

Memo 1

Date: December 15, 2025

Activity: Started collecting data and analyzing AMI to kick off CB9 housing research

Location: International House library, Columbia SIPA

Field Notes: What Happened

Today was my first day as a fellow with the Fund for the City of New York, working with Manhattan Community Board 9 on housing affordability. My goal is to create a clear, data-driven resource for CB9 to review new housing projects and advocate for policy changes.

I started by asking what seemed like a simple question: What does "affordable housing" really mean in CB9?

I looked up HUD's 2024-2025 Area Median Income data. For a family of four in the NYC Metro area, the AMI is \$127,100. According to HUD, a unit at 100% AMI is considered "affordable" if a household earns \$145,800 a year, following the 30% rent-to-income rule. That means they could pay about \$3,645 in rent each month.

Next, I downloaded 2023 American Community Survey data for CB9 from Census Reporter. The median household income here is \$ 64,69. Looking at my spreadsheet, I saw an \$81,102 gap—a 125% difference. What's called "affordable" housing actually requires incomes more than twice those of most CB9 households.

I checked the income distribution to see if a few outliers were making the numbers look worse than they are:

- 25.3% of CB9 households earn under \$25,000/year
- 43.5% earn under \$50,000/year (nearly half the neighborhood)
- 59.0% earn under \$75,000/year
- Only 28.2% earn over \$100,000/year.

This isn't just a statistical fluke; it's a structural problem. When developers build housing at 60% AMI, which requires an income of \$87,480, 58% of CB9 residents can't afford it. At 100% AMI, 70% are excluded.

Initial Reactions – What Stood Out

I was surprised at how high the AMI was compared to the neighborhood. The NYC Metro AMI includes places like Nassau County (\$123,100), Westchester (\$106,200), and Putnam (\$120,970)—wealthy suburbs unconnected to West Harlem's economy.

I found a Community Service Society report that shows this is a citywide issue: the median NYC household earns only 71% of AMI. That means the city's own affordability rules label the average New Yorker as "low income." No racial or ethnic group in NYC earns at or above 100% AMI.

What stands out is that "affordable housing" is now a political term. Instead of serving low-income communities, policy and developer definitions actually benefit middle- and upper-income newcomers—not existing residents.

I kept thinking about Board meetings where residents said, "This housing isn't for us." Developers would respond with charts showing they meet or exceed affordability rules. Both sides are correct, but that is the issue—the standard itself is ineffective.— What This Means for the Project

The AMI mismatch reflects a larger problem in NYC housing policy. HUD's regional standard was designed to stabilize markets, not to address neighborhood realities. In districts where census tracts earn as little as \$17,584, the regional metric is ineffective and exclusionary.

I wondered: what if AMI were based on the neighborhood? Using CB9's median income of \$64,698 instead of the regional median of \$127,100, the 60% AMI would drop from \$87,480 to about \$38,800—a shift that could actually help residents rather than exclude 70% of them.

But it's not that simple. CB9 isn't all the same. When I looked at the data by census tract, I found big differences within the district:

- Tract 219 (Manhattanville): Median income \$17,584 (extreme poverty)
- Tract 221 (Hamilton Heights south): Median \$34,200 (very low income)
- Hamilton Heights (northern tracts): Median ~\$62,100 (closer to CB9 average)
- Highest tract (205, Morningside): Median \$ 208,500. That's a 353% difference within one community district. Using a single affordability standard won't meet the needs of 65% of the research question is changing: How can we create a tract-specific affordability system that matches CB9's real income distribution, and what would that mean for reviewing new housing projects? Launching new housing projects?

Reflexivity – My Perspective and Assumptions

I began this project focusing on quantitative analysis, under the assumption that presenting data would highlight systemic issues for policymakers to address.

The 125% gap reflects the system's intended design. HUD's methodology prioritizes regional market stability over neighborhood fairness. The city has used this approach for years, resulting in limited benefits for low-income residents. This is an issue of policy, not missing information.

My own position matters here, too. I'm a Columbia SIPA student living in university-subsidized housing. Columbia's Manhattanville campus expansion, which began in 2008, has directly increased gentrification pressure in CB9, especially in Tract 219, where the poorest residents live. I benefit from resources that shield me from the rent problems I'm studying for others.

I also realize I've been looking at this mostly through numbers: AMI levels, income breakdowns, and eligibility rules. But behind these figures are real people—like the family in Manhattanville earning \$35,000 a year who's told a new "affordable" building isn't for them, or the senior in Hamilton Heights on a fixed income who faces being pushed out as the neighborhood changes. I'd to keep that distance in mind and make sure my analysis focuses on the experiences of long-term residents, not just the institutions I'm closer to.

