby approved.

8. Middle Hill District – Herron Avenue Housing Assemblages Phases I & II

a. Authorization to enter into exclusive negotiations for a period of six months with JK Equities and Manor Park Ventures, or a related entity, for the sale of the following 90 publicly owned parcels (5.28 acres), in the 5th Ward:

Parcel Number	Address	Owner
10-H-266	0 CENTRE AVE	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
10-H-268	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-271	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-272	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-273	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-274	0 HORTON	URA
10-H-275	0 HORTON ST	URA

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

10-H-276	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-277	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-278	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-279	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-280	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-281	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-284	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-285	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-286	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-287	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-289	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-290	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-291	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-292	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-293	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-294	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-295	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-296	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-297	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-298	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-299	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-300	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-301	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-302	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-303	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-305	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-A-129	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-A-131	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-A-135	0 VANCROFT ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-1	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-2	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-4	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-6	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-9	0 BREEN ST	URA
27-E-11	0 WANDLESS ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-12	0 WANDLESS ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-13	0 WANDLESS ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-14	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-15	0 BREEN ST	URA
27-E-47	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-48	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-48-A	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-49	0 HERRON AVE	URA

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

27-E-50	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-51	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-52	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-53	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-54	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-55	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-56	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-57	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-58	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-59	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-69	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-70	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-71	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-72	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-74	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-76	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-83	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-85	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-86	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-87	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-88	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-89	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-90	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-91	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-92	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-93	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-94	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-95	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-96	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-97	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-98	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-100	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-101	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-102	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-103	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-104	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-105	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-107	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-109	0 CENTRE AVE	URA
27-E-127	0 LANDLEISS PL	URA

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

Ms. Nemani-Stanger requested Board approval of the above item.

Maya Fews presented that authorization is requested to enter into exclusive negotiations with JK Equites and Manor Park Ventures or a related entity, for a period of six months for 90 publicly owned parcels located in the 5th Ward.

The Herron Avenue Housing Assemblage will consist of four phases. The first phase will consist of a 195-unit market rate building. The development consists of 145 three-bedroom apartments, 20 two-bedroom apartments, and 30 one-bedroom apartments with ground floor commercial space.

Phase II will consist of two six-story market rate apartment buildings. The first apartment building will have 60 units that will include 35 three-bedroom, 15 two-bedroom, and 10 one-bedroom apartments, with ground floor commercial space. The second apartment building will have 80 units that will include 50 three-bedroom, 15 two-bedroom and 15 1-bedroom apartments with ground floor commercial space.

The projected total development cost for the first two phases is approximately $170,000,000, which is expected to be privately funded by the developer.

JK Equities is a New York Limited Liability Company located at 2 Seaview Boulevard, Suite 203, Port Washington NY, 11050.

Manor Park Ventures is a New York real estate investment firm located at 10 County Center Road, Suite 323, White Plains NY, 10607.

Upon a motion to approve by Mr. Lavelle seconded by Mr. Williamson and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 147 (2026)

RESOLVED: That exclusive negotiations with JK Equities and Manor Park Ventures, or a related entity, for six months for the sale of the following publicly owned parcels in the 5th Ward are hereby approved:

Parcel Number	Address	Owner
10-H-266	0 CENTRE AVE	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
10-H-268	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-271	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-272	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-273	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-274	0 HORTON	URA
10-H-275	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-276	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-277	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-278	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-279	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-280	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-281	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-284	0 HORTON ST	URA

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

10-H-285	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-286	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-287	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-289	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-290	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-291	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-292	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-293	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-294	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-295	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-296	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-297	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-298	0 HORTON ST	URA
10-H-299	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-300	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-301	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-302	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-303	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
10-H-305	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-A-129	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-A-131	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-A-135	0 VANCROFT ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-1	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-2	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-4	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-6	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-9	0 BREEN ST	URA
27-E-11	0 WANDLESS ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-12	0 WANDLESS ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-13	0 WANDLESS ST	CITY OF PITTSBURGH
27-E-14	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-15	0 BREEN ST	URA
27-E-47	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-48	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-48-A	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-49	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-50	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-51	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-52	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-53	0 HERRON AVE	URA

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

27-E-54	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-55	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-56	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-57	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-58	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-59	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-69	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-70	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-71	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-72	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-74	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-76	0 WANDLESS ST	URA
27-E-83	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-85	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-86	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-87	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-88	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-89	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-90	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-91	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-92	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-93	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-94	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-95	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-96	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-97	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-98	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-100	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-101	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-102	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-103	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-104	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-105	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-107	0 HERRON AVE	URA
27-E-109	0 CENTRE AVE	URA
27-E-127	0 LANDLEISS PL	URA

9. Larimer – For-Sale Development Program – Larimer Affordable Homeownership

a. Authorization to enter into a For-Sale Development Program grant agreement with East Liberty Development, Inc., or a related entity, in an amount of up to $980,000 for the new construction of six homes and rehabilitation of two existing homes located on various parcels in the 12th Ward.

Ms. Nemani-Stanger requested Board approval of the above item.

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

Emily Kern, Lending Analyst , Residential Lending presented that authorization is requested to enter into a For-Sale Development Program (FSDP) grant in the amount of $980,000 for the new construction of six homes and the rehabilitation of two existing properties in the Larimer neighborhood. All homes will be sold affordably to homebuyers earning at or below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI). Two of the properties will be sold at deeper affordability levels, creating homebuying opportunities for a variety of low- to moderate income households.

