

PART A: AGENCY-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

I. PROJECT PIPELINE, PROCESSES, OPERATIONS, CLOSINGS AND DELIVERY

1. Please provide the following for each development project financed by DCHFA in FY25 and FY26, to date, please provide the following requested project-level information.

Response: See Tab 1.

- a.** Name;
- b.** Ward;
- c.** Number of units broken down by number of bedrooms, level of affordability, and rental vs. ownership structure; and
- d.** Types and amounts of funding that DCHFA allotted.

In addition, using the most recent multifamily pipeline milestone report, analyze the following;

e. How DCHFA defines a “healthy” pipeline in terms of timing, subsidy layering, and likelihood of closing;

Response:

A healthy pipeline for DCHFA is one that is right-sized, sequenced, and credible. Specifically, we assess health across several dimensions:

Timing: Projects demonstrate readiness, including realistic milestone schedules that reflect market conditions, construction readiness, and public approval processes, not aspirational timelines.

Financing: Sponsors have committed equity investors, construction, and senior lenders secured with executed partnership agreements, Letters of Intent, and loan documents.

Subsidy layering: Capital stacks are coordinated and internally consistent, with clear alignment among bonds, tax credits, and District subsidies, and no unresolved gaps or duplicative assumptions.

Likelihood of closing: Projects have advanced site control, zoning certainty, development team capacity, and a clear path through required approvals.

A healthy pipeline is not defined by volume alone, but by the probability that projects can convert from inducement to closing and ultimately stabilization within the established timelines while preserving public resources.

f. The number and share of projects that have experienced material delays (defined as six months or more past an anticipated milestone), and the primary causes of those delays;

Response:

In FY25, all six (6) projects in the pipeline experienced some form of material delays beyond the anticipated milestones. The delays were primarily driven by a combination of market and structural factors, including:

Financial Restructuring, as sponsors were required to secure new or revised equity and senior financing commitments in response to changing market conditions;

Timing and coordination of subordinate public financing (HPTF), including processing and receipt of District funding sources, in most cases, additional amounts above and beyond the original underwriting of the projects due to market dynamics and cost increases that are essential to project feasibility; and

Changes within development teams, including General Partners, General Contractor, and Property Management substitutions and pricing revisions, which required revalidation of budgets, schedules, partnership terms, and services.

Importantly, these delays did not reflect a lack of project viability, but rather the increased complexity of executing transactions in a volatile market environment with layered public and private capital. DCHFA continued to actively manage these projects through re-underwriting, revised milestone tracking, and close coordination with our Board, project sponsors, agency, and financing partners to position these projects for eventual closing.

g. Any concentrations of risk by ward, sponsor, financing structure, or affordability level; and

Response:

The Agency continues to monitor concentrations of risk across its portfolio to ensure early identification of potential performance challenges and to guide strategic resource deployment. Current analysis indicates that risk is not evenly distributed but instead shows identifiable clustering across several key dimensions.

From a geographic standpoint, portfolio stress is most concentrated in Wards 7 and 8, which collectively account for approximately 43% on the Agency's watchlist. These concentrations are largely driven by older multifamily and garden-style developments facing rising operating costs, deferred maintenance needs, and tenant income pressures. Properties in these wards also tend to serve deeper affordability bands, which can limit revenue flexibility.

Sponsor-level risk concentrations are relatively limited but present in a small number of sponsors with multiple aging assets financed during similar periods. These portfolios often share common characteristics, including higher leverage, limited replacement reserves, and exposure to similar market conditions. DCHFA continues to actively engage these sponsors to monitor financial health and ensure timely corrective actions.

In terms of financing structure, projects with layered financing—particularly those combining tax-exempt bonds, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits nearing the end of compliance, and soft subordinate debt—show elevated risk. As these properties approach key financial transition points, including tax credit expiration or refinancing windows, they may experience increased operating and capital pressure.

Risk is also more pronounced among properties serving extremely low-income households, where rental revenue constraints make it more difficult to absorb cost increases. While these developments remain critical to the Agency’s mission, they often require closer monitoring.

Overall, while these concentrations reflect structural and market realities rather than systemic portfolio weakness, the Agency’s ongoing surveillance framework allows the Agency to proactively identify trends, prioritize resources, and mitigate potential long-term impacts on affordability preservation.

h. What actions DCHFA takes when a project remains stalled in the pipeline for an extended period, including when and how the agency decides to restructure, pause, or exit a deal.

Response:

When a project remains stalled in the pipeline for an extended period, DCHFA applies a structured and graduated management approach focused on preserving viable deals while protecting public resources.

Key actions include:

Active monitoring and re-assessment: DCHFA conducts ongoing milestone reviews to determine whether delays are market-driven, sponsor-specific, or structural, and whether the project continues to demonstrate a credible path to closing.

Targeted restructuring: Where appropriate, the agency works with sponsors to restructure transactions, including resizing loan amounts, revising capital stacks, updating pricing assumptions, or adjusting delivery schedules to reflect current market conditions.

Board-authorized extensions: During FY25, DCHFA communicated with its Board in real time to extend eligibility and inducement resolutions to prevent viable projects from expiring and being forced to restart the readiness process. These extensions preserved deal continuity while sponsors obtained revised equity commitments, financing approvals, or resolved development team changes.

These actions reflect a balance between flexibility and discipline, ensuring that projects are not prematurely abandoned due to temporary market disruptions, while maintaining accountability and stewardship over public funds.

Please identify any pipeline risks that concern the agency heading into FY26 and explain why.

Response:

Heading into FY26, the agency is closely monitoring two (2) key pipeline risks:

- **Federal LIHTC equity investment:** Equity pricing and investor appetite remain sensitive to interest rates, regulatory uncertainty, and portfolio concentration limits, which can affect project feasibility, timing, and the amount of gap financing required.
- **Availability of soft debt:** Many projects rely on subordinate public subsidies to close financing gaps. Limited availability, delayed approvals, or misaligned timing of soft debt awards can slow execution and increase carry risk, even for otherwise viable transactions.

DCHFA continues to mitigate these risks through conservative underwriting, early feasibility testing, and close coordination with financing partners to ensure projects advance only when capital sources are sufficiently aligned.

2. Please provide the most recent project milestone report for multifamily pipeline projects.

Response: See Tab 2.

3. Please provide the current balance and allowable uses of each special, reserve, and other fund maintained by DCHFA. In addition, explain how DCHFA determines whether existing reserves are sufficient to address portfolio risk, market volatility, or project underperformance, and identify any gaps the agency believes exist under current reserve structures.

Response: Not Applicable

4. Please provide an update on the Housing Investment Platform single family program. In addition, evaluate the program's effectiveness to date, including cost per unit, time to delivery, geographic distribution, and whether current barriers suggest structural limits to scaling the program under existing conditions.

Response: See Tab 3. and

The Housing Investment Platform (HIP) has invested in six (6) single-family projects across the District in partnership with emerging developers, delivering 52 for-sale units to date, with 27 additional units in the pipeline, for a total of 79 units upon completion. The Agency has deployed approximately \$5 million in patient, below-market capital to support homeownership opportunities for households earning 50%–120% of AMI, with approximately 85% of units serving the “missing middle” at 120% AMI. Program activity has been concentrated in Wards 7 and 8, introducing new starter-home inventory in neighborhoods with historically limited attainable for-sale housing.

From a performance standpoint, total development costs per unit range from approximately \$333,000 to \$539,000, reflecting rising land, construction, and financing costs. Construction durations have ranged from nine months to over four years, and sales absorption periods have increased from one month in early projects to as long as 21 months in more recent developments as mortgage rates rose and buyer purchasing power declined.

While HIP's patient capital and developer partnerships have enabled projects to move forward despite these headwinds, the data indicate that scaling the program under current conditions faces structural limits. Single-family projects are capital- and staff-intensive, yield fewer units per dollar invested, and are highly sensitive to construction cost inflation, interest rate volatility, and buyer qualification constraints. As a result, HIP is best positioned as a targeted homeownership and neighborhood stabilization tool, rather than a high-volume production platform, absent changes to subsidy availability, financing tools, or delivery structure.

5. Please describe DCHFA's role in the Qualified Action Plan process and explain how the agency's technical input influences feasibility, cost containment, and project viability. Identify any recurring issues DCHFA raises during QAP review and whether those concerns have been addressed in final allocations.

