SEATTLE HOUSING AUTHORITY
REGULAR BOARD BRIEFING

LOCATION	**Held via Teleconference Line** **Microsoft Teams** **(206) 257-3799; Phone Conference ID 314 303 096#** [Click here to join the meeting] Listen in: Jesse Epstein Conf Rm, 1st Floor, SHA Central Office
DATE	**October 10, 2022, 4:30pm - 6:00pm**
BOARD ATTENDEES	**Paul Purcell, Board Chair** **Gerald Smiley, Vice-Chair** **Sally Clark** **Robert Crutchfield** **Dr. Paula Houston** **Rita Howard** **Twyla Minor**
DISTRIBUTION	SHA Board of Commissioners; Cabinet

Commissioner Roll Call

AGENDA:

Briefing Items

- **Resolution No. 5249 –** SHA 2023 Annual Moving To Work (MTW) Plan; Public Comments Results (15 min)
- **Resolution No. 5250 –** SHA 2023 Annual Budget (40 min)
- **Resolution No. 5251 –** homeWorks Exit (15 min)

Commissioners roll call was given at 4:35 p.m. The Briefing was held via teleconference. Commissioner Minor was absent from the Briefing.

Review 10/17/22 Regular Board Meeting Agenda and Updates

Resolution No. 5251 – homeWorks LP Exit & Dissolutions

Executive Director Rod Brandon introduced Finance & Asset Management Director Jared Cummer to present Resolution No. 5251 to the Board.

Last month, it was reported via the Director Report about our ongoing negotiations with Boston Financial, who is the investor; that is the partner at what we refer to as the homeWorks properties. They are three tax credit partnerships that were formed in 2005, 2006 and 2007, and they were formed for the purpose of rehabilitating nearly 2000 public housing units in 21 buildings. Each partnership has seven buildings in it, and they are all 100% public housing units, and we use the tax credit program to invest mostly in the mechanical systems, as well as the roof and some of the bigger components of the building It was not a lot of cosmetics that were included. The initial limited partner was Boston Capital, and they were bought out by Boston Financial in 2020. As of right now, Boston Financial is the 99.99% owner limited partner and we (SHA) are the general partner with a 0.01% interest.

So, in all, in phase one, we are through the compliance period, often referred to as year fifteen, and the other two phases we are coming up close to the compliance period and we began negotiations about two years ago to try and exit these partnerships because all the tax credits were delivered. We now want to take these partnerships back, retain ownership of the buildings, as well as limit future exit tax liability that we could potentially have with these partnerships as we look to invest more money in these as the interiors of these buildings are starting to need a lot of repairs. So, we have negotiated an exit for the Board's consideration. It involves the transfer of all of Boston Financials interest to SHA and our affiliate. So, upon the exit, SHA would become the 99.99% owner and our affiliate which is called SHA Instrumentality would be the 0.1%.

As part of this negotiation, there are two key deal points. The 1st is a payment of what are called exit taxes for homeWorks phase two of $1,000,000 and $24114.00 for homeWorks phase three. The $1,000,000 exit tax payment represents closer to about $0.35 on the dollar because the exit tax liability at the end of 2021 tax year was just over $2.2 million. After factoring in this year's losses, it would be close to $3,000,000. So, we're probably about $0.30 to $0.35 on the dollar for the exit taxes. And just a reminder, the way these partnerships work when they're formed, the tax credit investor is not only investing money to buy the tax credits; they're also investing to buy the losses and the way the tax code works is you can take more losses than what your investment was. If your losses go below your investment, you have what's called a negative capital account and the IRS says that's fine. You can take more losses than you invested, but you must pay IRS back when you sell the asset. That's where exit tax liability comes in and historically, going back 15 years or more, that had not been something on many tax credit developers' radar, including SHA. It wasn't something that was thought about in depth. Now that has changed and over the last five to eight years, we've really focused more on this to the point now where we don't accept any partnership transactions that propose any exit tax liability due by the Authority. That is the exit tax portion of the proposal; the second is what's called a recapture reserve.