The new construction units will be modular and will meet the U.S. Department of Energy's Efficient New Homes Program standards. Savings from utility costs will further the affordability for future homebuyers. All homes will include energy efficient appliances and high-efficiency HVAC systems. The developer has also committed to utilizing low-VOC paints and sustainably sourced materials when possible.

East Liberty Development, Inc.'s creation of eight affordable, for-sale properties advances goals set by the Larimer community's neighborhood plan. Creating and preserving high-quality, affordable housing encourages access to homeownership and sustainable growth in the neighborhood, while helping to mitigate displacement as its housing market grows due to its proximity to public transit and the growing East Liberty neighborhood.

The East Liberty Transit Revitalization Investment District Revitalization Authority (ELTRIDRA) approved a predevelopment loan and construction grant from the East End Housing Development Program in July 2026, conditional on final financing.

Construction financing is expected to close by the end of 2026. Approval of the FSDP grant is conditional on final approval of financing.

Project Information:

Borrower/Developer:	East Liberty Development, Inc.
Project Location:	125 Auburn St., 157 Auburn St., 159 Auburn St., 159 Mayflower St., 173 Mayflower St., 175 Mayflower St., 6277 Meadow St., and 6279 Meadow St.
Neighborhood:	Larimer
Council District:	9
Preliminary Authority Financing for Review:	$980,000 For-Sale Development Program
Collateral	Declaration of Restrictive Covenants requiring four of the units to be sold to a household at or below 80% of AMI at the time of initial sale and for any sales within a period of 99 years. Declaration of Restrictive Covenants requiring the four remaining units to be sold to a household at or below 80% of AMI at the time of initial sale and for any sales within a period of 30 years for the rehabilitation units and 40 years for the new construction units.
Proposed Program Sources	Housing Opportunity Fund
Commitment Expiration Date	February 28, 2027
Total Units	8
Affordable Units	8 units affordable at or below 80% AMI
Sources of Funds	
First Commonwealth Bank First Mortgage	$1,298,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Pittsburgh Grant	$1,200,000

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

URA FSDP	$980,000
PHFA PHARE (2023, 2025, 2026)	$416,867
ELTRIDRA EEHDP Grant	$250,000
DCED CEAP Grant	$240,288
ELDI Equity	$74,661
Transactions Fee	$51,920
Total Project Financing	**$4,511,736**
Uses of Funds	
Hard Costs	$3,072,317
Developer Fee	$529,000
Construction & Permanent Loan Financing Charges	$370,810
Professional and Development Fees	$326,784
Acquisition	$160,904
Transaction Fees	$51,920
Total Project Costs	**$4,511,736**

East Liberty Development Inc., a Pennsylvania non-profit corporation with a mailing address of 211 N Whitfield Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15206. Principal: Ted Melnyk, Director of Operations

Upon a motion to approve by Mr. Lavelle seconded by Mr. Williamson and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 148 (2026)

RESOLVED: That a For-Sale Development grant with East Liberty Development, Inc., or a related entity, for the new construction of six homes and the rehabilitation of two homes located at various parcels in the Larimer neighborhood, 12th Ward, in an amount of up to $980,000, payable from the For-Sale Development Program, is hereby approved, and the Executive Director, Deputy Executive Director, Chief Development Officer, Chief Housing Officer, Chief Lending and Investment Officer and/or Chief Financial Officer, on behalf of the Authority, is hereby authorized to execute a grant agreement therefor, in and the Secretary or Assistant Secretary is authorized to attest the same and affix the seal of the Authority thereto.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Members reviewed the items on the Consent Agenda upon motion made by Mr. Lavelle, seconded by Mr. Charland, and unanimously carried; the following resolutions were adopted:

1. Authorization to amend Resolution No. 73(2026) to increase a Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund (GHDNRF) grant disbursement with Center That Cares, or a related entity, for The Career Compass Program project, from $25,000 to $30,000, payable from the GHDNRF fund, as approved by the GHDNRF Advisory Board at their September 14, 2026, meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 149 (2026)

RESOLVED: That Resolution No. 73 (2026) is hereby amended, to increase a Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund (GHDNRF) grant disbursement from $25,000 to $30,000.

2. Authorization to amend Resolution No.235(2025) for the Summerset Phase 2 Frick Park Extension Contract with an additional $7,292 for landscaping at Shelburne Park.

Docusign Envelope ID: 6CF3908F-534E-8014-83AD-9F7316F4F3F0

RESOLUTION NO. 150 (2026)

RESOLVED: That Resolution No. 235 (2025) is hereby amended, to increase the contract from $7,292 for landscaping services.

3. Authorization to amend Resolution No. 95 (2026) to increase the funds awarded to the URA under the 2025 PAYGO Funded Programs Cooperation Agreement with the City of Pittsburgh from $1,100,000 to $1,257,175, to pay for a portion of the Pittsburgh Land Bank personnel costs.

RESOLUTION NO. 151 (2026)

RESOLVED: That Resolution No. 95 (2026) is hereby amended, to increase the funds awarded to the URA under the 2025 PAYGO Funded Programs Cooperation Agreement with the City of Pittsburgh from $1,100,000 to $1,257,175.

4. Authorization to enter into a Community Development Investment Fund grant agreement with HG Missing Middle LLC, or a related entity, for the Woodlawn Walk at Hazelwood Green housing development, to support construction of 30 units of rental workforce housing, in an amount not to exceed $100,000, payable from Housing State Loan Repayment fund.