Project Implications – Where This Goes Next

The project scope has grown a lot. At first, I planned to list CB9's housing projects and do basic affordability math. Now I see the Board needs solid evidence, something strong enough to challenge HUD's AMI method and support talks with HPD and City Planning.

This means the analysis needs multiple components:

1. Tract-level affordability standards

I can't just rely on CB9's overall median. I need to map each census tract's income and determine the percentage of residents who can afford housing at different AMI levels (30%, 50%, 60%, 80%, 100%). This will show that "affordable" is relative—what works in Hamilton Heights leaves out Manhattanville residents.

2. Housing pipeline audit

I'll pull HPD's affordable housing data from 2014 to 2026, sort each project by AMI level, and compare them to income profiles for each tract. This will show the affordability gap: how many units are truly available to current residents versus how many require incomes above the neighborhood median.

3. Sub-neighborhood differentiation

CB9 comprises three very different areas: Morningside Heights, Manhattanville, and Hamilton Heights, each with distinct income levels. I need to highlight those differences and establish separate affordability standards for each.

4. Service equity component

I've heard that Tract 219 (Manhattanville) has too much supportive housing and social services. I need to check this with data by mapping the facilities, calculating how many there are per person, and checking for a Fair Share violation. If the poorest tract also bears most of the service burden, that creates a double equity problem.

Next Steps – Concrete Actions

1. Complete tract-by-tract income analysis – Download ACS data for all CB9 census tracts, calculate median income, poverty rates, and income distribution for each. Map the spatial variation.
2. Build housing pipeline database – Use NYC Open Data (HPD Affordable Housing Production by Building), NYC Housing Conference tracker, and DCP Community Profiles to catalog every project in CB9 from 2014–2026. Tag each by location (tract), total units, affordable units, AMI band, and supportive housing component.
3. Calculate tract-specific affordability accessibility – For each tract, determine what percentage of residents can afford units at 30%, 50%, 60%, 80%, and 100% AMI. This will show exactly where standard affordability thresholds fail.

4. Geocode service infrastructure – Map mental health facilities, food pantries, and supportive housing sites using DOHMH data, 311 requests, and CBO outreach. Calculate service density per 1,000 residents by tract.
5. Research Fair Share compliance – Pull NYC Comptroller's Fair Share audit (I saw a reference to Audit MD22-101A from 2023). See if CB9 was flagged for facility over-concentration or 197-a review violations.
6. Meet with community stakeholders – Schedule interviews with PALANTE Harlem (tenant organizing), Heritage Health Housing (supportive housing operator), and longtime CB9 residents. Ground-truth the data with lived experience.
7. Draft preliminary findings memo – Get initial AMI mismatch findings and tract-level variation documented for the Board's Housing Committee before the February meeting.

Memo 2

Date: January 22, 2026

Activity: Deep dive into service saturation and supportive housing concentration

Location: Field research in Manhattanville (Tract 219) + data analysis

Field Notes – What Happened

After analyzing income data by tract, I walked through Manhattanville to observe service saturation firsthand. Starting at 125th and Amsterdam by the Manhattanville Houses, I moved north into Hamilton Heights.

The concentration was clear. Within six blocks of the center of Tract 219, I found:

- Heritage Health Housing's supportive facility at 1727 Amsterdam (130 units, 60% supportive housing)
- Two mental health outpatient clinics
- Four food pantries with lines extending down the block
- Three substance abuse treatment centers
- Multiple tenant services offices

I briefly spoke with a social worker outside a food pantry. She shared that their client load has doubled over the past 3 years, but their funding has remained unchanged. When I asked about services in other CB9 areas, she replied, "Not really. Everyone comes here. We serve people from ten blocks away."

Then I walked north into Hamilton Heights (Tract 221). Over ten blocks, I found:

- Zero dedicated mental health outpatient clinics
- One food pantry (1.5 miles from Tract 219)
- No supportive housing facilities
- Harlem Hospital's psychiatric ER (1.1 miles away) is the only mental health access point.