Response:

DCHFA's role in the QAP process was technical and advisory. The QAP is developed and administered by DHCD, and DCHFA provided input on financing mechanics, market conditions, and feasibility considerations related to LIHTC equity, debt sizing, construction costs, and bond execution. DCHFA shared technical guidance and market observations during the QAP development process; however, the agency does not control QAP policy decisions or final scoring criteria. DCHFA continues to coordinate with DHCD during implementation to manage execution risk and support projects as they move from award to closing.

6. Please list all programs, products, and initiatives that develop revenue for the agency and provide a disaggregated list noting how much each has brought the agency in FY25 and FY26, to date. In addition, please assess the stability and predictability of these revenue sources and identify any risks associated with over-reliance on particular programs.

Response:

	Audited		Unaudited	
	FY25		2QFY26	
Interest Income	\$	8,058,728	\$	1,410,461
Multifamily Program		34,569,018		6,355,284
Single Family		312,974		58,423
Misc Other Income		954,436		153,847
	\$	43,895,156	\$	7,978,015

7. Please list the events, information sessions, or other public meetings that DCHFA held in FY25 and FY26, to date, to inform the public about its programs. For each, please list the total attendance and how the agency advertised the event.

Response:

DCHFA’s Business Development and Outreach Manager for Single Family Programs conducts virtual lender and realtor training twice per month to empower them with accurate information to share with their clients about DCHFA’s homeownership resources. Lenders and realtors register for training via the Agency’s website.

The Business Development and Outreach Manager take DCHFA’s message to the community by partnering and participating in several events including those sponsored by DC government agencies, community-based organizations, realtors and lenders. Events are shared with the public via the Agency’s Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn and X accounts. In addition, the homebuyer webinars are advertised in *The Washington Informer*.

DCHFA advertises all of the Agency’s homeownership programs monthly in *The Washington Informer*, *Mid-City*, *Hill Rag*, and *East of the River Magazines* in its print and online editions. Ads were also specifically purchased to promote DCHFA’s Homeownership Fair (June 21, 2025) in *El Tiempo Latino*, Nextdoor app, *The Washington Informer* and WPGC. The fair was also promoted through interviews on Fox5, WIN TV and WPGC. There were 200 attendees at the homeownership fair.

In January 2025, the Agency launched The Pathway to Homeownership series of information sessions highlighting DCHFA’s homeownership resources. This series is

being advertised in *Mid-City*, *Hill Rag*, and *East of the River Magazines* and DCHFA's social media.

- NOE (Notice of Eligibility) Town Halls – FY25

Served 200+ NOE holders with an average attendance of approximately 62 participants per session. Sessions filled post-HUD education gaps and included lenders, realtors, appraisers, inspectors, insurance providers, and Operation HOPE. One in-person event was held in September 2025. Feedback reflected increased understanding and program demand.

- ANC 4B Housing Justice Committee Meeting (October 2, 2024)

Engaged 38–42 constituents. Provided agency overview, DCHFA and HPAP education, and addressed buyer commission questions related to down payment assistance.

- Mentoring Through Athletics Homeownership Workshop (November 16, 2024)

Partnered with Mentoring Through Athletics at Ferebee-Hope Recreation Center. Led to interest from DC Parks & Recreation for future expansion. 23 attendees

- Homefront: Honoring Our Veterans and Building Wealth Through Real Estate (November 10, 2024)

Partnered with Washington Real Estate Brokers Association and the DC Association (an arm of NAREB). Presented on DCHFA and how the agency supports affordable homeownership in DC. Attended by approximately 42 external stakeholders.

- Path to Homeownership – Lafayette Federal Credit Union (November 23, 2024)

Engaged approximately 20 community members interested in DCHFA programs and pathways to DC homeownership.

- Industrial Bank – “Home for the Holidays” Outreach (December 14, 2024)

Engaged with approximately 42 attendees which led to a larger partnership with Industrial Bank related to community projects they execute on behalf of returning citizens.

- DC Decades Community Event (February 8, 2025)

Engaged 50+ DC residents; 42 converted to DCHFA homebuyer webinar attendance.

- UDC Career & Community Expo (April 6, 2025)

In-person tabling event reaching approximately 20+ participant conversations among students and UDC staff, with 50+ overall interactions. A live radio interview with WHUR was conducted during the event arranged by DCHFA PR, giving a brief overview of the agency and the information we had for constituents during the event. Created an interest

from UDC to have DCHFA’s Business Development Manager present to staff at all campuses. This effort is still being coordinated.

- House of Ruth Open House (June 24, 2025)

Outreach support event strengthening nonprofit housing partnerships. 18 attendees

- First-Time Homebuyers Event – Busboys & Poets (June 26, 2025)

Partnered with RM Simpson Real Estate Brokerage; presented alongside lenders, home inspectors, and a title company. Attended by approximately 30 participants.

- MANNA Level Up Homeownership Expo (June 28, 2025)

Held at Martha’s Table; engaged 100+ community members as part of ongoing support for community-based organizations.

- DMV Made Event – National Mall (July 26, 2025)

Event attendance exceeded 1,000. Direct engagement with 100+ attendees; 60+ converted to homebuyer webinar participation.

TARGETED HOMEBUYER EDUCATION

- Homebuyer Webinar Series – FY25

Conducted 16 webinars. Transitioned after the June homeownership fair to a two-part model with Operation HOPE: Tuesday focused on financial well-being, credit, savings, and preparation; Wednesday focused on DCHFA and co-administered programs with a live lender case study on capital stacking. Resulted in strong engagement and multiple conversions into the homeownership pipeline.

- Breaking Barriers, Building Legacies – Returning Citizens Homebuyer Series (FY25)

Developed partnership with Industrial Bank, MORCA (the Mayor’s Office on Returning Citizens Affairs) and Director Carey. Seven-month monthly webinar series featuring DCHFA and housing stakeholders (realtors, inspectors, insurance providers). Highlighted in the Mayor’s newsletter at launch. Average attendance was approximately 28 participants per session, with 12 participants beginning the process of purchasing homes in the District of Columbia utilizing a DCHFA program or one of our programs in conjunction with a program we co-administer.

STAKEHOLDER & INDUSTRY OUTREACH

- Virtual Lender Training Series (“Lender Talk”) – FY25

Conducted 23 trainings with average attendance of approximately 52 lenders. Held on the second and fourth Friday of each month at 10:00 a.m. EST. Included real-time updates, a Marketing Minute, live Q&A, guest speakers (Fannie Mae, Down Payment Resource,

Operation HOPE), and Underwriter’s Corner (fourth Friday). Produced a living Lender Q&A/FAQ and contributed to improved file quality and reduced turnaround times.

- Realtor Training & Engagement – FY25

Conducted 6 realtor trainings (including one large virtual session) with average attendance of approximately 29 per event. Realtors were also invited to join lender training and observe two-part homebuyer webinars. Increased realtor fluency and advocacy for DPA-backed contracts, improving seller-side understanding and acceptance.

8. What counseling does HFA offer and/or advertise to support program recipients, and how does the agency assess whether those referrals are sufficient to prevent downstream issues such as loan failure, delinquency, or foreclosure?

Response:

DCHFA does not employ HUD-certified counselors nor does it offer direct counseling services. However, we are committed to ensuring that program recipients receive the guidance they need. We refer individuals to our trusted community-based organization (CBO) partners, who provide professional housing counseling services tailored to various needs, including homeownership, financial literacy, and foreclosure prevention. There is a list of CBOs that participate in the HPAP application process on DCHFA’s [website](#). Housing Counseling Services tags the Agency in its seminar posts on Instagram and X and DCHFA reposts these events.

9. Please provide a list of all affordability covenants that are expiring within the next 5 calendar years in DCHFA’s portfolio, the financing tool(s) that were used on that project, and DCHFA’s strategy to create new affordable covenants on those properties. Please explain DCHFA’s strategy for prioritizing which properties to preserve, including what criteria is used when resources are constrained.

Response: See Tab 4 and

Over the next five years, 43 projects in the Agency’s portfolio will reach the end of their tax credit compliance period. During this same timeframe, 10 additional projects have already redeemed, bringing the total number of affected projects to 53.

Of the 43 projects approaching compliance expiration, 19 are currently on the Agency’s watchlist, reflecting heightened monitoring and potential risk.

DCHFA’s role is not to designate or prioritize preservation projects, but to facilitate financing, including tax-exempt bonds, Risk Share loans, and other tools, once projects are in a readiness position and have been selected or advanced through District-led processes. The agency engages when sponsors are prepared to enter DCHFA’s readiness and underwriting process to support execution and extension of affordability.