RESOLUTION NO. 152 (2026)

RESOLVED: That an Community Development Investment Fund grant agreement with HG Missing Middle LLC, or a related entity, for the Woodlawn Walk at Hazelwood Green housing development,, for an amount up to $100,000 payable from the Housing State Loan Repayment fund is hereby approved, and the Executive Director, Deputy Executive Director, Chief Development Officer, Chief Housing Officer, Chief Lending and Investment Officer and/or Chief Financial Officer, on behalf of the Authority, is hereby authorized to execute a grant agreement therefor, and the Secretary or Assistant Secretary is authorized to attest the same and affix the seal of the Authority thereto.

Disclosure Agenda

1. Providing notice to the public that Henry Germany is to receive a Bedford Choice Facade Program grant of up to $60,000 (Mr. Germany is an employee of the City of Pittsburgh Public Works Department.)

2. Providing notice to the public that Marshall Richburg is to receive a Bedford Choice Facade Program grant up to $60,000 (Mr. Richburg is an employee of the City of Pittsburgh Public Works Department.)

3. Providing notice to the public that Daniel Mszyco is to receive a Down Payment and Closing Cost Assistance Program loan of up to $7,500 (Mr. Mszyco is an employee of the City of Pittsburgh Public Works Department.)

There being no further actions to come before the Members, the Meeting was adjourned.

DocuSigned by:
Theresa Schacht
742E4DACDC874B0...

Board Secretary

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF PITTSBURGH BOARD OF DIRECTORS

October 8, 2026
Dr. Kimberly C. Ellis
Regarding the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund

Members of the URA Board:

I testified before you on September 10, 2026, regarding serious concerns about the governance, transparency, fairness and accountability of the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund.

Four days later, on September 14, 2026, I was kicked off the GHDNRF Advisory Board.

Four people voted yes. One person abstained. One person was absent.

I was told that Robert's Rules of Order were followed and that this was not retaliation.

I strongly disagree with both assertions.

I received no advance notification that I was facing removal. I received no written charges. I was given no meaningful opportunity to prepare a defense or question the people making accusations against me. In fact, during the meeting, Councilman Daniel Lavelle reminded us that the proceeding was not supposed to be "interrogatory."

Making a motion and taking a vote does not mean that you followed Robert's Rules of Order.

And when I testify before the URA on Thursday, September 10, about problems with the Fund and am kicked off the Advisory Board on Monday, September 14, the URA should at minimum be concerned about retaliation and the chilling effect this can have on anyone else who might dare to speak up.

The Person Who Made the Motion

The person who made the motion to remove me represented the Hill District Consensus Group.

She did not make that motion on behalf of the Consensus Group's Board. The Board did not know she was going to do it, and the Board does not approve.

She also was not a member of the GHDNRF Advisory Board during the development discussions that gave rise to many of my complaints. She does not know firsthand what happened or why I was insisting that these problems be corrected.

There is also relevant history.

Years ago, during the controversy over the proposed casino in the Lower Hill, this individual told me that my opposition to that casino had cost her contractual or employment opportunities.

That history matters.

When someone with a longstanding grievance against me becomes the person who makes the motion to remove me four days after I testify before the URA, that deserves scrutiny.

But this is much bigger than her.

And it is bigger than me.

This Is About Whether People Can Trust This Fund

This is about whether developers, businesses, organizations and residents can trust the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund.

It is about whether companies like the Buccini/Pollin Group, which took out a loan to fulfill the financial commitments associated with this Fund, can trust that what they were told and what they approved will actually be enacted.

Bomani Howze, then Vice President of the Pittsburgh office, and I, then Director of Community Arts and Culture, approved what was requested of us based upon what we were told would occur.

What we were told and what we approved were not what ultimately happened.

The Buccini/Pollin Group deposited approximately $7.18 million in September 2021.

The Hill CDC received the money to which it was legally entitled under the settlement almost immediately.

I have documentation stating:

“Total grant provided to Hill CDC for its leadership in securing the LERTA funds for the entire Hill District community is 4% of deposited funds. The fund issued Hill CDC a check dated 11/08/2021 in the amount of $287,481.80.”

I am not challenging that payment.

It was part of the legal settlement.

My point is what happened next.

The Hill CDC received $287,481.80 within approximately two months of the $7.18 million being deposited.

And yet not one dollar was spent on developers or development projects in the Hill District until March 2026.

Think about that.

September 2021 to March 2026.

And after all those years, only approximately $950,000 was distributed for development.

That is a disgrace.

Millions of dollars existed for the benefit of the Hill District while developers waited, projects waited and the community waited.

That is precisely why I began insisting that we do something different.

The Board Was Not Told the Complete $7.18 Million Story

There is another reason this history matters.

Throughout our meetings, Marimba Milliones repeatedly raised approximately $313,000 that she maintained remained owed in connection with the Lower Hill redevelopment.

What she did not tell the GHDNRF Advisory Board was that the Buccini/Pollin Group had taken out a loan to provide the approximately $7.18 million that established this Fund.

I told the Board that.

When I told them, Board members said they did not know.

I consider that presenting a half-truth.

If we are going to repeatedly tell the community what a developer still owes, then we also have an obligation to tell the community what that developer has already provided, how those funds were obtained, and what financial obligations that developer undertook to provide them.

Tell the whole story.

The Advisory Board deserved the whole story.

The Hill District deserves the whole story.

The September 2023 Reallocation Discussion

And I want to be very precise about this date because it matters.

In September 2023, we had a reallocation meeting.

Arbie Bankston, LaKeisha Wolf, Alicia George, Richard Witherspoon and I participated.