Back in the office, I reviewed the data and found it aligned with my field observations:

Tract 219 (Manhattanville – poorest):

- Median income: \$17,584 (86% below NYC Metro AMI)
- 12 mental health facilities (highest in CB9)
- 71.8% of renters are severely cost-burdened (spending >50% income on rent)
- Supportive housing density: 18.6 units per 1,000 residents

Tract 221 (Hamilton Heights south – very low income):

- Median income: \$34,200
- Zero dedicated mental health outpatient clinics
- 36.2% of renters are severely cost-burdened
- Supportive housing density: 0 units per 1,000 residents

Citywide average:

- Supportive housing density: 5.3 units per 1,000 residents

CB9 has 3.5 times the citywide average for supportive housing. Nearly all of this housing is in Tract 219, while many other tracts receive little to no housing, revealing a clear imbalance.

Initial Reactions and Observations

Spatial inequality is clear. The tract with CB9's poorest residents (median income of \$17,584) has the densest network of supportive services. In contrast, Tract 221, though still very low-income (median income \$34,200), lacks mental health services; residents must travel over a mile for care.

This was not what I anticipated. Policy generally states services should be located where the need is greatest. Thus, Tract 221, with 48% poverty and no clinics, would be a priority. However, the current pattern shows services accumulate in Tract 219 not only because of high need, but also because placements are more feasible there: land costs are lower, there is less community resistance, and the area is predominantly Black and low-income, with limited political influence.

When I cross-referenced this with the NYC Comptroller's Fair Share audit (Audit MD22-101A, 2023), I found CB9 was explicitly named as one of the top five Manhattan districts for Below the Poverty Line (BTP) facility concentration. The audit documented that 38% of CB9's recent facility sitings bypassed the required 197-a community review—the Charter provision that gives community boards formal input on public facility siting.

The placement of facilities in CB9 without adhering to required procedures suggests that the situation involves considerations beyond just local opposition. This raises equity concerns that merit further analysis.

Analysis – What Does This Mean?

To measure this imbalance, I created a composite Service Saturation Index (SSI) that combines:

- Mental health sites per 1,000 residents

- Supportive housing units per 1,000 residents
- Food pantries per 1,000 residents

Normalized to CB9 average = 100.

Results by tract:

- Tract 219: SSI = 137 (over-saturated, 37% above the district average)
- Tract 221: SSI = 42 (critically underserved, 58% below average)
- Tract 209 (Morningside Heights): SSI = 58 (underserved)
- Tract 231 (Hamilton Heights north): SSI = 35 (critical gaps)

This provides a way to measure equity. Now, CB9 can respond to new supportive housing proposals in Manhattanville: "Your proposal violates Fair Share because Tract 219 operates at 137% saturation, while Tract 221 has zero mental health clinics." This is a call for district equity, not NIMBYism.

311 Mental Health Crisis Requests by Tract:

- Tract 219: 94 requests (38% of CB9 total), over-represented
- Tract 221: 54 requests (22% of CB9 total), under-represented given its population
- Tract 231: 40 requests (16% of CB9 total), under-represented

A key finding is that Tract 221 residents submit fewer 311 requests (22% of CB9 total) than their population share (25% of CB9's poorest), suggesting unmet demand: residents do not request what they know is unavailable. This indicates a hidden need in underserved areas.

When I pulled comparative data across Manhattan community districts, the regional inequality was even worse:

District	Supportive Housing per 1,000	Shelter Beds per 1,000
CB9 (West Harlem)	18.6	4.0
CB10 (Central Harlem)	15.2	7.2
CB11 (East Harlem)	13.7	10.0
CB7 (Upper West Side)	1.6	0.6

CB8 (Upper East Side)	1.2	0.4
Citywide Average	5.3	3.1

Data show that CB8 (Upper East Side) has 53 times fewer supportive housing units than CB9. This reveals that affluent districts bear far less of the burden of supportive housing, highlighting a striking citywide equity gap.

Reflexivity – My Assumptions and Biases

Walking through Manhattanville made me face something uncomfortable. I have been working as if better data would lead to better policy. But the Fair Share audit already showed the city broke its own Charter requirements in 38% of CB9 sitings. They *knew* community review was required and ignored it. This is not a knowledge problem; it is a power problem. The city has been able to ignore CB9 because CB9 lacks the legal or political leverage to force compliance. My analysis alone will not change that, but it can provide the evidence needed for *enforcement*, either through Charter litigation or political pressure.

I also recognize that I have often used indirect terms for displacement and gentrification, such as "income targeting challenges" and "affordability mismatch." These policies can result in lower-income residents being replaced by higher-income residents. Columbia's Manhattanville expansion, which involves my institution, is one factor in this process. I need to clearly identify these dynamics.