For phase two and phase three of homeWorks, there is still one and two years, respectively for those on what is called the IRS compliance period. During that period, if we violate one of the IRS programmatic rules, the tax credits can still be subject to recapture. SHA has never had credits recaptured before in the past and we've done this format. This would be our 4th and 5th partnership that we've structured and exited like this. What we do is we'll we will put just over $2,000,000 into an escrow reserve at the end of this year. By January 15th of next year, assuming we have no violations, $815,000 will be released, which will be all of phase two and then about $700,000 for phase three. Then, by January 15th of 2024, the remainder will be released from phase three and all the money would come back to SHA. The exit tax liability is pretty low risk for us as we've never had a recapture event, and it's not perceived to happen in the future. Once the limited partner is out of these partnerships and we have control through us in our affiliate, then we will take steps to dissolve the partnership by the end of the year. The main reason we want to do that as quickly as we can is once it reverts back to full SHA ownership without the affiliate, the property reverts and our tax exemption comes back in not for property tax, but for labor and materials, so we're able to save a lot of money there and we have a lot of projects going on in these properties because it's a significant number of units. Lastly and most importantly, this is just paper transaction. In the background, this transaction will have no impact on existing residents as the regulatory requirements remain in effect and the management of the property will not change. They will have to have an updated lease when their leases come up, but it just won't have the tax credit entity on it anymore. It'll just have SHA.

<u>Resolution No. 5249 – SHA 2023 Proposed Annual Moving To Work (MTW) Plan; Public Comments Results</u>

Executive Director Rod Brandon introduced MTW Coordinator Lily Sweeney and Policy & Strategic Initiatives Andria Lazaga to present Resolution No. 5249 to the Board, as well as a brief overview of what was presented to the Board last month and public comments results received about the Plan.

The public comment process is a joint process between both the budget and the MTW plan, so a lot of the comments received are opportunities for residents to sort of talk about capital projects that they have desires to see or other issues that are highlighted in the budget. As an overview of SHA's MTW Plan, it's a prescribed format that's often very difficult to read through and understand; some of the public comments that we received, we have high level information on housing stock leasing, waiting lists, capital expenditures and financials. As a reminder, again this is also where we propose our new strategies or activities which are new areas that we either want to newly flex, or rethink how we implement them, regulations from HUD or we're getting updates to things that we already allowed ourselves to do. Just clarify the breadth, we're in the depth of the allowances that we have, so we have the required public comment process which ended last Friday and was extended by a week per request of the JPAC members so that they would fully have time to comprehend all the information that we presented at the public hearing and at the JPAC meeting, reach out to other residents if they thought that there were areas that they would be interested in learning about and still have time to return information to us via postal mail, which is the longest amount of time that it will take, and make sure that all of their voices were able to be heard. So, we did do outreach on the website, in The Voice, public and information was sent out to staff as well.

As a reminder of the new updates and strategies that we're going to have in this plan, we added ENSPIRE standards to the list of protocols that may be interchangeably used during our inspections. There is a new strategy where we're proposing a new method of calculating rent for mixed status households. And, then we also added a note just to clarify for the purposes of our MT plans and reports HUD had requested that we categorize them in a way that makes sense so that they can follow what we're doing. Plus, we do have the 125 strategies, so it helps staff recall where those are as well. So, an activity is an umbrella of types of strategies and then the strategies are the way that we implement the proposals that we have. The proposal for HUD is that we figure out a different way to calculate our rent for our mixed status households, which are households that have one or more in eligible non-citizens. We think this is an important race and social justice issue, as these households pay on average 175% of their income and rents, so they're extremely rent burdened, especially in the voucher marketplace. There are 56 total households. They are 1.5 times more likely to have people of color in the household, and three times more likely to have children than households that are not mixed status. So, our goal with this proposal is to not only lower the rent burden on these households, but it's also hoping to see additional lease ups, higher acceptance of units increase, self-sufficiency, decreased rent burden and more mixed households feeling that they are able to access housing benefits in the city of Seattle.