We agreed that it would be a good idea to take all of the money that had not been spent in 2023 and apply it to 2024, along with making certain reallocations.

We agreed.

And I do not have to ask the URA to rely solely upon my memory about this.

I have the contemporaneous 2023 reallocation document, supplied here under the filename “GHDNRF Reallocation Plan Oct 2023(1).pdf,” and I am submitting it with this statement. It lists the five participants and records their consent to move unspent funds to 2024.

The URA can read it.

The follow-up work was never completed.

We never had the necessary meeting to carry through what we discussed.

Marimba Milliones did not agree with the reallocation.

And everything stalled.

Arbie Bankston was subsequently removed from the Advisory Board—not by a vote of the Advisory Board.

Brittainy Collins was also removed—not by a vote of the Advisory Board.

And now I have been removed through a vote.

My concern is the pattern: people who question or challenge how—or whether—the money is being spent, and who raise questions about the process, are removed.

What happens to people who challenge the way this Fund is being operated?

What happens to people who disagree with its leadership?

What happens to people who insist that previous discussions and commitments actually be honored?

The URA must address whether members can raise legitimate concerns without being pushed out.

March 2026: We Had Enough Money to Fund These Projects

Now we get to March 2026.

My position during the Round One development discussion was not simply, “We have money, why aren’t we using it?”

My position was much more specific.

We had enough money to fund all of these projects.

We had not spent a single dollar on developers or development projects since the money was deposited in September 2021.

It was now March 2026.

I said that we should do the right thing.

We should fund these projects.

We could support development on Centre Avenue.

We could support the Herron Avenue corridor.

We could support development in the Middle Hill.

We could support development in the Lower Hill.

And we could support the grocery store.

If some projects required additional safeguards, then put contingencies on them.

Marimba Milliones herself had placed a contingency on the African Queens project while still supporting funding for that project.

If a contingency could be placed on African Queens, contingencies could be placed on other projects.

And we could have put contingencies on awards in exactly the same way that the URA places contingencies on development financing while helping projects move toward completion.

We did not have to reject these developers.

We had another option.

Fund them and impose reasonable contingencies where necessary.

A Board member asked Councilman Lavelle whether we could do that and what the URA would say.

Councilman Lavelle said the URA would be happy about it. He told us that the URA had wanted us to get more money out.

And everybody on that call agreed that we would meet again and continue the discussion of Round One.

Everybody.

Marimba Milliones was not on the call when that agreement was reached.

And Then the Letters Went Out

The very next day, Kirk Holbrook sent us an email stating that the letters to the accepted and rejected applicants had already been sent, including the amounts they had—or had not—been awarded.

That was not the agreement we made.

We had agreed to continue the discussion.

On March 26, 2026, Mr. Holbrook also sent an email stating: “In response to the motion passed during the March 19th, 2026, advisory board meeting, to call for a physical meeting to discuss the allocation of approved dollars within 30-days, I have created this doodle poll.”

That email is attached to this statement. It confirms that a motion passed to convene a further meeting within thirty days.

Why did that meeting never happen?

Why didn’t Councilman Lavelle call for an emergency meeting, the same way he called for other emergency and urgent meetings?

Why were the needs of these developers not considered important enough to actually convene the meeting we had agreed to hold?

Afterward, there were attempts to put the Round One discussion I had requested back on the calendar.

But there was never any urgency.

There was never any sense that completing the discussion we had agreed to complete was important.

It never happened.

Then, when the grocery store came before us again, I tried again to raise the unresolved Round One issue.

It was rejected.

That is ultimately how I came before you.

I saw the writing on the wall.

Kirk Holbrook: Tell the Truth

I want to address Kirk Holbrook directly.

I am still confirming Mr. Holbrook's precise contractual title and relationship to the URA and the GHDNRF, and I will not misstate it.

But I am asking Mr. Holbrook for something very simple:

Tell the truth.

Don't protect me.

Don't protect Marimba Milliones.

Don't protect Councilman Lavelle.

Don't protect anybody.

Tell the truth about what happened.

Tell the truth about what you said you did not know.

Tell the truth about who helped you.

Tell the URA what the Advisory Board actually discussed.

Tell them what we agreed to.

Tell them what happened afterward.

Tell them what instructions you received, who gave you those instructions, and what you subsequently did.

The records will speak for themselves.

September 8 and the Proposed $27,000 Commitment

There is another matter that I am specifically asking the URA to investigate.

On September 8, 2026, the GHDNRF Advisory Board voted to provide $600,000 to Macedonia Church.

Immediately afterward, Marimba Milliones made a separate request concerning the Hill CDC.

As I understood the request, she asked the Advisory Board to approve a letter to a bank representing that the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund would cover approximately $27,000 for the Hill CDC if the Hill CDC lost its bid to purchase the Nafasi building from Josh Pollard for approximately $558,000.

She explained that she was not asking for the $27,000 to be distributed immediately. She wanted the letter sent to the bank.

I voted no.

LaKeisha Wolf abstained.

I do not remember with certainty how every other individual voted, so I will not state from memory what I cannot verify.

The motion passed.

The substantive discussion occurred in executive session, so there are no public minutes memorializing that discussion. There is, however, a record of the vote.

Therefore, I am asking the URA to investigate.

Did a letter actually go to a bank?

If so, who drafted it?

Who authorized it?

Who signed it?

What did it promise?

What financial obligation, if any, did it purport to place upon the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund?

Did the URA know about it?

Did the URA approve it?