10. Please provide a detailed breakdown of soft costs (legal, consulting, architectural, syndication, developer overhead) for all HFA projects closed in FY25 and FY26, to date, and identify any projects where soft costs exceeded 20% of total development cost? In addition, please identify:

Response: See Tab 5 and

a. What policies, guidelines or caps does DCHFA enforce on allowable soft costs in subsidized projects and at what stage(s) of underwriting or closing are these limits applied?

Response:

DCHFA does not impose fixed caps on allowable soft costs. Instead, soft costs are evaluated for reasonableness, eligibility, and consistency with an approved development budget during underwriting, document review, and throughout the construction draw process.

b. Does DCHFA require open-book accounting or third-party audits of soft costs before closing? If so, how many audits in the last three years resulted in cost reductions or claw backs?

Response:

DCHFA does not require open-book accounting or third-party audits as a standard condition prior to closing. Soft costs are reviewed through the requisition and draw process, which requires adequate backup documentation and a DCHFA-approved budget status report (BSR). Only eligible, project-related expenses are funded; costs not applicable to the project are not reimbursed.

c. For projects with stacked subsidies (Ex: LIHTC + HPTF + PILOT), how does DCHFA verify that soft costs billed to multiple funding sources are not duplicative?

Response:

For projects with stacked subsidies, DCHFA reviews all draw requests centrally and processes them through the bond trustee. This review ensures that expenses are not duplicated across funding sources, and duplicative requests are not approved for payment.

11. The Committee understands that DCHFA manages the 4% LIHTC process. Please address the following:

Response:

a. Whether DCHFA believes it has the institutional capacity and expertise to administer the 9% LIHTC program;

While DCHFA has deep expertise in bond-financed transactions, 4% LIHTC execution, and credit underwriting, the agency is not currently structured or resourced to administer the 9% LIHTC program, which involves a distinct competitive allocation process, compliance monitoring framework, and ongoing asset management oversight.

b. The potential benefits and risks of consolidating 4% and 9% LIHTC administration within DCHFA;

1. Consolidating 4% and 9% LIHTC administration could offer theoretical efficiencies in underwriting alignment and policy coordination. However, it would also introduce significant risks, including dilution of focus from DCHFA's core financing mission, increased administrative burden, and the need to replicate systems and expertise that already exist elsewhere within the District at DHCD. Additionally, DCHFA could face an elevated risk of a potential credit rating downgrade by assuming administration responsibility due to uncertainty within the portfolio, compounded by declining market conditions. Ongoing financial stress in certain properties, increased operating costs, and softening real estate fundamentals may negatively affect key performance indicators that rating agencies monitor, including asset quality, debt service coverage, and overall portfolio stability.

c. Any operational, funding, or governance constraints that would need to be addressed to do so; and

Administering the 9% program would require additional staffing, dedicated compliance infrastructure, IT systems, legal authority, and ongoing operating funding, as well as changes to governance and oversight structures. These requirements would be substantial and are not currently contemplated within DCHFA's current mandate or budget.

What legislative or interagency changes would be required to enable this shift. Any shift in responsibility would require legislative action, revisions to existing statutes and interagency agreements, and a formal reallocation of resources and authority between District agencies. The Agency cannot opine on what specific interagency measures need to be taken as DHCD is officially recognized by the IRS and the District's allocating agency. At this time, DCHFA's focus remains on effective administration of the 4% LIHTC and bond financing platform, while coordinating with DHCD to support feasibility and execution across the broader affordable housing system.

II. DC OPEN DOORS & HOME PURCHASE ASSISTANCE

PROGRAM (HPAP) ADMINISTRATION

12. How many DC Open Doors loans did DCHFA award, and what was the total amount awarded, in FY245 and FY26, to date? [Identify any disparities in outcomes among different demographic groups and describe how DCHFA is addressing these inequities.] Please provide breakdowns for both applicants and recipients by:

- a. Average income;
- b. Race;
- c. Gender;
- d. Age; and
- e. Ward.

Using the demographic breakdowns requested above, please identify any material disparities in application approval or loan receipt outcomes and explain the factors that DCHFA believes contribute to those disparities.

Response:

FY25 Applicants – 53 Total Applicants

FY25 Recipients – 40 mortgage loans funded in the amount of \$13,265,991.00.

FY26 Applicants – 18 Total Applicants

FY26 Recipients – six (6)mortgage loans funded in the amount of \$1,982,106.00.

Based on the FY25 and FY26 (to date) application and recipient data, no material disparities are evident in loan approval outcomes across race, gender, age, income, or ward. Approval patterns closely mirror application volumes, indicating that once applicants engage with the program, they are receiving outcomes that are proportional and equitable across demographic groups.

However, disparities in application rates—not approvals—do appear across demographic segments. These disparities stem from broader structural and economic conditions rather than inequities within DCHFA’s underwriting or program administration:

Ward-Based Differences

- Wards 7 and 8 show the highest application and approval activity, reflecting both greater awareness and greater need for down payment assistance.
- Wards 2 and 3 show low participation, largely driven by higher home prices that exceed income qualification thresholds for most moderate-income households.

Racial and Ethnic Representation

- African American residents represent the majority of applicants and recipients, concentrated in Wards 7 and 8.

- Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and some mixed-race applicant groups appear in significantly lower numbers.
- These differences are attributed to varying levels of program awareness, communications reach, and housing market differences—not to differences in approval likelihood.

Income-Driven Dynamics

- Lower-income applicants in Wards 7 and 8 participate—and are approved—at high rates, showing that the program is functioning as designed.
- Higher-income wards show lower participation because fewer households qualify for assistance or face affordability barriers due to significantly higher home prices.

Age Distribution

- The 27–42 and 43–58 age groups dominate applications and approvals, consistent with typical homebuying patterns.
- Limited participation from 18–26 residents is likely due to lower early-career income, higher student debt, and insufficient savings, not approval disparities.

Gender Representation

- Gender distributions among applicants and recipients track closely, showing no approval gap between male and female applicants.
- Variations across wards represent participation trends—not unequal outcomes.

DCOD Applicant Information FY25

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age 18-26	Age 27-42	Age 43-58	Age 59+
1	1	3	1			\$91,241	1	4		2		3
2			1		1	\$127,503	2		1	1		
3			1	1		\$114,272	2			1	1	
4		7				\$93,798	3	4		4	3	
5		3			2	\$116,963	1	4		3	2	
6		1			1	\$118,139	1	1		2		
7		19		2	1	\$109,261	11	11	1	10	10	1
8		8				\$83,819	5	3		4	3	1

DCOD Recipient Information FY25

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age 18-26	Age 27-42	Age 43-58	Age 59+
1	1	1	1			\$105,708	1	2		2		1
2			1		1	\$127,503	2		1	1		
3				1		\$165,172	1				1	
4		4				\$82,787	2	2		2	2	
5		3			2	\$116,963	1	4		3	2	
6					1	\$186,877	1			1		
7		16			1	\$107,572	7	10	1	7	8	1
8		7				\$82,280	4	3		4	2	1

DCOD Applicant Information FY26

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age 18-26	Age 27-42	Age 43-58	Age 59+
1					1	\$89,546		1		1		
2			1			\$140,000	1				1	
3		2	1			\$130,957	1	2		1	1	1
4		1				\$148,488		1		1		
5		2	1			\$66,659	1	2	1	1	1	
6												
7		3				\$78,175	3			2	1	
8		6				\$101,901	2	4	2	2	2	

DCOD Recipient Information FY26

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age 18-26	Age 27-42	Age 43-58	Age 59+
1												
2												
3		1	1			\$141,939	1	1			1	1
4												
5		1				\$50,000	1		1			
6												
7		2				\$72,208	2			1	1	
8		1				\$111,069		1			1	

13. Please provide the total amount of Down Payment Assistance Loans provided in FY25 and FY26, to date and explain how DCHFA evaluates whether current funding levels are sufficient to meet demand.

Response:

FY25 Recipients – 30 Down Payment Assistance loans funded in the amount of \$522,662.00.

FY26 Recipients – 4 Down Payment Assistance loans funded in the amount of \$41,873.00.

DCOD’s mission is to align with traditional 1st mortgage housing finance program guidelines. To continue to meet the needs of the communities that we serve, additional down payment funding options are in development at the agency.

14. Please provide an update to the Committee on DCHFA’s assessment of the effectiveness of DC Open Doors in achieving its intended homeownership outcomes, including design limitations or legislative changes the agency believes are needed to improve program performance.