So just a caveat, all the slides presented here are as of September 30th, we did get a couple comments after that as well, which I'll just touch on briefly. During the public process, we had our public hearing on the September 12; it is typically very underattended and this is not abnormal. This says the attendance level has no reflection of in-person versus remote. We had one resident and two staff attend the presentation. We had one resident who is someone that we work with closely. So, we spoke with this person and went through the whole presentation and then answered questions at the end for them to take back to their communities and their networks within our public housing system. For other contacts, we received two additional comments via e-mail for a total of eight, one comment via phone, four requests for hard copies as of Friday, we had zero comments to via postal mail. Many comments that came in were reflective of comments that came in through the JPAC. So, we made changes; one minor change to the MTW Plan via JPAC right now, it says zero changes under the public process. But as Andria will touch on later, we did end up getting some comments after we made the change that we're reflective of. So, for resident engagement, we held the joint JPAC meeting of SSHP and LIPH JPACs on the September 27. Nine residents were in attendance. There were zero substantive changes. One minor change to the Plan, and as it was mentioned earlier, we extended the comment period by a week, so overarching themes in general were issues of security in their neighborhoods and in their buildings, issues around maintenance and capital investments and a lot of discussion about ‘when my elevator is going to get fixed.’ This is very routine for this process. There was a lot of focus on digital equity and how we can better serve residents in that space. Then there was concern about language in the plan that is in a Section 2, called ‘public housing units to remove’, which understandably, if you don't understand what that section means can cause concern amongst residents, so that was probably the issue. This is the area that we got the most vocal responses about.

Ms. Lazaga clarified the section that Ms. Sweeney referred to, titled ‘planned public housing units to be removed’ and the language that HUD asked SHA to use as demolition/disposition. It is HUD prescribed, and so essentially what this is when if we have a public housing property or units that SHA wants to demolish or wants to sell or want to remove the exchange, the public housing subsidy for let's say project-based vouchers or something else, HUD has us use the exact the same language for all those things. So, what we put into the Plan is a listing of pretty much all our remaining public housing units with an explanation that we were going to do a review about looking at other funding opportunities. But we learned quickly that we didn't make it clear enough what our intentions were and that we really are just doing an analysis of other funding opportunities. This isn't demolishing units or anything like that. To everyone who made a comment, we responded to whether it was in the JPAC meeting, public hearing, or phone calls. Once they got the clarified explanation, they understood the language better but asked SHA in the future to do a better job of communicating intentions for the Plan. So, we tried to do that, made some changes in the plan itself. We also received an internal comment from staff because of what they were hearing from residents, and so we also put in a clarification around the bedroom size for housing choice voucher utility allowances. On the rare occasion when someone wants to lease a unit that functionally is a certain size, but technically, based on HUD’s rules, is not an example or would be different. An example is a one-bedroom unit, but the bedroom walls don't go all the way to the ceiling; HUD calls that a studio, but it is functionally a one- bedroom. So, we want the household to get the one-bedroom voucher payment standard and the one-bedroom utility allowance. We already got permission from HUD for this back in 2020, but the utility allowance piece of it wasn't explicit in staff wanted it in there so that it was clear to everyone. So, we just added that clarification. It's not something HUD approves or denies because it's already been approved. It's just there for clarification purposes.

Resolution No. 5250 – SHA 2023 Proposed Annual Budget

Executive Director Rod Brandon introduced CFO Shelly Yapp to present Resolution No. 5250 to the Board. Ms. Yapp then introduced Housing Operations Deputy Director Rachael Steward, Housing Operations Director Dave Wellings, Ms. Lazaga and IT Director Steve McDowell, who assisted in her presentation for the proposed Annual Budget.

