



**Main Office - Department of Housing**  
264 Harbor Blvd., Building A, Belmont, CA 94002-4017

**Housing & Community Development (HCD)**  
Tel: (650) 802-5050

**Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo (HACSM)**  
Tel: (650) 802-3300

**Board of Supervisors:**

Dave Pine  
Noelia Corzo  
Ray Mueller  
Warren Slocum  
David Canepa

**Director:**  
Raymond Hodges

**Deputy Director:**  
Rose Cade

# HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (HCDC)

## STUDY SESSION MINUTES

---

**Location: 350 Convention Way, Redwood City, CA 94063 & Virtual**      **Wednesday, September 3, 2025**  
**1:00 PM**

---

### A. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

1:08 p.m.

Chair Colson called to order the Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC) for an AHF 13.0 Study Session at which no action items were on the agenda.

### B. Roll Call

Chair Colson took a roll call vote:

**Present:** 7- Chair Donna Colson, Vice Chair Nell Selander, Elizabeth Moreno, Jenny Skoble, Richard Hedges, Nicole Moutoux, and George Saman.

**Present on Zoom:** 1- Annie Tsai.

**Absent:** 5- Laura Escobar, Juslyn Manalo, Rachel Horst, Monika Lee, Lavinia Prema

**Department of Housing Staff:** Raymond Hodges, Director; Jan Stokley, Supervisor; Douglas Frederick, Program Manager; Karen Coppock, Supervisor; Rocio Nalda, HCD Specialist; Manasa Hegde, HCD Specialist; Ronak Moradi, HCD Specialist; Stephen Bajza, HCD Specialist; Eleazar Malabanan, HCD Specialist; Christina Kim, HCD Specialist; Danita Robertson, HCD Specialist; Alejandro Segura, HCD Specialist; Jessica Chambers, Office Specialist; Marissa Santander, Office Specialist.

### C. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was opened for any items not on the agenda and closed. Diego Terreros, Eden Housing's representative for 851 Weeks requested an increase in the County's funding recommendation for their project to \$6 million to strengthen its competitiveness for tax credits.

### D. DOH STAFF PRESENTATION AND HCDC DISCUSSION

No actions were taken at this Study Session.

Staff presented an overview of AHF 13.0 funding sources, noting that Measure K funds were higher in AHF 13 than the standard \$19 million because of a one-time use of ARPA funds awarded in October 2024 to projects that satisfied the ARPA requirements including expenditure deadlines. MHSA funds were available because of a project in South San Francisco that did not move forward. HHAP funds became available after the release of the NOFA after the Human Services Agency got approval from state HCD to use unspent funds to finance PSH units for homeless. Staff also briefly reviewed the broader state and federal funding environment to provide context for the current funding cycle. Even with the increase, the available funding was less than half of the funds requested by the 17 applications received and reviewed by staff.

Staff explained that two of the 17 applications withdrew before Threshold findings. Five of the remaining 15 were found not to satisfy Threshold Requirements and were not competitively scored and ranked for presentation in the HCDC Study Session. One of the ten that met Threshold withdrew when AHF 13 funding was no longer needed because Children and Family Services renewed a commitment of \$864,000 in Measure K funds for Former Foster Youth.

Staff reviewed a summary of funding recommendations for the remaining 9 applications, noting that timing constraints as well as eligible use constraints affected the ability to award specific funding sources to specific projects. Emphasis was placed on whether a final award of County funds in AHF 13 would position the project to be competitive for the next appropriate tax credit round in 2026 and whether the amount requested from the County was at the appropriate level, given other financing sources. Projects that have a viable financing plan to be competitive for tax credit financing in 2027 or later were awarded smaller amounts to assist them to advance the planning for the project.

Then the reviewing staff members presented on each of the 9 projects that satisfied Threshold Requirements. Committee members raised questions on topics such as community outreach, City's funding commitments, and County's funding contributions as a percentage of the total development cost. Staff committed to relay these questions to the applicants, who will provide responses in their presentations at the September 10 HCDC meeting where action is scheduled to be taken.

Committee members asked questions on each project, some of which staff committed to submit to the applicant to address in their presentation at the September 10 HCDC meeting where action is scheduled to be taken.

## **E. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Colson moved to adjourn the Study Session meeting at 3 p.m. Passed 7-0.