Response:

DC Open Doors (DCOD) continues to be an effective tool for expanding homeownership among moderate-income District residents. The program consistently helps borrowers overcome the most common barriers to homeownership—primarily down payment and closing cost requirements—and supports strong participation from residents in Wards 7 and 8, where the need for assistance is greatest.

Program Effectiveness

DCOD is meeting its intended outcomes by increasing access to mortgage credit, reducing upfront costs, and supporting first-time and first-generation homebuyers. Borrower performance and sustained demand indicate that the program provides a stable and accessible homeownership pathway.

Design Limitations

Several market and structural constraints impact program reach:

Housing affordability in high-cost wards limits the ability of income-eligible borrowers to purchase homes in those areas.

Interest rate volatility reduces purchasing power.

Income limits do not always align with the realities of DC’s high housing prices.

Awareness gaps persist among immigrant and non-English-speaking residents.

Recommended Improvements

To strengthen program performance and expand access, DCHFA recommends:

Increased down payment assistance levels to keep pace with market conditions.

More flexible income rules, especially for larger households and first-generation buyers.

Targeted support for first-generation homebuyers, including enhanced assistance or lower interest rates.

15. In your role as an HPAP administrator, please provide the total number of people in each of the following categories and the total per month in FY25 and FY26, to date. Identify any disparities in outcomes among different demographic groups and describe how DCHFA is addressing these inequities:

- a. Applicants;**
- b. Recipients of Notices of Eligibility and average time elapsed since application for these recipients;**
- c. Recipient of loans and average time elapsed since receiving a Notice of Eligibility for these recipients**

HPAP LOTTERY Applicants and time elapsed from NOE Application to NTP Issuance FY25

FY 25 Month	HPAP LOTTERY Applicants	HPAP NTP Recipients	Average Days Elapsed
January 2025	15	14	5
February 2025	6	5	2
March 2025	1	1	1
April 2025			
May 2025	1	1	1
June 2025	4	3	1
July 2025	2	2	1
August 2025	1	1	1
September 2025			
October 2024	51	46	13
November 2024	58	49	13
December 2024	27	26	5

HPAP Applicants and time elapsed from NOE Application to NTP Issuance FY26

FY 26 Month	HPAP Applicants	HPAP NTP Recipients	Average Days Elapsed
October 2025	N/A	N/A	N/A
November 2025	75	6	4
December 2025	99	71	24
January 2026	20	40	10

In addition, please:

Response:

d. Define what DCHFA considers an acceptable processing timeline for HPAP;

DCHFA considers HPAP a transaction-based, time-sensitive homeownership assistance program that must align with residential purchase contract timelines. As such, DCHFA defines acceptable processing timelines using stage-based service standards, recognizing that portions of the process are outside the agency’s direct control and depend on applicants, housing counseling agencies, lenders, and DHCD.

DCHFA’s service expectation for its administrative role is:

NOE Package Review to Notice to Proceed (NTP) Issuance:

DCHFA targets issuance of the NTP within 10–15 calendar days of receipt of a complete and eligible NOE package assigned to DCHFA.

The issuance of the NTP authorizes the borrower to begin the home shopping process and provides certainty regarding the maximum HPAP assistance amount for which the borrower qualifies.

e. Assess whether current performance meets that standard;

DCHFA’s FY25 performance met and exceeded its internal service expectations for the NOE-to-NTP phase.

The longest NOE-to-NTP processing time in FY25 was 13 calendar days, occurring in October 2024.

The shortest NOE-to-NTP processing time was 1 calendar day, consistently achieved from March through August 2025.

These results demonstrate that once DCHFA receives a complete and eligible NOE package, the agency can perform its review and issue NTPs efficiently and predictably.

f. Describe specific changes implemented in FY25-FY26 to address delays; and

During FY25 and into FY26, DCHFA and DHCD implemented process changes designed to address historical delays and improve consistency across HPAP administrators.

At the beginning of FY26, DHCD implemented a revised intake and assignment process: Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) now submit NOE packages directly to DHCD.

DHCD determines which HPAP administrator will process the file.

Once assigned, DCHFA reviews the NOE package, performs its analysis, and issues the Notice to Proceed (NTP).

Following NTP issuance, the borrower may begin the home shopping process with clarity regarding the HPAP assistance amount available.

This redesign improved front-end alignment, reduced duplicative review, and allowed administrators to focus on analysis, compliance, and execution rather than intake routing.

g. Identify remaining structural or interagency barriers that limit further improvement.

Despite improvements, several factors continue to affect overall HPAP timelines:

File completeness and documentation quality, particularly household-level income and asset verification.

Market-driven pressures, including appraisal delays, contract deadlines, and rate-lock expirations.

16. In your role as an HPAP administrator, please provide the total dollar amount of HPAP loans funded in FY25 and FY26, to date, broken down by month.

Response:

FY25 Recipients – 141 HPAP loans funded in the amount of \$18,194,772.00

FY25 Recipients – 3 EAHP loans funded in the amount of \$129,000.00

FY26 Recipients – 14 HPAP loans funded in the amount of \$2,135,688

FY26 Recipients – 5 EAHP loans funded in the amount of \$112,594.00

HPAP Funded Loans FY25

FY 25 Month	HPAP Closed Loans	HPAP Funded Amount
January 2025	59	\$7,363,268
February 2025	34	\$4,826,233
March 2025	4	\$593,074
April 2025		
May 2025	1	\$186,050
June 2025	1	\$105,000
July 2025	3	\$435,800
August 2025	2	\$265,598
September 2025		
October 2024		
November 2024		
December 2024	37	\$4,419,749

Total Loans: 141

Total Funded: \$18,194,772.00

HPAP Funded Loans FY26

FY 26 Month	HPAP Closed Loans	HPAP Funded Amount
October 2025	N/A	N/A
November 2025	N/A	N/A
December 2025	5	\$896,209
January 2026	9	\$1,239,479
Total Loans: 14		Total Funded: \$2,135,688

EAHP Funded Loans FY25

FY 25 Month	EAHP Closed Loans	EAHP Funded Amount
January 2025		
February 2025		
March 2025		
April 2025		
May 2025		
June 2025		
July 2025		
August 2025	3	\$129,000.00
September 2025		
October 2024		
November 2024		
December 2024		
Total Loans: 3		Total Funded: \$129,000.00

EAHP Funded Loans FY26

FY 26 Month	EAHP Closed Loans	EAHP Funded Amount
October 2025	N/A	N/A
November 2025	N/A	N/A
December 2025	1	\$17,594
January 2026	4	\$95,000
Total Loans: 5		Total Funded: \$112,594.00

17. What steps did DCHFA take to work with DHCD on addressing delays in the HPAP process? What changes were implemented to address delays in FY25 and FY26, to date? Please share your evaluation of the rollout of the changes, including any additional refinements DCHFA intends to make.

Response:

DCHFAs has worked closely with DHCD to address HPAP delays through structured collaboration and process redesign. These efforts included:

Joint identification of recurring delay drivers.

Alignment on eligibility interpretation and submission standards.

Implementation of a more comprehensive lender submission checklist.

Clear sequencing between eligibility determination and authorization to shop for a home.

Evaluation of FY26 rollout

DCHFAs initial evaluation indicates that the revised FY26 process:

Clarifies roles and responsibilities among CBOs, DHCD, and administrators.

Preserves strong NOE-to-NTP performance once files are assigned.

Improves borrower readiness by ensuring assistance amounts are known prior to home shopping.

a. What additional changes does DCHFAs see as opportunities to improve the effectiveness of HPAP?

Response:

DCHFAs sees opportunities to further improve HPAP through:

Publication of stage-based performance metrics.

Strengthened pre-submission readiness controls.

Expanded training and technical assistance for CBOs and lenders.

DCHFAs will continue to work with DHCD to monitor outcomes and identify opportunities for further refinement.

III. ReMIT

18. Please provide an assessment of the Reverse Mortgage Insurance & Tax Payment (ReMIT) program for FY25 and FY26, to date, including:

- a. Total assistance provided and remaining funds available;**
- b. Demographic characteristics of applicants and recipients;**
- c. Whether DCHFAs considers ReMIT to function as a foreclosure prevention program.**

Response:

DCHFAs considers ReMIT to function as a targeted foreclosure risk mitigation program for seniors with reverse mortgages. The program assists eligible homeowners by

addressing delinquent property taxes, insurance, and condominium or HOA fees that may trigger default and foreclosure risk.

If DCHFA does not consider ReMIT to be a foreclosure prevention tool:

d. Explain why; and

Response:

While ReMIT mitigates foreclosure risk for a defined population, it does not function as a comprehensive foreclosure prevention program.

e. Identify what programmatic or legislative changes would be required for it to function as one.