Was this type of contingent commitment authorized by the GHDNRF governing documents?

And was it appropriate for a co-chair affiliated with the organization that stood to benefit from the commitment to make or participate in that request?

I am not declaring that the request was illegal.

I am asking the URA to determine whether it was authorized, appropriate, properly disclosed and consistent with the governing documents and conflict-of-interest requirements of this Fund.

There should be a documentary trail if a letter was prepared or transmitted.

Find it.

The Applicants Were Not Told About the URA Review Provision

While preparing this statement and reviewing records and notes that I have kept over the years, I rediscovered something extremely important.

Years ago, when I began having doubts about things I was witnessing inside the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund, I copied and saved a provision from the GHDNRF Guidelines.

I had forgotten about it.

I rediscovered it while reviewing my old records in preparation for this matter.

The Guidelines state:

“Should the Advisory Board deny an application, or fail to issue a final determination on an Application, within sixty (60) days of the submission date of such Application, the Applicant may submit such Application to the URA, to be reviewed by staff as directed by the Executive Director or their designee. URA staff may, at its discretion, review the Application and, in its sole discretion, determine whether to issue a Recommendation Report to the Board of Directors of the URA. Any Recommendation Report issued by URA staff shall include the information set forth in Section IV.C.1 above.”

To my knowledge, these applicants were never told about this provision.

And I did not remember it at the time either.

I know about it now because I found it again.

So I am bringing it before you now.

And I am specifically asking the URA:

Do not use the passage of time against these applicants when, to my knowledge, they were never informed that this review mechanism existed.

The quoted provision describes a sixty-day period for Advisory Board action. It does not expressly state that applicants must request URA review within sixty days.

Please clarify the provision and give affected applicants a meaningful opportunity to use it.

Do not compound the unfairness by denying access to a process they were never told was available.

Contact them.

Give them the provision.

Allow them to submit their applications.

And review the applications yourselves.

Finish Round One

The grocery store has now been funded, so that issue has changed.

I am asking the URA to independently review applicants four through ten on the Round One list.

Finish Round One.

Finish the process that we agreed to continue and never completed.

Look at these applications yourselves.

Look at the merits.

Look at their financials.

Look at their readiness.

Where reasonable contingencies are necessary, impose them.

Then make a fair decision.

These developers deserve fairness.

They deserve accountability.

They deserve transparency.

LaKeisha Byrd

I specifically request reconsideration of LaKeisha Byrd's award.

LaKeisha Byrd requested $250,000.

She was ultimately awarded $175,000.

I am asking that her application be reconsidered and that she receive the full $250,000 she requested.

That possibility was part of the broader conversation about using the money available to fully support these development projects.

Tonya Ford

I am also asking that Tonya Ford receive independent reconsideration and be fully funded.

At one point, the Advisory Board contemplated dividing approximately $95,000 between LaKeisha Byrd and Tonya Ford.

There is another issue here that cannot simply be ignored.

Marimba Milliones has had an extraordinarily hostile relationship with Tonya Ford and has publicly criticized her.

Nobody has adequately dealt with that.

Councilman Lavelle, I acknowledge that you protected Tonya Ford when she appeared before the GHDNRF.

But given this history of hostility, Marimba Milliones' participation in consideration of Tonya Ford's application should at minimum have triggered serious consideration of recusal.

An applicant should never have to wonder whether access to community development money is affected by whether the person judging the application personally likes or dislikes her.

I am asking the URA to give Tonya Ford the independent consideration she deserves and to consider fully funding her project.

The Grocery Store and Derrick Tillman

There is a related concern involving Derrick Tillman, the broker on the grocery store deal.

Marimba Milliones has an extremely negative relationship with Mr. Tillman.

Community members have expressed a belief that she has actively undermined or sabotaged the grocery store effort. They do not claim to know every action taken or exactly how that may have occurred. I am reporting their concern, not presenting that belief as an established finding.

But the concern itself is serious.

Residents should not have to wonder whether personal hostility toward a broker, developer or applicant is affecting decisions about a grocery store their community urgently needs.

This is another reason these proceedings must be recorded.

A recording would allow the community and the URA to hear what was said, see how applicants and their representatives were treated, and evaluate how decisions were reached.

Transparency should provide answers. The absence of transparency leaves residents trying to reconstruct decisions that affect their daily lives.

Councilman Lavelle and Complicity

And now I need to address Councilman Daniel Lavelle.

My concern is not simply that Marimba Milliones and I disagree.

We have not been friends for more than five years.

You've never seen some enormous public blowup between us.

I am speaking now because I am tired of watching this happen.

My concern is what happens when Marimba does something that I believe violates the rules, disregards an agreement, undermines transparency, or harms the community—and Councilman Lavelle gives her the space to do it.

That is what I mean when I talk about complicity.

That kind of wishy-washy complicity creates the conditions for a lack of transparency, unfairness and lack of accountability.

I have now convened two community meetings called "Hill District Community Briefings: Transparency, Fairness, and Accountability."

Those words describe exactly what the community is demanding.

The community has spoken.

The community will continue to speak.

During these briefings, residents made clear that their concerns did not begin with my removal from the Advisory Board.

Community members described a meeting approximately two years ago to which Susheela Nemani-Stanger and other URA officials were invited. Residents were asked to physically stand to demonstrate their disapproval of how the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund was being operated.

They stood.

They communicated clearly what they wanted.

And they are deeply disappointed that, in their view, essentially nothing changed for another two years or so.

The community is now completely fed up.