The predominant action that the budget Resolution No. 5250 does is adopt the budget for the Agency; this resolution will adopt the $416.2 million budget for 2023. That budget is 8.1% higher than the 2022 budget and it is comprised of the operating budget, which is $284.9 million, about 68% of the total budget, and $131.4 million for the capital side of the budget, which is at about 32% of the total budget. That percentage varies from year to year depending on the size of the redevelopment work that is going on and the level of funding we receive in the capital budget. There are also seven provisions besides adopting those numbers that are mostly ministerial. The first one provides for the terms and the schedule for publication of the adopted budget. So, after you're done, we go through some more technical reviews and bringing in some technical revisions and produce a final adopted budget book. Secondly, it affirms that all our 2023 MTW estimated incomes and expenditures are included in the budget. Thirdly, it represents that the budget has been prepared, consistent with HUD approved LAMP; that is our Local Asset Management Plan, which is included every year as part of the MTW plan, and it basically defines where we differ from the way HUD operates. A project-based budgeting system. It recognizes there are two things on tax credits in here. For the first one is recognizing that with multiple limited partners as well as SHA-owned tax credit properties, there's a need that they be operated as a seamless whole and we leave this in here to kind of apprise the limited partnerships of that might be three different limited partnerships in a community that our expectation and the way we're going to manage the budget (even though they each have a budget) is that we're going to manage it as a whole for the benefit of the residents. Secondly, the Board is approving submittal of the preliminary 2023 operating and capital budgets for the tax credit properties to the limited partnerships they have final approval of those budgets and rarely are there many changes except things that might be updates as a result of more information. For example, on what utility expenditures are likely to be next year because we've got more data from where we are this year. So, there will be some revisions like that that'll go in that partners will want to have reflected in the final budgets. Their total budgets for the seventeen partnerships are $21.2 million. Next, the Board will certify that the budget and any changes in the expenditures are consistent with provisions of law and with the MTW agreement. Finally, the Board would make it clear that the budget that you have just passed relies on the Board's, and on SHA's good faith and professional estimates of future federal appropriations that are not known to us at the time the Board passes the budget.

Ms. Yapp introduced the four upcoming presentations of Opportunity Investments (OI) in Resident Supports. The first is Youth and Education Coordinators in Family Communities presented by Rachel Stewart, the Deputy Director of Housing Operations; the second is Pathways to Permanent Supportive Housing presented by Housing Operations Director Dave Wellings; the third is Housing for Returning Citizens, presented by Policy Director Andria Lazaga; and the fourth is Information Technology Training and Mentorship Intern Program presented by IT Director Steve McDowell.

OI: Youth and Education Coordinators in Family Communities – Rachael Steward
Over the years, we've had an increase in the number of youth who are living in SHA communities and, as we have experienced the pandemic over the last two years, we've not only seen an increase in the number of young people at properties such as Yesler, where folks are returning, but also an increased need and a lack of the kind of built in supports in the broader community to meet the needs of our young people. So, this is the Housing Operations Department, and specifically the Community Services Division's effort to try and shore up what we understand to be necessary across our communities. We've been able to map out a plan to utilize to the tune of $2.4 million to increase the number of FTE (or full-time employee equivalents) to SHA communities, including Yesler, High Point, Rainier Vista, and New Holly. In the past, the structure has included having two staff