Response:

Expansion would require:

Broader statutory authority and eligible uses.

Dedicated, recurring funding.

Formalized servicer participation.

Integration with foreclosure counseling and legal services.

f. A breakdown of applicants by average income, race, gender, age, and ward.

ReMIT Applicant Information FY25

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age(s)
1		1				\$20,638	1		77
2		1	1			\$21,218	2		77, 83
3			1			\$43,148	1		82
4		6				\$29,450	3	3	72,74,75,77,77,80
5		10				\$35,031	1	9	73,74,75,75,75,77,77,84,88,88
6									
7		4				\$30,905	1	3	73,77,79,93
8		1				\$17,670		1	73

g. A breakdown of recipients by average income, race, gender, age, and ward.

ReMIT Recipient Information FY25

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age(s)
1		1				\$20,638	1		77
2		1	1			\$21,218	2		77, 83
3			1			\$43,148	1		82
4		5				\$32,766	2	3	72,74,77,77,80

5		10				\$35,031	1	9	73,74,75,75,75,77,77,84,88,88
6									
7		3				\$29,659	1	2	73,77,93
8		1				\$17,670		1	73

Please also assess whether there is a need for a separate foreclosure prevention program for seniors beyond ReMIT.

Response:

There may be a need for additional senior-focused foreclosure prevention tools for risks not addressed by ReMIT. The need for any such program should be assessed by several District agencies and external stakeholders and coordinated with existing District foreclosure counseling and prevention resources to avoid duplication and maximize impact.

19. Please explain any outreach and/or partnerships that have been instituted to advance the ReMIT program and reach seniors who may be interested in the available assistance.

Response:

In August 2024 DCHFA relaunched the ReMIT program and announced it by distributing a [press release](#). The reopening of the program was covered by news organizations [The Washington Informer](#) and [Mortgage Professionals Magazine](#). Both articles were shared via DCHFA’s social media Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn and X. The Agency also created a social media campaign about the relaunch of the program and continued to post information about the program periodically. Paid advertising campaigns were purchased in *The Washington Informer*.

DCHFA created ReMIT flyers and provided them to the Department of Aging for distribution to its constituents. DCHFA’s Business Development and Outreach Manager was also provided with print and electronic versions of the flyer to share information about the program. In addition, ReMIT is included in the DHCD’s DC Housing brochure.

If ReMIT continues the Agency will promote the program with District agencies, Senior-serving organizations, and housing counseling agencies.

Community-based education and enrollment efforts.

Targeted communication with servicers, condominium associations, and HOAs.

Outreach

20. How much funding for ReMIT is currently available for distribution?

Response:

There are no remaining funds for ReMIT. The funding was fully expended in April of 2025.

21. The ReMIT program is often seen as a foreclosure prevention program. Does DCHFA agree with this assessment of the program and if not, what would need to change for the ReMIT program to function as a foreclosure prevention program?

a. Does DCHFA see a need for ReMIT to function as a foreclosure prevention program?

Response: Please see response to Q.18.

b. Does DCHFA see a need for a separate foreclosure prevention program to be created?

Response: Please see response to Q.18.

22. Please provide an update to the Committee on DCHFA’s assessment of the effectiveness of this program and if there are any legislative updates needed to improve its administrability.

Response: Please see response to Q.18.

IV. DC4ME

23. Please provide an assessment of the DC4ME program for FY25 and FY26, to date, including:

a. Number and dollar amount of loans funded;

Response:

FY25 Applicants – 7 Total Applicants

FY25 Recipients – 4 mortgage loans funded in the amount of \$1,371,925.00.

FY26 Applicants – 2 Total Applicants

FY26 Recipients – 0 mortgage loans funded in the amount of \$0.00.

DC4ME Applicant Information FY25

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age 18-26	Age 27-42	Age 43-58	Age 59+
1		1				\$40,075		1		1		
2												
3												
4		1	1	1		\$121,453	1	2		2		1
5												

6												
7		2				\$117,500		2		1	1	
8		1				\$70,000	1			1		

DC4ME Recipient Information FY25

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age 18-26	Age 27-42	Age 43-58	Age 59+
1		1				\$40,075		1		1		
2												
3												
4		1	1	1		\$121,453	1	2		2		1
5												
6												
7												
8												

DC4ME Applicant Information FY26

Ward	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic/Latino	Refused	Average Income	Gender Male	Gender Female	Age 18-26	Age 27-42	Age 43-58	Age 59+
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8		2				\$75,825		2		2		

b. Demographic outcomes for applicants and recipients; and Response:

While, DCHFA is tracking demographic characteristics of DC4ME applicants and recipients, including income levels and geographic distribution, to ensure the program is aligned with District equity and workforce housing goals there is minimal data to determine outcomes.

c. Whether the program is meeting its workforce housing objectives.

Response:

d.

DC4ME is intended to support District government employees by improving affordability and access to homeownership. Based on FY25 and FY26-to-date activity, DCHFA continues to evaluate utilization levels, borrower profiles, and affordability impacts to determine whether the program meets its workforce housing objectives and to identify opportunities for enhancement.

Additionally, please identify any disparities in outcomes and explain whether program design or eligibility criteria contribute to those disparities. Please note any legislative changes DCHFA recommends to improve program effectiveness.

Response:

DCHFA does not attribute the lower utilization of DC4ME to disparities in eligibility or access among District government employees. Rather, the primary factor affecting program uptake in FY25 and FY26 to date has been market-driven interest rate competitiveness.

Specifically: Interest rate sensitivity is the primary driver of borrower and lender decision-making. In the current rate environment, participating lenders are often able to secure lower first trust interest rates through conventional market products than those available under DC4ME at the time of application.

Borrowers are highly rate-sensitive, particularly workforce households balancing affordability, debt-to-income ratios, and monthly payment constraints. Even modest rate differentials can materially impact purchasing power and qualification outcomes. Lender recommendations reflect market conditions, not program restrictions. Where lenders identify more competitive rate options outside DC4ME, borrowers frequently pursue those alternatives, resulting in fewer DC4ME conversions from applicant to closing.

No demographic or eligibility barriers have been identified that would suggest disparate treatment or inequitable access across protected classes or income groups. Applicant profiles reflect the intended workforce population, but conversion to closing is constrained by relative product competitiveness.

DCHFAs continues to monitor DC4ME utilization and recognizes that interest rate competitiveness is central to the program’s effectiveness. Opportunities to improve outcomes may include periodic rate adjustments, enhanced rate buydown options, or structural changes that allow DC4ME to remain competitive in varying interest rate environments.

V. LEVEL 1 RISK SHARE PROGRAM

24. For the DCHFAs/HUD: Level 1 Risk Share Program, please provide for FY25 and FY26, to date:

1. The number of developers, by ward, who have benefited from the program;

Response: 17

2. The number of units rehabilitated and constructed, by ward, with assistance from the program; and

Response: 2514 units encompassing 24 projects

3. The number of affordable units, by level of affordability and by ward, rehabilitated and constructed with assistance from the program.

Response: There are 2,514 units under the Risk Share Program located in every Ward except Ward 3.

In addition, please explain how DCHFAs evaluates the program’s risk exposure relative to the public leverage achieved.

Response: DCHFAs consistently monitors property conditions on an annual—and, for certain risk-share properties, semiannual—basis. Financial reviews are conducted quarterly, and the Agency holds monthly meetings with property operators.

VI. PORTFOLIO STABILIZATION GRANT

25. For the Portfolio Stabilization Grant, please provide for FY25 and FY26, to date:

1. The number of applications received;

Response: 55 applications were received.

2. The number of recipients, by ward; and

Response: A total of 55 awardees across every Ward, with the exception of Ward 3.

3. The total award amount for each grantee.

Response:

Awards ranged from \$50,000 to \$250,000, based on the program’s established criteria. The funding matrix was developed using project size and watchlist status as key factors. The Agency’s watchlist consists of three phases—Pre-Watchlist, Moderate, and Severe—each defined by specific financial benchmarks, property conditions, and sponsorship/borrower performance metrics.

26. Does DCHFA plan to offer this program in FY26?

Response: No

What is DCHFA’s assessment of the need for stabilization funding in the District for FY26?

Response:

Based on the Agency’s 4% LIHTC portfolio, the need for stabilization funding remains significant and is expected to persist absent legislative and judicial reforms to stem ongoing financial distress across properties. Without practical policy interventions, these assets will continue to hemorrhage.