Residents want the URA to know that they will be speaking with you again.

This will not be the end.

They will not give up.

They understand these resources as their tax dollars—public resources intended to benefit their community—and they expect accountability for how those resources are governed and spent.

One of the things said during our discussions was essentially this:

Some of us are friends with Daniel Lavelle.

But we are furious about what is happening.

Friendship does not excuse this.

Councilman Lavelle, if you are going to be co-chair, then co-chair.

Exercise leadership.

Insist upon rules.

Insist upon fairness.

Insist that when the Board reaches an agreement, that agreement means something.

And if you are unwilling or unable to do that, then you should be removed from that leadership position.

You recently told the Hill District community that you were surprised that the Pittsburgh Penguins walked away.

That shocked me.

Why were you surprised?

After everything that has happened surrounding the Lower Hill redevelopment, after controversies involving prospective tenants and relationships surrounding the development, why would you be surprised when an institutional partner decides it has had enough and walks away?

If you are surprised by that, then you need a reality check.

Because the Penguins can walk away.

Developers can walk away.

Businesses can walk away.

Investors can walk away.

And eventually the community loses faith and walks away from the process itself.

The New Granada Theater and the Community's Priorities

Community members also raised concerns about the New Granada Theater and the Hill CDC's role in this Fund.

Many residents believe that, because Marimba Milliones helped negotiate the deal that created these resources, she initially wanted all of the money directed toward the underfunded New Granada Theater.

I am reporting that community belief, not claiming here to have established her original intentions through documentary evidence.

But residents were very clear about their priorities.

They value the New Granada Theater as a historic building and recognize its potential to be an important community asset.

That does not make it more important than housing in the Hill District.

It does not make it more important than other businesses in the Hill District.

And it does not entitle one organization to treat a community reinvestment fund as its own source of support.

The Hill CDC cannot continue to engage in what residents view as self-dealing through the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund.

The URA must ensure that requests benefiting the Hill CDC receive independent scrutiny, that conflicts are disclosed and addressed, and that the organization's leadership cannot use its position within the Fund to favor its own interests.

These resources belong to the community.

The community's needs must determine the priorities.

Record the Proceedings: No More Secret Meetings

The community is demanding a fundamental change in how this Fund operates.

Just as Housing Opportunity Fund Advisory Board meetings are recorded and made available to the public, the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund must have recorded, publicly accessible proceedings.

I am asking the URA to require every aspect of the Fund's official deliberations and decision-making to be recorded: Advisory Board meetings, committee meetings, application discussions, funding recommendations, reallocations, contingent commitments and votes.

Record the discussions.

Record the decisions.

Preserve the recordings.

Make them available to the community, along with agendas, minutes, recommendations and vote records.

No more executive sessions.

No more secret meetings.

No more decisions affecting community resources that residents can only learn about after the fact.

This is what the community is demanding.

Residents should be able to see and hear how these decisions are made, who participates, what concerns are raised, whether conflicts are disclosed, and whether collective agreements are honored.

Transparency cannot depend upon whether someone happens to save an email, remember a conversation or speak up at personal risk.

It must be built into the operation of the Fund.

We Deserve These Resources—and We Know How to Govern

I am aware of the current political circumstances surrounding former Mayor Ed Gainey and allegations concerning his handling of funds.

Many people in the Black community believe these accusations are an unfounded attack.

Regardless of whether the accusations are substantiated, the surrounding controversy continues to leave the Hill District community exposed to racist attacks.

But I want everyone to be clear: I will not allow concern about racist attacks—or the opinions of people who believe we do not deserve these resources—to silence demands for accountability.

We absolutely deserve these resources.

We deserve the money.

And we deserve a disproportionate investment of tax dollars in our community precisely because we were disproportionately harmed by redlining, displacement, urban renewal and other policies that stripped our community of homes, businesses, wealth and opportunity.

Demanding accountability does not weaken our claim to those resources.

It affirms our right to have them used fairly and effectively for our community.

And I also want to be clear: Black people know how to govern.

Although I am raising serious concerns about the governance of the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund, we have a hero in our midst.

He is a Black man.

His name is Mark Lewis, of the POISE Foundation.

This Is a Pattern I Have Seen Before

I have seen problems with the distribution of Hill District resources before.

During my involvement with the Hill District Growth Fund, the Hill CDC received approximately $1 million, and I voted for it.

I supported it.

What I did not expect was that barely any other businesses would receive money.

And thank God there was someone willing to say enough.

Mark Lewis stopped the shenanigans.

The money was frozen.

There had to be regrouping and restructuring.

Community-controlled resources require community accountability.

That was true then.

It is true now.

My Requests to the URA

I am asking the URA to do the following:

1. Determine whether my September 14, 2026 removal complied with the GHDNRF governing documents and Robert’s Rules of Order, including whatever notice and procedural protections were required.

2. Examine whether removing me four days after my September 10 testimony before the URA constituted retaliation or created an unacceptable appearance of retaliation.

3. Review the contemporaneous documentation from the September 2023 reallocation discussion and determine what was agreed upon, what was not implemented, and why.

4. Determine why, despite approximately $7.18 million being deposited in September 2021, no money was distributed to developers or development projects until March 2026 and only approximately $950,000 was distributed at that time.

5. Determine why the Advisory Board apparently was not given the complete history concerning the Buccini/Pollin Group’s financing of the approximately $7.18 million while the approximately $313,000 allegedly still owed was repeatedly discussed.