members shared across multiple properties. So, New Holly and Rainier Vista were sharing an Education Engagement Specialist and a Youth Engagement Specialist with High Point and Yesler. We're also sharing Youth Engagement Specialists and the Education Engagement Specialist. Aside from the difference in geography, the communities also have different cultural needs. They have different schools and outside of school time, resources, and so those staff members were having to try and cover a very wide breadth of need and assets within the community to meet the needs of young people and their families. So, with this, we are converting three existing positions from being specialists, which are higher cost positions to Coordinators. What's important to know about kind of the details behind these roles is that these staff members will be scheduled to work during out of school time periods more so than in school time or typical traditional business hours. Rather than having staff start the day at 9:00 AM when young people are in school, they would start later than that so that they can work later and meet the needs of young people until as late as 8:00 PM on weekdays and the like. They will be supported by utilizing the expertise in staff of the existing, or continuing Education Engagement and Youth Engagement Specialist roles. There are two full-time staff who will remain in those positions and provide leadership to the coordinators, as well as take on additional responsibility to coordinate all our various community assets that are organizations, community-based organizations and school partnerships to really enhance the investment that we're making here with staff, as well as the investments that we make in contracted supports for young people. Input for this OI came from some of our youth and residents, in that at each of our family communities, the Community Builder teams as well as the Education Youth Development teams host regular meetings with community members, and we hear from them and oftentimes they're not meetings only attended by the heads of households, or the adults; young people are there as well and they share back with us how important it is to be able to access the Education and Youth Development staff of SHA after 5:00 PM and after 6:00 PM and on the weekends. We have found that at communities such as Yesler, having a person who's very familiar with the community and can be present during multiple different hours makes a difference in helping young people to have more productive ways to spend their time rather than getting too creative with their mischief and being able to utilize some of those additional assets that we have in the neighborhoods, like our parks. The proposed $2.4 million is very much focused on staffing. There are dollars in the operating budget already for programming and what's important to notice with that is we have programming dollars that staff can utilize to have different activities and supplies in ensuring that young people get to those activities is some of the work that these Coordinators will do. These Coordinators are more like adult mentors than counselors. There is a lot of conversation in the community at large about bringing in mental health care, mental health counselors and so forth, and we've been very focused on trying to remind residents that that is a medical or health service; SHA is not hiring medical providers to bring those services right to a table in their community room, rather, we will make a referral for you. We will support you and help in navigating you to get to that support system and make sure that you're able to get that service in an environment that's appropriate for the level of need that you have. Metrics in the staffing configuration and metrics in programs to keep resident youth in school is two-fold. They have related metrics to one another. So much of what we have been focusing on with education, youth development and measuring our impact is looking at what we know and understand to be the important precursors to a young person being successful at school because just like we aren't hiring health providers to give a check up to you on site, we're also not hiring teachers to walk you through the State curriculum for math or English language arts. Rather, we want to support you in getting ready to go into that space and be a strong learner, to prepare you to have consistent attendance. So, we are looking at how we support young people and developing those non-cognitive skills and there are specific metrics and assessments that have been put together by groups such as the YDECK (Youth Development Executive Directors of King County). They've created the YP QA assessments that look at the quality of service that out of school time providers are offering to youth and so we utilize those sorts of assessments both with our contracted providers, as well as with the programming that we're doing, as well. Then related to staffing, we are constantly taking a look at what our staffing structure is, which is how we have come to this place of understanding of having staff split across multiple communities is inadequate as well as having these staff available only during business hours is inadequate; we need to have team members who are available during business hours to interact with all of our partners, including Seattle Public Schools and their administrative group. But there's this whole other host of partners and community assets that we want to be able to touch base with, and so we'll be looking at both of those elements and we'll be partnering with our team members in the Policy Office to make sure that those assessments are meaningful to the agency overall, as well as to our community members. We have a data sharing agreement with Seattle Public schools and so we are looking at how young people who are supported by our housing are doing in Seattle Public Schools, in general. However, we are not taking individual student data and matching it to our resident logs. We are very careful to respect the privacy of our students in those respects, we can see whether communities that have higher participation in our programs and in our contracted investments have also have higher incidence of on-time graduation. Regular school attendance in participation in the family engagement activities at the school district put together. So, we are paying attention to those things. We also have metrics and reports that are provided to us regularly from our contracted providers on how they measure the successes of young people in their programs.

<u>OI: Pathways to Permanent Supportive Housing – Dave Wellings</u>
In talking today about the Pathways to Permanent Supportive Housing opportunity investment and I will start just by talking a little bit about my experience in property management at SHA. I've spent seven years in various roles in, in property management here and I'll say that you know we as an agency and as property management teams do as much as we can to maintain the housing of our residents and have people be successfully housed in our communities. I think these days we do even more than when I started to maintain that housing effort. We work sometimes with some very challenging situations and residents. I personally have always viewed when having to come to a decision to evict somebody as some sense of failure. It's not necessarily like my personal failure or our failure as an agency, but just that something didn't work right. For some residents, they need different type of housing, as SHA can't provide the support needed and its difficult to evict a person that needs that help. Several of us has been interested in a while in creating a pathway to permanent supportive housing, and this is an opportunity investment to explore options to conduct a feasibility study to create a pathway for SHA residents who are not able to succeed in SHA housing due to perhaps mental or behavioral health challenges. Things that are causing them to have challenges living with the level of