It is also important to note that DCHFA is a small instrumentality with limited resources, which are primarily intended to support the creation and preservation of mission-driven affordable housing units throughout the District of Columbia.

a. Are there particular submarkets that are in greater need of stabilization funding than others?

Response:

As of the YE25 Agency portfolio review, Wards 4, 5, and 8 exhibit significant stress and collectively account for approximately 50% of the projects on the HFA’s watchlist.

b. What type of housing stock is in the greatest need of stabilization funding?

Response:

Family-style (i.e., garden and high-rise) and multifamily projects are experiencing the highest levels of stress within the Agency’s portfolio.

c. When awarding recipients, how does DCHFA differentiate between applicants? Does DCHFA consider if the applicant will be able to be self sufficient after receiving funds?

Response:

Yes. As noted previously, the Agency is a small organization with limited resources; therefore, we approached the review process strategically, focusing on areas where it would have the greatest impact. The watchlist performance matrix was utilized to identify projects most in need of financial support.

If yes, how does DCHFA measure this? See above

If not, why shouldn't that be a consideration?

d. When awarding stabilization funding, how does DCHFA assess whether a property is likely to be financially self-sufficient after assistance, and how does that assessment affect award decisions?

Response:

When awarding stabilization funding, DCHFA evaluates whether a property is likely to achieve financial self-sufficiency after assistance by conducting a comprehensive assessment of the property's current and projected financial condition. This evaluation typically includes:

Financial Analysis

Property Condition Needs

Sponsorship and Management Capacity

Market Consideration

In essence, DCHFA uses these assessments to ensure that stabilization resources are directed toward properties where they will have the greatest long-term impact—both in preserving affordable housing and in minimizing ongoing fiscal risk. These actions fall within the Agency's purview; however, achieving truly lasting impact will require more aggressive housing legislation and judicial action.

VII. MCKINNEY ACT LOAN PROGRAM

27. What is the current status of the pre-development fund (McKinney Act Loan Program) and what factors have contributed to the absence or delay of closings in FY25–FY26? Please assess whether program design, market conditions, or administrative constraints are limiting utilization.?

Response:

The McKinney Act Loan Program is fully subscribed, with approximately \$10 million in committed predevelopment funding. From an operational standpoint, DCHFA can underwrite and close McKinney Act Loans within approximately three (3) months, consistent with market standards for predevelopment financing.

The absence or delay of closings in FY25–FY26 is not attributable to program design or administrative constraints, but rather to downstream market conditions. In particular, some projects have experienced delays advancing to construction loan closing due to reduced appetite from federal LIHTC investors for District projects and constraints on subordinate soft debt, including the availability and timing of sources such as HPTF and Amazon HEF. These factors have slowed project progress beyond predevelopment, affecting the overall timing of loan conversions.

**28. For the McKinney Act Loan Program, please provide for FY25 and FY26, to date:
Response:**

- 1. The number of developers, by ward, who have benefited from the program;**
- 2. The number of units rehabilitated and constructed, by ward, with assistance from the program; and**
- 3. The number of affordable units, by level of affordability and by ward, rehabilitated and constructed with assistance from the program.**

DCHFA - MCKINNEY ACT PREDEVELOPMENT LOAN | FY25 & FY26 CLOSINGS

Name	FY	Developer	Ward	Awarded	Total Units	@30%	@50%	@60%	@80%	@ Market
Meadow Green Court	2026	Lincoln Westmoreland Housing	7	\$ 750,000	434	0	0	434	0	0
Mount Pleasant Apartments	2026	Jubilee Housing	1	\$ 1,000,000	150	30	106	0	14	0
The Coretta	2025	Blue Skye Development	7	\$ 1,000,000	144	42	26	0	76	0
950 Eastern Avenue	2025	Cubed Partners	7	\$ 750,000	56	13	43	0	0	0
Flats at South Capitol	2025	Dantes Partners	8	\$ 1,000,000	106	22	72	12	0	0
Total				\$ 4,500,000	890	107	247	446	90	0

VIII. BOARD ACTIVITY

29. Please list the members and terms of the DCHFA Board, including any vacancies.

Response:

Bryan Irving, term end 6-28-23

Heather Wellington, term end 6-28-25 (reappointment to 6-28-27 in progress)

Yohance Fuller, term end 6-28-25 (reappointment to 6-28-27 in progress)

Carri Robinson, term end 6-28-26

30. Please describe any changes in practice or procedure related to actual or perceived conflicts of interest by Board members in FY25 and FY26, to date.

Response:

There have been no changes in practice or procedure related to conflicts on interest in FY25 and FY26.

31. Please list projects sponsored by a member of the Board, their organizations, employees, and/or development partners in FY25 and FY26, to date.

Response: Harvard Court Apartments FY25

32. Please list any projects considered by the Board in FY25 and FY26, to date, in which a member of the Board or staff member of the Board had a financial interest.

Response:

Harvard Court Apartments FY25
Hillsdale Flats FY25

33. Please list projects where a staff member or member of the Board recused themselves in FY25 and FY26, to date.

Response:

Hillsdale Flats FY25
Flats at South Capitol FY25
Harvard Court Apartments FY25
Henson Ridge II FY25
Belmont Crossing Phase II FY25
Wagner Senior Apartments FY25
S Street Village FY25
2911 Rhode Island Avenue FY25
Benning Road Metro Affordable FY25

PART B: COMMITTEE ON HOUSING GENERAL QUESTIONS

34. Last year, DCHFA identified 3 goals using the Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound (SMART) framework.

- a. State the original target, the actual outcome achieved, and the **percentage of the goal met**. If the goal was not met, quantify how far short the agency came.

Response:

Goal 1 – Close 200MM of Bond Capital – Completed – 100 percent

Goal 2 - Complete Single Family Strategic Plan – Completed – 100 percent

In FY 24 the Agency contracted with a vendor to prepare a strategic plan for the Single-Family Lending programs and recommend products that are best practice and/or enhance home purchase assistance. The plan was completed.

Goal 3- Establish a Mentorship Program for Emerging Developers and Launch Pre-Development Fund – the fund is now entitled Hagans Multifamily which is a part of Theodore R. Hagans Impact Investments –

The first part of the goal was revised to more accurately capture the program the Agency is establishing for emerging developers. The goal is now entitled - Establish a project support program for emerging developers with active or viable investment deals. - Ongoing

- b. Describe any operational or strategic changes the agency made during FY25–FY26 in response to progress toward (or shortfalls from) the goal, including when those changes were implemented.**

Response: None

- c. Briefly explain what the agency believes most affected performance for each goal (e.g., internal capacity limits, partner agency delays, policy constraints).**

Response: The performance of Goal 1 is impacted by market conditions – see second paragraph of Q. 26.

- d. For FY26, indicate whether the agency is continuing, revising, or replacing each goal. For any revised or replacement goal, explain what changed and why the original goal no longer reflected the agency’s priorities or operating reality.**

Response:

Goal 1 is continuing in FY 26 as issuing volume cap is a priority of the Agency. Goal 2 was completed and another goal for the Single Family business area was established for FY 26. Given the heightened concern related to economic vacancy a new goal was created that focuses on developing an application that generates portfolio status reports.

- e. Please identify one lesson learned from FY25 goal-setting that directly informed how FY26 goals were designed.**

Response: Establishing goals that include external parties can be difficult to manage.

35. Please list in descending order the top 25 overtime earners in your agency in FY25 and FY26, to date, if applicable. For each, state the employee’s name, position number, position title, program, activity, salary, fringe, and the aggregate amount of overtime pay earned by each.

Response: See Tab 6.

36. For FY25 and FY26, to date, please provide a list of employee bonuses, special pay granted, or separation pay issued, that identifies the employee receiving the bonus, special pay, or separation pay, the amount received, and the reason for the bonus, special pay, or separation pay.

Response: See Tab 7.

37. For FY25 and FY26, to date, please list any purchase card spending by the agency, the employee making each expenditure, and the general purpose for each expenditure.

Response: See Tab 8.

38. Please list and describe any spending pressures the agency experienced in FY25 and any anticipated spending pressures for the remainder of FY26. Include a description of the pressure and the estimated amount. If the spending pressure was in FY25, describe how it was resolved, and if the foreseen spending pressure is in FY26, describe any proposed solutions?

Response: Not Applicable

39. Please identify any legislative changes the agency believes are necessary to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, or risk management of the programs under DCHFA's direct control.

Response: None

a. Why has DCHFA discontinued the Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) and does DCHFA have plans to bring the program back?