6. Determine who authorized Kirk Holbrook to send the Round One acceptance and rejection letters before the Advisory Board reconvened for the discussion we had agreed to continue, and why the further meeting called for

by the March 19 motion and documented in his March 26 email never occurred within thirty days or afterward.

7. Determine whether contingencies were applied consistently and fairly among applicants, including comparison with the contingency placed upon African Queens.

8. Investigate the September 8, 2026 vote concerning the proposed approximately $27,000 commitment benefiting the Hill CDC in connection with the Nafasi building acquisition.

9. Determine whether a letter was actually prepared or transmitted to a bank as a result of that vote and, if so, obtain and review the letter, drafts, emails, transmittal communications and responses.

10. Determine who drafted, authorized and signed that letter, what representations it made, whether the URA knew about or approved it, and whether the proposed commitment complied with GHDNRF governing documents and applicable conflict-of-interest requirements.

11. Notify affected Round One applicants of the review mechanism contained in the GHDNRF Guidelines.

12. Clarify the sixty-day provision and do not deny applicants access to URA review based on the passage of time when, to my knowledge, they were never informed that this review mechanism existed.

13. Invite applicants four through ten to submit their applications to the URA pursuant to the Guidelines and have the Executive Director or their designee direct staff to consider those applications independently.

14. Reconsider LaKeisha Byrd's application and consider awarding the full $250,000 she requested rather than the $175,000 ultimately awarded.

15. Independently reconsider Tonya Ford's application, including whether the history of conflict between Ms. Ford and Marimba Milliones should have resulted in recusal, and consider fully funding Ms. Ford's project.

16. Examine whether personal hostility toward applicants or their representatives, including Tonya Ford and Derrick Tillman, affected deliberations, treatment or funding decisions, and establish clear disclosure and recusal procedures.

17. Examine the broader pattern of removing, marginalizing or silencing Advisory Board members who question or challenge how—or whether—the money is being spent, including the removal of Arbie Bankston, Brittainy Collins and me.

18. Require all official GHDNRF deliberations and decision-making proceedings to be recorded, preserved and made publicly accessible, using the Housing Opportunity Fund's publicly available meeting recordings as a model. This must include Advisory Board and committee meetings, application discussions, funding recommendations, reallocations, contingent commitments and votes. End executive sessions and secret meetings concerning the community's Fund.

19. Establish stronger URA oversight and clear written procedures so that no individual co-chair or individual member can override or effectively nullify collective Advisory Board decisions.

20. Require independent scrutiny of requests benefiting the Hill CDC, enforce conflict-of-interest and recusal requirements, and ensure that housing, other businesses and the full range of community needs receive fair consideration alongside the New Granada Theater.

21. Address the concerns residents raised at the earlier community meeting to which URA officials were invited, explain what action followed, and provide a substantive public response to the concerns now raised through the two Hill District Community Briefings: Transparency, Fairness, and Accountability.

22. Preserve all relevant recordings, minutes, executive-session records that may lawfully be preserved or reviewed, emails, text messages, correspondence, contracts, funding recommendations, award and rejection letters, financial records, bank communications and governance documents necessary to determine what actually happened.

And I want to make one thing clear:

I am not asking the URA to take my word for all of this.

Look at the records.

Follow the money.

Determine who had authority to do what.

And tell the Hill District the truth about what happened.

My Final Request

The Hill District community has had enough.

The Lower Hill redevelopment has experienced enormous conflict and delay.

Live Nation was part of the broader Lower Hill redevelopment, regardless of attempts to rhetorically separate it from everything else that occurred there.

Our residents have waited for a grocery store.

That grocery store could have been funded in March along with the McAuley Ministries money.

In my view, that earlier funding could have put it much closer to opening by now.

Instead, residents were allowed to continue waiting.

Residents of Fireside Apartments have complained about unacceptable conditions and have waited for relief.

At some point, leadership has to be accountable not simply for what it says it intends to do, but for the consequences of what it actually does.

This is not simply about whether I have a seat on an Advisory Board.

It is about whether Hill District residents can speak up about millions of dollars intended to repair historic harm without being punished for doing so.

It is about whether companies can make financial commitments based upon representations made through this process and trust that those representations will be honored.

It is about whether developers can work for months and years on projects and trust that they will receive fair consideration.

It is about whether people who disagree with leadership can continue to participate without being pushed out.

It is about whether agreements made by an Advisory Board actually mean something.

It is about whether residents can see and hear how decisions about their community's resources are made.

And ultimately:

It is about whether the people of the Historic Hill District—not one organization, not one co-chair, not one councilmember and not one personality—will control the destiny of resources created for our community.

The community has spoken at two Hill District Community Briefings: Transparency, Fairness, and Accountability.

They spoke before those briefings, too.

They will be speaking with you again.

This will not be the end.

They will not give up.

That is what I am fighting for.

That is what I am asking the URA to protect.

And after everything I have witnessed, everything I have documented, and everything I have placed before you, my final request—indeed, my demand—is straightforward:

Marimba Milliones should resign from the Greater Hill District Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund Advisory Board.

Period.

