

COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST TASK FORCE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2025

WELCOME ATTENDANCE / INTRODUCTIONS

Members Present:

Eric C. Olson, Council Member (District 3), Chair

Bryan Franklin, Director, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)

Warren Burris, Senior Advisor, Director of Program Operations, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

Stephanie Prange Proestel, Executive Director, Housing Initiative Partnership (HIP)

Consultant:

Ms. Brenda Torpy

Staff Present

Julio Murillo, Chief of Staff, Council Member Olson's Office

Karen Guzman, Community & Economic Development Director, Council Member Olson's Office

Ayana Crawford, Chief of Staff, Council Member Blegay's Office

Jashawn Stewart, Committee Director, Supervisor

Rana Hightower, PHED Committee Director

Kathleen Canning, Legislative Attorney

Shalene Miller-Whyte, Budget and Policy Analyst

Charlotte Aheart, PHED Committee Assistant

Nikia McBride, GOFP Committee Assistant

DISCUSSION

Ms. Torpy discussed options for creating a community housing trust (CHT) and the positives and negatives of each option. There are three options, which include:

1. Create a new entity with a mission of affordability
2. Advertise the project to existing nonprofits and allow them to bid to add the trust to their programs
3. Create the entity that embeds the mission, and allow the entity to contract with an existing entity to carry out the program.

Questions

Mr. Warren Burris asked how committed the County is to creating a CHT. Does the County plan on providing funds from the General Fund to support the program? Is option three like some of the existing programs the County already has in operation?

In response to Mr. Burris's questions, Council Member Olson explained that the task force will create a report and submit recommendations to the County Council. Other council members do have an interest, and a determination will have to be made on where the funding will come from, whether that is direct support from the County or federal funding. When the College Park CHT was started, Senator Van Hollen earmarked funds to support the program. Council Member Olson explained that the report could include various options, given the robust nonprofit community. In response, Mr. Burris said that the County can perform program tasks that nonprofits cannot.

Mr. Bryan Franklin asked whether there is a list of quasi-governmental and governmental agencies, and how resources are currently being used. He also explained it would be helpful to understand how much funding the governing body would need.

Ms. Torpy explained that if another nonprofit starts the program, they will need startup funding. The new entity does not have to duplicate nonprofit management roles. The hybrid option is contracted, and part of the contract requires administering the funds and reporting compliance. Capital is needed to fund the program.

Discussion Community Housing Trust Structure

Mr. Burris recommended including community asset mapping to enable task force members to have a granular view of the organizations and resources available. He also explained that the leadership of whichever option is chosen needs to have a sound understanding of the process. Council Member Olson explained that the report should state that, whatever the entity's structure, expertise in the field is necessary.

Council Member Olson also explained that he believes the community land trust, in the beginning, should have government representation and housing experts from a housing group serve as members of the governing board. As the land trust grows, community members could serve on the board.

Ms. Torpy explained that the CHT governing body is usually divided into three different member sectors. One-third are usually public representatives, another one-third are residents, and the last one-third are members with expertise in raising funds for the CHT.

Mr. Burris explained that he sits on the FCS First Board, which is a model that could be used for the CHT. The FSC First Board has members from the government and the community. They go out and seek additional outside funding. The County Council also reviews FSC First's budget for transparency.

Council Member Olson stated he wanted to make sure the discussion was captured. Ms. Torpy explained that priorities for the CHT's structure are beginning to take shape.

Mr. Franklin recommended that the CHT adopt a hybrid structure with private leadership. Privately led organizations work collaboratively with the public sector.

Ms. Stephanie Prange Proestel recommended that partnerships with nonprofits would make the most sense for the CHT's structure.

Ms. Torpy wanted to group thoughts into a new entity, an existing group, or a hybrid structure. Ms. Torpy mentioned she was hearing that the preference is for the structure to be a public, government, and nonprofit partnership. Mr. Burris agreed that it should be a public-private partnership, but it should be a new entity. Ms. Torpy replied that we want to have a board structure that includes public and private members and ultimately includes residents, which requires the creation of a new entity. The entity's core mission will be to create and steward permanent affordability and to add permanent affordable homeownership to all other affordable housing options through the existing permanent network.