independence that that we need in our buildings and to provide an option other than eviction; to provide an option of housing where they can be successful. This is a relatively small opportunity investment just as it stands; $200,000. SHA will hire a consultant to help identify options for creating a pathway to permanent supportive housing, where an SHA resident could receive the higher level of care they need and remain stably housed. Many residents have counseled SHA over the years to find options for alternative housing for their neighbors who need more care to live stably. Many residents have been recommending for years for SHA to put something like this in place due to their own experiences with fellow residents that needed additional care. We are interested in seeing consultants who do understand the permanent supportive housing landscape; what it takes to fund, manage, and finance that that type of project. Who understands partnerships between public housing authorities and nonprofits and understands the housing landscape in Seattle and in the greater Seattle area. The product will be a report of potentially feasible options and the decisions on the options and timing of any implementation will be a followed up on later.

Ms. Steward mentioned that as a region, we are very much still learning what pathways to permanent supportive housing look like. The system is very inadequate for the need in our community right now, and so there's an effort to find ways and certainly we've made investments to do that. For instance, the Behavioral Outreach program that the Policy Office is helping us to do a study on right now that partners with Sound Mental Health and SE Youth and Family Services to respond to residents who are in immediate need and crisis is some of the stopgap work that we're doing. But, as it is right now, there are not enough beds and there are not spaces and that's so much of what King County Regional Homelessness Authority is trying to solve, as well as other entities in the county and the city to meet the needs of individuals who really have health needs beyond what our public systems are built to sustain right now.

Commissioner Howard commented: I just wanted to point out to my colleagues on the Board of Commissioners and to Rod that this speaks to the issue that I raised in an e-mail about senior housing. And so, it isn't just a matter of whether you can house people stably in an SHA facility building, but also about the safety of the building and the hygiene of the building, and that these are not necessarily issues that can wait two years. It’s doing something about senior housing and continuum of care and continuum of housing that is appropriate.

Commissioner Purcell commented: I was going to raise the same question as it seems to me, we have people who, from a physical perspective, age out of their ability to stay in our housing and we have an equal responsibility not just for behavioral or mental health or other reasons. We've traditionally talked about permanent supportive housing about in terms of taking care of homeless people or people who lose their capacity to live independently. But we also have a population of people who simply physically aged out of our capacity to live by themselves in our facility and I’m assuming, or I hope that we have a similar plan.