Dr. Kimberly C. Ellis

Gmail

Kimberly Ellis <drkimellis@gmail.com>

Advisory Board Working Meeting re: Allocation Plan

3 messages

Kirk Holbrook <ghdnrf@ura.org> Thu, Mar 26 at 11:56 AM
To: mmilliones@hilldistrict.org <mmilliones@hilldistrict.org>, Lavelle, Daniel <Daniel.Lavelle@pittsburghpa.gov>
Cc: Lakeisha Wolf <lakeisha.wolf@gmail.com>, Glenn Grayson <ggrayson@centerthatcares.org>, Leeretta Payne <hillrisingclt25@hdcg.org>, rspoon@hilldistrictfcu.org <rspoon@hilldistrictfcu.org>, Alicia George <aliciageorge1126@gmail.com>, Kimberly Ellis, PhD <drkimellis@gmail.com>, Julia McMahon <jmcmahon@ura.org>, Hill CDC Executive Admin <admin@hilldistrict.org>

Good afternoon, Advisory Board members,

In response to the motion passed during the March 19th, 2026, advisory board meeting, to call for a physical meeting to discuss the allocation of approved dollars within 30-days, I have created this doodle poll: https://doodle.com/group-poll/participate/elkVyvld

The doodle poll includes two Saturday dates in April for an up to 2-hour meeting to be held in person at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh Hill District Branch in the August Wilson Room. I ask that you **please complete this doodle poll by Monday, March 30th.**

Additionally, I am compiling prep materials and will send those out you in the coming weeks.

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Kirk

Get Outlook for Mac

Kimberly Ellis <drkimellis@gmail.com> Thu, Mar 26 at 4:15 PM
To: Kirk Holbrook <ghdnrf@ura.org>
Cc: mmilliones@hilldistrict.org <mmilliones@hilldistrict.org>, Lavelle, Daniel <Daniel.Lavelle@pittsburghpa.gov>, Lakeisha Wolf <lakeisha.wolf@gmail.com>, Glenn Grayson <ggrayson@centerthatcares.org>, Leeretta Payne <hillrisingclt25@hdcg.org>, rspoon@hilldistrictfcu.org <rspoon@hilldistrictfcu.org>, Alicia George <aliciageorge1126@gmail.com>, Julia McMahon <jmcmahon@ura.org>, Hill CDC Executive Admin <admin@hilldistrict.org>

Dear Kirk,

Thank you for this. April 25 is the weekend of the NFL Draft and I will also be out of town that weekend for the opening of August Wilson's Joe Turner's Come and Gone, so I did not vote for any times on that day.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ellis
[Quoted text hidden]

Kirk Holbrook <ghdnrf@ura.org> Thu, Mar 26 at 4:17 PM
To: Kimberly Ellis <drkimellis@gmail.com>

Got it! Thanks for letting me know. I'm hopeful the 18th will be it.

I'll keep you posted!

Kirk

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Kimberly Ellis <drkimellis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:15:22 PM
To: Kirk Holbrook <ghdnrf@ura.org>
Cc: mmilliones@hilldistrict.org <mmilliones@hilldistrict.org>; Lavelle, Daniel <Daniel.Lavelle@pittsburghpa.gov>; Lakeisha Wolf <lakeisha.wolf@gmail.com>; Glenn Grayson <ggrayson@centerthatcares.org>; Leeretta Payne <hillrisingclt25@hdcg.org>; rspoon@hilldistrictfcu.org <rspoon@hilldistrictfcu.org>; Alicia George <aliciageorge1126@gmail.com>; Julia McMahon <jmcmahon@ura.org>; Hill CDC Executive Admin <admin@hilldistrict.org>
Subject: Re: Advisory Board Working Meeting re: Allocation Plan

[Quoted text hidden]

EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Eligible Uses	Percentage Allocated to Eligible Use	Dollar Amount for 2023
Administration	10.00%	150,000
Children and Youth Education Initiatives	8.00%	120,000
Rent Assistance Subsidies	5.00%	75,000
Mortgage Assistance Subsidies	5.00%	75,000
Job Placement Programs	4.00%	60,000
Workforce Development Initiatives	4.00%	60,000
Development Initiatives	31.00%	465,000
Project Development	3.00%	45,000
M/WBE Development Initiatives	7.00%	105,000
M/WBE Business Counseling Initiatives	1.00%	15,000
Historic Hill Institutional Preservation	5.00%	75,000
Reoccurring Revenue Initiatives Under Community Control	15.00%	225,000
Other Wealth Building Initiatives	2.00%	30,000
Grand Total	**100.00%**	**1,500,000**

Attendees: Arbie, Kim, Alicia, Richard, LaKeisha

2023 Allocation $1.5mil

-Spent: $465,000 to Home Repair 31%
-Spent: $150,000 to Administrative?? 10%
-Remaining: $1.035mil remaining??

- Proposal to rollover remaining 2023 funds to 2024 allocation plan and increase some critical line items
    - Five members are in consent to move unspent funds to 2024

2024 Allocation $2.5-3mil?

- **Estimate that $400k will be deposited in 2024**

Categories $$ %

- Administration
- Children, Youth, Education
- Rent
- Mortgage
- Job Placement
- Workforce Development
- Development Initiatives
- Housing Initiatives
- Project Development

- MWBE Development Initiatives
- MWBE Business Counseling
- Historic Hill Institutional Preservation
- Recurring Revenue Initiatives Under Community Control
- Other Wealth Building Initiatives

Conversation Notes:

How much more $ will be added to fund?

- close on Block E LERTA $ per year??
- Current Penguins Parking lot $400k per year for 3 years ($1.2 mil in 3 yrs)
- Lower Hill Parking Garage %
- Live Nation Tix ($2/tix starting in 2025)
- Does Hill CDC continue to take a percentage off the top?
- What are the admin fees from URA?

Most important assets based on values of group members- people, homes, businesses

- 2 mil towards people (housing, rent, mortgage)- resident retention
- 1 mil towards businesses, other