Ms. Torpy asked if any task force members objected to starting a new entity. Ms. Prange Proestel expressed concerns about starting a new entity due to the creation of new infrastructure, which entails additional costs. She likes the idea of working with an existing nonprofit that has an entity below it, a single-purpose entity focused on the CHT. Then have a board or advisory committee with members from the public and private sectors to allow the use of the existing infrastructure (accounting, technology). Operating costs are a concern with a new entity. Council Member Olson agreed to have an existing 501(c)(3) organization.

Ms. Torpy asked Ms. Prange Proestel whether she had considered the hybrid structure in which an existing nonprofit administers the program. The public sector takes a back seat, with the nonprofit being in charge.

Council Member Olson thought the idea made sense. The nonprofit is the entity, but since public funding will support the CHT, there should be public-sector members on the board.

Ms. Prange Proestel stated that the agreement between the nonprofit and the County can be very clear about the expectations for the structure and the general membership of the board or advisory committee. Council Member Olson requested a list of organizations.

Ms. Prange Proestel recommended that solicitations be obtained through an RFP to ensure an open and transparent selection process. Mr. Burris asked whether there would be a preference for entities within the County, as it is, in his opinion, paramount. Council Member Olson said he thought that was important and that the Council may insist that preference be given to County organizations.

Mr. Franklin stated he is leaning toward Option 2 (Existing Group), but he does see the importance of the public-private partnership. The slight difference between Option 2 (Existing Group) and Option 3 (Hybrid) is whether the power resides on the public or private side.

He encourages a public RFP process that gives preference to a Prince George's County entity, but does not eliminate the ability of other entities outside the County to apply. If outside organizations apply, there should be a clear expectation of how Prince George's will be represented in the entity.

Ms. Torpy summarized the recommendation: seeking a nonprofit partner with the County government to carry out this mission through a competitive process. Ms. Torpy expressed

support for the entity being a Prince George's County organization. The entity needs to demonstrate its investment in the mission.

Council Member Olson asked the task force members if they were comfortable with the direction. Ms. Torpy explained that the entity is a nonprofit continuing to receive substantial public input on the different ways of participation. Ms. Torpy will provide a written recommendation.

Service Area Discussion

Ms. Torpy discussed with task force members whether the service should be countywide, countywide with target areas, or County plus (metro areas), and the pros and cons of each option.

Council Member Olson says the County plus option would be difficult to achieve at this time. The countywide and countywide with targeted areas options are political questions. The priority should be the policy approach that addresses the greatest need. The County Executive has discussed restarting the Transforming Neighborhoods Initiatives, which targeted five or six geographic areas with the greatest need. The beltway has traditionally been the geographic line in different planning documents which have referenced inside and outside the beltway. The report could say that we should consider all the options and not recommend a specific target service area.

Mr. Burris asked about the Plan 2035, the housing study, and the Metropolitan Council of Governments in the metropolitan area. Is it good to look at those documents? Council Member Olson explained that looking at existing plans is a good idea. Ms. Torpy explained that there is no need to duplicate if there are plans that identify areas of need, as a good place for the entity to operate.

Ms. Prange Proestel stated that it might be best to start countywide, then narrow down targets or priorities.

Mr. Franklin recommends a countywide approach with strategic priorities. We should discuss the range of housing types we are considering —single-family dwellings outside the beltway —and whether we are considering condominiums, then inside the beltway.

Mr. Burris asked if the County knows its priorities. Ms. Prange Proestel stated that sometimes the priorities are from the State of Maryland, which is why countywide may be preferred—the central question is how the CHT will be funded.

Council Member Olson asked whether specific neighborhoods are excluded based on housing prices in those areas. He further noted that large sections of the County would not be eligible due to the pricing, so countywide is not an option. Ms. Torpy stated that Council Member Olson is correct.

Ms. Torpy said that if you recommend countywide, make sure you underscore that nonprofits work with the priorities within the state and county plans. There can be a wide range of affordable options.

Council Member Olson stated he was torn on the options because of the politics, and areas that have been left behind need more attention. His perspective is to discuss both options. The group

could recommend countywide, but we recognize there are priority areas that should receive extra attention.

Ms. Torpy stated we could recommend around the area median income and geography.

Mr. Burris asked if the Section 8 Homeownership program has been used in the County. Ms. Prange Proestel stated that the program has been used in the County.

Will discuss the resell formula in November and frame out recommendations for the task force members to review.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.