OI: Housing for Returning Citizens – Andria Lazaga

What we are proposing here is a housing pilot that would specifically be for returning citizens, which is a growing term to refer to folks who are recently, or who are released from incarceration. Housing is such a vital platform for stability, health, jobs, and every aspect of stability and quality of life. And for many, securing affordable housing in Seattle is difficult. It's even more so for returning citizens. We also know that the criminal justice system has been disproportionately incarcerating Black men in particular and people of color, in general. For example, in Washington state, Black people make up 5% of our state, but 18% of our prison population. So, there is a tie in with our racial equity goals in the organization. We also know that people who have been incarcerated are ten times more likely to face homelessness than people who have not been incarcerated. This challenge is real; we're not the justice system and we can't reform the justice system, but what can we do as a Houser? We have already done some things several years ago under leadership and housing operations. We took, and made some intentional, thoughtful changes to our policies and procedures for applicants with criminal histories. But we know that there is more to do. Sarah Zavaleta is a Research and Evaluation Analyst in the Policy Office, and she did a great landscape analysis earlier this year to better understand the resources and gaps for housing opportunities for folks recently returning from incarceration. What she found is that there are some things that the Justice Department does to provide some shallow short-term subsidy for those who aren't returning to friends and family. But what we also found is that like that shallow short-term subsidy can only be used if the person can somehow secure the unit prior to being released and, if they can't achieve that, then they cannot take advantage of the early release that they are eligible for and will have to remain in prison until they can secure a unit, or they reach their maximum sentence. And, if they reach their maximum sentence, they're basically released into homelessness. So, there's some critical things happening at that juncture, not to say that there aren't across the spectrum. There are some successful models in our community, or at least well-regarded models for more of to provide longer term assistance to folks returning from incarceration. But they are very limited. They're very targeted for certain populations. For example, one in the county is for women, for women with children, but they're partner, if their partner is male, they're partner can join them. But only if their partner was also recently released from incarceration. So, there's lots of persnickety things that make it difficult for folks to be successfully housing after incarceration. So, what we are basing on learnings from Sarah's work, which was talking to many folks in the community who are engaged in things related to this and then thinking about what SHA's sweet spot is in this. What we're currently considering is a short-term housing program. By short term, we suggest maybe two years, which is longer than the six months that they receive from DOJ. That would allow folks the opportunity to get stably employed, get their driver's license, save up money to buy their own bed. You know, all these very important things in life so that they can be more stable when that housing assistance is available when their time is due. For those for whom living independently isn't really an option, whether it's that they financially are going to need subsidy or they need a greater supports that time, the final time period would be designed to help ensure that they would have the opportunity to come up to the top of a waiting list so that they would still remain stably housed at the end of that period. The specifics of the exact subpopulation when the referrals are going to happen - is it vouchers or hard units? - all those kinds of things, we will spend this first year trying to figure out. But first and foremost, getting more engaged with folks with lived experience and who are on the ground doing the work like A Village of Hope and the Black Prisoners Caucus are some examples of the groups that we plan to engage with early on before we get too deep into the design here. The pilot is currently planned for four years of implementation and budgeted where we could serve about 30 households or so at any given time. The length of the housing program will also dictate how many different people we could serve within that four-year period.

<u>OI: Information Technology Training & Mentorship Intern Program – Steve McDowell</u>
This opportunity investment is something that I think fits with who we are as a core at our agency and is an investment that I'm really excited to be participating in. We are partnering with Human resources for this program, and it came to fruition basically by speaking to people outside of the agency on our RSJ initiatives, noting that the IT field is not very diverse and trying to bring in diverse candidates to increase the diversity in the IT Department at SHA. To consider what some of those barriers might be, I found a lot of them are centered around both education and experience that are always required for technical positions. There are some positions that absolutely must have expertise and experience around that. But we were looking to put something together that provides an on ramp for people to get into the IT profession. So, we're looking at low-income populations that suit a fit for our agency RSJ priorities. This is not a normal intern program. We are not looking to go to the University of Washington and say, 'give me your computer science students for three months at 3/4 time', or whatever. We want to target people who may have some education, maybe a trade school, maybe a specialized curriculum and provide them an opportunity to internship at SHA for a year, a full-time internship where they can gain some experience and hopefully get them ready for another job. And if that job happens to be with SHA because we have an opening, that's even all the better. We have talked to a couple of different organizations and have gotten the ideas of what we want to do. We need to flesh out the rest of the program as we as we approach these next couple of months and are working with Human Resources to do just that. It is essential to have supports around the interns as they come in, and we will assign a mentor in IT. We're looking at three interns and we have three kinds of verticals within IT. One is around infrastructure and help desk. Another is around our applications and the last being cyber security and project management. Each one of those verticals will have an intern there and a mentor assigned to that intern to help them navigate the IT world. Then, Human Resources is going to provide some support around the program and issues that may arise that are outside of the expertise of our mentors, as well as help us get some training for our IT mentors as we start this up. We are also partnering with JobLink, as one of the challenges of placing JobLink candidates in jobs is people who even may have degrees, there are too many people who require some experience along with those degrees. And you know, we're hoping that this will help take care of that as well. This program hits on two levels - One is it helps us further SHA RSJ goals, and two, it also creates a potential pipeline into our IT departmental needs for full-time permanent staff.

Ms. Yapp closed the presentation by inviting Commissioners to reach out to staff if they wanted any additional information regarding the Proposed Annual Budget, or if they had further questions regarding the presentations to date.

Mr. Purcell then asked the Board if there were any questions, or comments pertaining to the Briefing. After hearing none, the October 10, 2022, Regular Board Briefing was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

____

Secretary-Treasurer