NASHUA HOUSING REVOLVING FUND

COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 22, 2026
ROOM 208, CITY HALL
229 MAIN STREET, NASHUA, NH 03060

Members Present: *Matt Sullivan, Liz Hannum, Kristy Besada, Skye Wheeler, Kyle Schneck, Alderwoman Lori Wiltshire*

Staff Present:

Others Present: *Doug Howard, Front Door Agency*

Discussion: Landlord Incentive Program Review

- S. Wheeler raised concerns about landlords increasing rent when tenants are using housing vouchers.
- M. Sullivan noted that landlords sometimes intentionally price units above the subsidy threshold to avoid renting to voucher holders.
- Doug Howard provided an overview of the Landlord Incentive Program funded by the HRF and implemented by the Front Door Agency.
- The original goal of the landlord incentive program was to partner with community organizations to house individuals experiencing Category 1 homelessness; the program hoped to support 1-2 households per month
- The program found it difficult to place individuals without subsidies into sustainable housing options
- A shift in determining household eligibility was proposed:
    i. Expanding from Category 1 (literal homelessness, including shelter) to Category 2 (imminent risk, including individuals who are couch surfing, at risk of losing housing within 14 days, etc.)
    ii. Benefits include easier documentation and having potentially more stable candidates for long-term housing
- L. Hannum asked if requiring participants to be Category 1 was in the contract; M. Sullivan stated it does not appear to be in the grant agreement.
- There was some uncertainty regarding the requirement for formal approval of program changes; the group agreed that while formal approval was likely not required, changes should be acknowledged. The committee should be informed of all changes, and transparency and communication would be essential if changes occurred.
- L. Hannum stated she thought the program was designed to identify new voucher-accepting landlords.
- Doug Howard presented project outcomes for the Committee's discussion; 13 households have been served, and all remain housed. The majority of participants are all below 50% AMI and are primarily single individuals – two were two-person households; the others were single individuals. Special populations served include youth, individuals with disabilities, and long-term motel residents. Examples were provided of specific cases.
- The project has only spent $40,000 as they were expecting more referrals from external partners; the program officially started around July 1, 2025.
- Current allocations of the funding program were discussed and clarified:
    i. $500 – Landlord sign-on bonus
    ii. $2,500 – Security deposit
    iii. $2,500 – Loss mitigation
    iv. $4,000 – Unit improvements / renovation funds for code and safety concerns

- D. Howard noted that no landlords have requested renovation funds thus far.
- A suggestion was made to reconsider the allocation model, and/or introduce flexible per-household caps; M. Sullivan noted the caps are memorialized in the grant agreement. D. Howard noted that if anything, he would decrease the renovation amount and increase the security deposit or incentive amounts.
- D. Howard noted that for other grant agreements, they have very strict dollar amounts for what they can and can't spend the money on; if these grant funds can be flexible, it can help offset first-year costs.
- K. Besada stated that most landlords would rather keep a tenant than turn over a unit, as it's cheaper.
- As there are grant caps in the contract, L. Hannum suggested that those could perhaps be adjusted if all categories are not being spent.
- Committee members had concerns about HB-1336 passing and impacting this program.
- The following modifications were proposed by the Committee.
    i. $1,000 – Landlord sign-on bonus
    ii. $2,500 – Security deposit
    iii. $3,500 – Loss mitigation
    iv. $2,500 – Unit improvements / renovation funds for code and safety concerns
- L. Hannum suggested stating the program could provide funding "up to $9,500 per household" as opposed to creating individual categories with hard spending limits; M. Sullivan noted there are categories that do need to be capped, including the renovation category.
- M. Sullivan noted that the reporting is bi-annual; L. Hannum suggested making the requested changes and then checking in at the next six-month mark to discuss if any additional changes are necessary.
- Discussion commenced about increasing the security deposit limitation above the $2,500; it was agreed that the security deposit should be bumped to $3,000, making the total $10,000 per household.
    i. $1,000 – Landlord sign-on bonus
    ii. $3,000 – Security deposit
    iii. $3,500 – Loss mitigation
    iv. $2,500 – Unit improvements / renovation funds for code and safety concerns
- M. Sullivan stated the committee would like an update in six months.
- ***Motion to Accept Presented Changes***
  L. Hannum made a motion to accept the presented changes to the grant agreement. K. Schneck offered a Second to the motion. A roll call was taken, which resulted as follows: Yea: 5 Nay: 0 Motion Carried
- M. Sullivan agreed to draft the grant amendment to reflect these changes.
- The group noted that they were comfortable with participants of the program being in either Category 1 or 2.
- ***Motion to Broaden Participation Categories***
  K. Besada made a motion to allow participants of the program to be in either Category 1 or Category 2 of HUD's homelessness definition S. Wheeler offered a Second to the motion. A roll call was taken, which resulted as follows: Yea: 5 Nay: 0 Motion Carried

Discussion: Upcoming Applications & Project Updates

- M. Sullivan noted there were two potential upcoming applications:
    - Marguerite's Place: $500,000 request for 15 transitional housing units
    - L. Hannum's Land Bank Feasibility Project
- M. Sullivan requested that Marguerite's Place come to the next meeting to discuss the project, including whether the project actually needs the funding; the committee agreed.
- M. Sullivan stated that Maynard Homes Phase I project is underway and is preparing for an additional phase; they may come back to the committee for additional funding.
- K. Besada requested a broad overview of how much money is left in the fund at the next committee meeting
- The committee discussed alternate forms of revenue, as projects often have 15- or 17-year loans
- L. Hannum presented an overview of the land bank feasibility study project
    - The first phase would be a $24,000 request
    - The second phase will depend on the results of the feasibility study
- M. Sullivan expressed an interest in knowing why no other municipalities have not created a land bank; he suggested scoring the application at the next meeting during a public meeting.

    - K. Schneck expressed a concern that the Revolving Fund Committee should not review a City application or that City projects may not be eligible for funding through the fund; others suggested that the application should follow a due process.
    - It was noted that the committee's recommendations go to the Mayor as the Agent to Expend.
    - K. Besada noted that the money was allocated in the interest of being creative with housing solutions.
    - M. Sullivan stated that he and L. Hannum should step away when voting occurs for any City projects.
    - The discussion was tabled; Committee members requested discussing the priorities, legislation, and remaining funds at the next meeting.
    - S. Wheeler stated that they would like to see more ADA-compliant units being built in future projects; others suggested perhaps adding this criterion to the scoring process.

- **Meeting adjourned.**

- **Next meeting:** The next meeting will take place on 07/13/26 at 5:00PM in Room 208 at Nashua City Hall.