Response:

The Mortgage Credit Certificate Program was discontinued in FY 22 due to a shortage in bond cap and redirected to multi-family projects in the pipeline.

i. If yes, when?

ii. If not, why?

PART C: GENERAL QUESTIONS (COUNCIL BUDGET OFFICE PERFORMANCE TEAM)

Note: this year the Council Office of the Budget Director's Performance Initiative developed a set of standard questions that Council committees may use to help standardize data collection and analysis from office to office and year to year. Departures from the standard questions are noted in brackets.

Governance and Personnel

40. Please provide a complete and current organizational chart for the agency and each division and subdivision within the agency, including:

Response: See Tab 9.

a. The names and titles of all senior personnel;

b. A description of the roles and responsibilities for each division and subdivision;

Response:

Office of the Executive Director provides overall leadership and oversight for the DC Housing Finance Agency, ensuring programs, policies, and operations align with the Agency's mission. It directs agency-wide strategy, guides senior leadership, and manages key relationships with government officials, industry partners, and community

stakeholders. The office leads government affairs and community engagement efforts to strengthen partnerships and advance housing initiatives.

Office of Administration oversees core operational functions that keep the Agency running efficiently. The department includes Human Resources, Information Technology, Public Relations, Procurement, and Administrative Services.

Office Financial Management is responsible for the fiscal health of the Agency through budgeting, accounting, auditing, investments, and financial management of assets.

Office of General Counsel oversees the legal operations of the Agency. The Office of the General provides legal advice on operational and programmatic activities including oversight of the corporate governance, risk management, contract matters, and consulting with the Board of Director's legal counsel as needed.

Office of Strategic Planning & Performance develops and manages the Agency's strategic plan. It sets measurable goals and monitors performance across departments to ensure initiatives are effective and aligned with the Agency's mission, goals, and priorities.

Multifamily Lending and Neighborhood Investments is responsible for executing the Agency's Multifamily financing program and Housing Investment platform through underwriting and compliance of affordable multifamily housing projects.

Portfolio and Asset Management ensures that multifamily rental projects receiving funds from DCHFA maintain compliance with the terms of the applicable loan agreements, such as debt payments and affordability restrictions.

Single Family Programs manages the Agency's homeownership programs with the goal of expanding and retaining homeownership opportunities in the District of Columbia.

c. A narrative explanation of any changes to the organizational chart made in the last calendar year; and

Response: There have been no recent changes to the Agency's organizational structure.

d. An indication of whether any positions in the chart are vacant.

Response:

Vacant positions (6) as of 12/31/25 include;

- Senior Vice President, Strategic Planning & Performance
- Director, Business Development – Housing Investments (MLNI)
- Financial Planning & Analysis Analyst (OFM)
- Counsel (OGC)
- Paralegal / Legal Assistant (OGC)
- Senior Compliance Analyst (Single Family Programs)

41. Please provide a complete, up-to-date list of contract workers working directly for your agency, ordered by program and activity, and including the following information for each position:

Response: There are no contractual workers.

- a. Title of position;
- b. Indication that the position is filled or vacant;
- c. Date employee began in the position;
- d. Whether the position must be filled to comply with federal or local law;
- e. If applicable, the federal or local law that requires the position be filled;
- f. The entity from which they are contracted; and
- g. The contracted annual cost.

42. Please provide, for each month of FY25 through FY26 to date, the net number of personnel separated from and hired to the agency.

Response:

MONTH	HIRED	SEPARATED
OCTOBER 2024	1	0
NOVEMBER 2024	2	0
DECEMBER 2024	0	0
JANUARY 2025	0	1
FEBRUARY 2025	2	0
MARCH 2025	2	1
APRIL 2025	0	1
MAY 2025	2	2
JUNE 2025	0	1
JULY 2025	0	1
AUGUST 2025	1	1
SEPTEMBER 2025	2	1
OCTOBER 2025	2	0
NOVEMBER 2025	1	0
DECEMBER 2025	0	1

43. Does the agency conduct annual performance evaluations of all its employees? If so, who conducts such evaluations? What steps are taken to ensure that all office employees are meeting individual job requirements?

Response:

Yes, DCHFA conducts annual performance evaluations for all employees. During FY25, the Agency launched an electronic version of its performance management process through the Human Resources Information System (HRIS), which streamlines evaluations and enhances consistency across departments.

Evaluations are conducted by each employee's direct supervisor, with oversight from department heads and Human Resources to ensure fairness, accuracy, and alignment with Agency goals and standards. To ensure that all employees meet their job requirements, senior leadership first establishes the Agency's annual goals. The Agency goals are then used to create aligned departmental goals, which are further cascaded into individual employee goals and initiatives. Throughout the year, supervisors meet with staff to review progress, provide feedback, and address any performance gaps, ensuring employees remain on track and receive the support needed to achieve their objectives.

44. Please provide the following for each collective bargaining agreement that is currently in effect for agency employees:

Response: Not Applicable

- a. The bargaining unit (name and local number);**
- b. The start and end date of each agreement;**
- c. The number of employees covered;**
- d. Whether the agency is currently bargaining;**
- e. If currently bargaining, anticipated completion date;**
- f. For each agreement, the union leader's name title and contact information; and**
- g. A copy of the ratified collective bargaining agreement.**

45. Please list all employees currently detailed to or from your agency. For each detailed employee, include:

Response: Not Applicable

- a. The reason for the detail;**
- b. The job duties if detailed to your agency;**
- c. The start date of detail;**
- d. The agency the employee is detailed to/from; and**
- e. The projected date of return.**

46. Please provide a copy of your agency's Schedule A, as of the date of receipt of this questionnaire.

Response: See Tab 10.

47. Please provide a list and description of all memorandums of understanding and memorandums of agreement in effect during FY25 and FY26, to date.

Response: See Tab 11.

MOA between DMPED, DCHFA and DHCD, regarding allocation of Private Activity Bond Volume Cap. May 9, 2024 – May 8, 2025. The MOA is no longer in force.

MOU DHCD & DCHFA: Delegation of LIHTC Determination and Administration Agreement regarding underwriting of 4% LIHTC. May 15, 2015 - May 15, 2020. The Parties are still complying with the MOU.

The Residential Accessory Apartment Program MOU was an agreement between the DC Housing Finance Agency (HFA) and the Dept of Housing and Community Development (DCHD) whereby the Agency disbursed grants, at the direction of DHCD, to District residents for the creation of residential accessory apartments. The agreement was effective as of September 2022. The parties are currently working to extend the agreement.

MOU between DHCD & DCHFA regarding development rights for the Stack Eight project site. February 24, 2022 – February 24, 2024. The MOU expired in 2024, and there has been no extension or revival.

Finance and Budget

48. Please provide a status report, including timeframe of completion, for all projects for which your agency currently has capital funds available.

	Actual	Budget
	FY25	FY26
Furniture, Fixture & Equipment (FFE)	-	60,000
Software	537,827	574,000
Building/Capital Improvements	100,417	95,000
	638,244	729,000

49. Please provide copies of all [local] budget enhancement requests (The Form B or similar form) submitted in the formulation of the proposed FY25 and FY26 budgets.

Response: Not Applicable

50. Please list all [local] budget enhancements in FY25 and provide a status report on the implementation of each enhancement.

Response: Not Applicable

51. Please fill out the attached spreadsheet titled “Question 12 Grants Received,” and list all federal and/or private grants received by your agency in FY25 and FY26 to date, current balances, and indicate any that lapsed during or at the end of FY25.

Response: Not Applicable

- a. Please submit the completed document in both Excel and PDF formats.
- b. Please include your [local budget] Agency Code in the filename [e.g., Question_12_HY0_2026.xls].

52. List all grants issued in in FY25 and FY26, to date in the attachment labeled “Question 13 Grants Issued”.

Response: See Tab 12

- a. Please submit the completed document in both Excel and PDF formats.
- b. Please include your Agency Code in the filename [e.g., Question_13HY0_2026.xls).

53. What financial and grants management software does DHCD operate on?

Response: Not Applicable

54. Similarly, please provide a list of software's tools used for application and result tracking for all of the programs that the committee asked about in the Agency Specific question section.

Response:

Multifamily

- eLoans
- Emphasys (implementing)
- M365 – Excel, Adobe, Teams and SharePoint.
- Right Signature

Single Family

- Lender Portal 2.0
- Lotus – Emphasys
- Counselor Direct
- M365 – Excel, Adobe, Teams and SharePoint.

Finance

- Emphasys Financial Suite
- M365 – Excel, Adobe, Teams and SharePoint
- Right Signature
- BondLink

Public Relations

- Canva
- Issuu
- Hootsuite
- Meltwater
- M365 – Excel, Adobe Creative, Teams and SharePoint
- Constant Contact
- Eventbrite

Operations

55. Please provide the Committee with a list of all vehicles owned or leased by the agency; the purpose of the vehicle; the division the vehicle is assigned to, if applicable; and whether the vehicle is assigned to an individual employee.

Response:

Vehicle Year	Vehicle Make	Model	Owner	Accidents
2016	Chevrolet	Suburban	DC Housing Finance Agency	None
2018	Kia	Soul	DC Housing Finance Agency	None

56. Describe problems and challenges, including chronic maintenance issues and design flaws, in agency-owned or leased facilities.

Response:

DCHFA headquarters is in a building that the agency owns. Due to the age of the building, unexpected repairs or maintenance issues may arise.

a. What capital or operating projects arose from these issues in FY25 and FY26 to date, including cost and actions taken?

Response:

Fiscal Year	Issue	Resulting Project	Cost
FY25	Shattered exterior glass	Glass replacement	\$16,050
FY25	Major 3rd-floor toilet leak → building-wide flooding	Emergency remediation + repairs	\$90,000
	Parking Garage Repair (Patch)	Concrete Repair	\$2,850
	Parking Garage Structural Survey	Chain Drag Survey	\$5,900
FY26	Deteriorated parking garage	Structural repair project	\$900,000 (est.)
FY 26	Ballistic Shield Installation	Safety and Security of Staff	\$94,408

57. Please list each new initiative implemented by the agency during the past two fiscal years to date. For each new initiative, please provide:

Response:

Portfolio Stabilization Grant – (See Q. 25)

- a. A description of the initiative;
- b. Actual start date;
- c. Actual or anticipated end date;
- d. The funding required to implement the initiative;
- e. Whether the initiative was mandated by legislative action;
- f. Problems or challenges faced in the program's implementation;
- g. The metrics the agency is collecting to measure the initiative's success; and
- h. An assessment of the initiative's success thus far.

To the extent particular initiatives are addressed in full in response to later agency-specific questions in this document, please feel free to note that here with a cross-reference.

58. Please list any [federal or local] legislation that impacts your agency from the prior two fiscal years and provide a status report on the agency’s implementation related to each piece of legislation.

To the extent particular legislative changes are addressed in full in response to later agency-specific questions, please feel free to note that here with a cross-reference.

Response:

B26-0164 – The RENTAL Act of 2025

B25-0972 - Reverse Mortgage Insurance and Tax Payment Program Extension Emergency Amendment Act of 2024

One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA) (P.L. 119-21) Changed the 50% test to a 25% test. While it can decrease the need for bonds for specific projects, it also decreases the Agency’s potential revenue. The Agency calculates its fees on the dollar amount of the bond issuance. If the necessary issuance amount for tax exempt bonds is halved, the Agency’s fee is halved.

59. Customer feedback

a. How does the agency solicit feedback from customers (i.e., District residents served)? Please describe.

Response:

The Agency conducts surveys at the conclusion of public events including the annual DCHFA Homeownership Conference and Fair. District residents may provide feedback to the Agency via email by using the contact form on the website or emailing Info@dchfa.org. Messages from the contact form are delivered to this the Info@dchfa.org inbox. The inbox is monitored and emails are sent to the department to obtain answers relevant to the inquiry. Replies are sent to the inquirer once the appropriate response is determined. Residents also send direct messages via social media and by commenting on posts. Direct messages and comments are monitored, and replies are provided once the appropriate response has been determined.

b. What has the agency learned from this feedback?

Response:

Respondents expressed the desire to have homebuyer education seminars take place throughout the District rather than solely at DCHFA’s headquarters and for the homeownership fair to take place in Metro accessible locations in different neighborhoods.

c. How has the agency changed its practices because of such feedback?

Response:

In January 2025, the Agency launched The Pathway to Homeownership series of information sessions highlighting DCHFA’s homeownership resources. The information sessions take place at neighborhood libraries across the District. As a result of feedback from attendees, DCHFA’s homeownership conference and fair have taken place in a different ward for the last three years.

Laws, Audits, and Reports

60. Please identify any legislative modifications that would enable the agency to better meet its mission.

Response: None

61. Please identify any regulatory impediments to your agency’s operations.

Response:

There are no regulatory impediments to the Agency’s operations for FY25 and FY26.

62. Please list and describe any ongoing investigations, audits, or reports on your agency or any employee of your agency, or any investigations, studies, audits, or reports on your agency or any employee of your agency that were completed during FY25 and FY26, to date.

- a. Please include in your response any material adverse findings in the reviewing party’s own words and any management response or corrective action plan.**
- b. Please attach copies of any reports issued to the Executive Director of Board in draft or final form.**

Response:

Capitol Vista and Delta Towers Audit – Ongoing

The Residences at St. Elizabeth - Ongoing

63. Please identify and provide an update on what actions have been taken to address all recommendations made during the previous three years by:

Response: Not Applicable

- a. Office of the Inspector General;**
- b. D.C. Auditor;**
- c. Internal audit; and**
- d. Any other federal or local oversight entities.**

64. Please list all pending lawsuits in which the agency, or its officers or employees acting in their official capacities, are named as defendants, and for each case provide the following:

- a. The case name;**
- b. Court where the suit was filed;**
- c. Case docket number;**
- d. Case status; and**
- e. A brief description of the case**

Response:

District of Columbia Housing Agency v. V Street Apartments Owner, LLC and Bath Club Capital Partners, LLC (1:23-cv-03022 (JMC))

The Agency filed suit against the defendant for the nonpayment of a loan awarded from the Agency's McKinney Act Loan Program. The loan provided predevelopment funds for the V Street Apartments Project. The Agency is waiting for the court to rule on Motion for Summary Judgment.

65. Please list the total amount of money the agency or the District, on behalf of the agency, expended to settle claims against it, or its officers or employees acting in their official capacities, in FY25 and FY26, to date.

Response:

The Agency did not expend any funds to settle claims against it in FY 25 or FY26 to date.

66. Please list each settlement the agency or the District, on behalf of the agency, entered into in FY25 and FY26, to date that involved claims against the agency, or its officers or employees in their official capacity, including any settlements covered by D.C. Code § 2-402(a)(3). For each settlement, provide:

Response:

The Agency did not enter any settlements in FY 25 or FY26 to date that meet the criteria of this question.

- a. The amount of the settlement,
- b. If related to litigation, the case name and brief description;
- c. If unrelated to litigation, please describe the underlying issue or reason for the settlement (e.g. administrative complaint, etc.).

67. Please list all administrative complaints or grievances that the agency received in FY25 and FY26, to date. For each complaint, list;

- a. The source of complaint;
- b. The process utilized to respond to the complaint or grievance;
- c. Any changes to agency policies or procedures that resulted from the complaint or grievance;
- d. If resolved describe the resolution.

Response:

The Agency received a grievance from an employee. The grievance was investigated resulting in no changes to the Agency's policies or procedures. The investigation concluded with a finding of no wrongdoing.

68. Is the agency currently party to any active non-disclosure agreements? If so, please provide all allowable information on all such agreements, including:

Response:

The Agency has two (2) NDAs currently in place with a contractor, SEDC providing services to the Agency.

a. The number of agreements;

Response: Two

b. The department(s) within the agency associated with each agreement; and

Response: Office of Administration

c. Whether any agreements are required for specific positions (please list each position by division and program and indicate whether the position is contracted)

Response: The NDA is with a contractor providing services to the Agency.

Data

69. In filterable and sortable spreadsheet [format], please list all electronic databases maintained by your agency, including the following:

a. A detailed description of the information tracked within each system;

b. The age of the system and any discussion of substantial upgrades that have been made or are planned to the system; and

c. Whether the public can be granted access to all or part of each system.

Response: See Tab 13.

70. Please provide a list of all studies, research papers, and analyses (“studies”) the agency or an agency’s employee requested, prepared, presented or contracted for during FY25. For each study please list:

Response: None

a. The status;

b. The purpose; and

c. A link (if published) to the study, research paper or analysis or, if not published, please attach a copy.

71. Please list contracts and procurements awarded, entered into, extended, or for which an option year was exercised, by the agency during FY25 and FY26, to date in the attached spreadsheet titled “Contracts and Procurements”.

a. Please include your Agency Code in the filename [e.g., HY0_2025_Contracts and Procurements.xls].

b. You may add additional lines to the sheet but please do not change any other formatting.

Response: See Tab 14