My position as a graduate researcher also affects how I think about solutions. I favor negotiating with agencies because I see the value in future work. However, residents who have been excluded from housing do not have that option. Their goal is not to maintain institutional relationships; it is to demand accountability. I need to shape my analysis to support *their* strategy, not just my own.

Project Implications – Building the Framework

The analysis now has two parallel tracks that need to be integrated:

Track 1: Affordability (demand-side)

From Memo 1, I have tract-level income data showing that standard AMI thresholds fail 65% of CB9's poorest residents. I need to build tract-specific affordability standards:

- Tract 219 (poorest): Require 70% of units at $\leq 50\%$ AMI
- Tract 221 (very low income): Require 60% of units at $\leq 50\%$ AMI

- Morningside Heights: Require 50% of units at $\leq 60\%$ AMI
- Hamilton Heights: Require 40-50% at $\leq 60\%$ AMI, with 60-80% AMI as secondary tier

Track 2: Service equity (supply-side)

Based on today's research, the Service Saturation Index shows Tract 219 at 137% and Tract 221 at 42%. I need to build service equity requirements:

- Any project in high-saturation tracts ($SSI \geq 120\%$) must include a service redistribution plan.
- Projects must fund service expansion in underserved tracts ($SSI \leq 60\%$)
- Developer contribution formula: \$500-\$1,000 per supportive unit above the citywide average

Combine these two tracks into a tiered decision-making framework that CB9 can apply to each project:

Tier 1 (Priority Support): Deep affordability + service justice

- 70% of units at $\leq 50\%$ AMI in high-poverty tracts
- Integrated on-site services
- Supportive housing operators with 80%+ retention rates
- Board Action: Affirmative recommendation + request city funding acceleration

Tier 2 (Conditional Support): Moderate affordability + Community Benefit Agreement

- 40% of units at $\leq 60\%$ AMI
- Signed CBA with local hiring, tenant services, CB9 resident preference
- Board Action: Support contingent on CBA execution

Tier 3 (Opposition Unless Offset): Mixed-income without deep affordability

- Typical MIH structure (40% affordable at 60-100% AMI, 60% market-rate)
- Projects in high-saturation tracts
- Board Action: Oppose unless developer commits to 1:1 deep affordable offset OR \$500k+ for Tract 221 mental health clinic

Tier 4 (Service Rebalancing Required): All projects in saturated tracts

- Any project in Tract 219 ($SSI = 137\%$)

- Board Action: Require \$150/unit contribution to CB9 Service Equity Fund + satellite operations in underserved tracts

Next Steps – Building the Complete Report

1. Complete the housing pipeline database—catalog all 12 projects from 2014-2026, classify by tier, and calculate the aggregate deep affordability deficit.
2. Formalize the Service Saturation Index – Write up the methodology so it is reproducible and defensible. Cross-reference with Comptroller's Fair Share audit data.
3. Build tract-specific approval standards – Document exactly what each tract needs: income thresholds, service requirements, anti-displacement protections.
4. Draft the tiered evaluation framework – Make it concrete enough that CB9 can apply it to every ULURP review and CBA negotiation.
5. Map the housing pipeline against tract capacity – Show which projects meet standards, which don't, and what the aggregate deep affordability gap is (preliminary estimate: 400-500 units needed).
6. Compile Fair Share evidence – Document Charter violations, 197-a bypass rate, comparative density with CB7/CB8.
7. Write the comprehensive report – Pull all components together into a single evidence-based document with policy recommendations.
8. Schedule stakeholder validation – Meet with PALANTE Harlem, Heritage Health Housing, and Met Council to ground-truth findings before finalizing.

Memo 3

Date: February 28, 2026

Activity: Finalizing the comprehensive report, including synthesis and policy recommendations

Location: CB9 office working session with Housing Committee

Field Notes: What Happened

Over the past three weeks, I pulled together eight weeks of research to complete a full report for CB9. Today, I met with the Housing Committee to go over the final draft before it heads to the full Board next week.

The report integrates everything from Memos 1 and 2:

- Part 1: Affordability threshold analysis (tract-by-tract income profiles, AMI mismatch)
- Part 2: Housing pipeline audit (12 projects from 2014-2026, classified by AMI band and tract)
- Part 3: Supportive housing density analysis (Service Saturation Index, Fair Share violations)
- Part 4: Tiered decision-making framework (four tiers with tract-specific standards)
- Part 5: Policy recommendations (15 concrete actions CB9 can take)
- Appendix: Geocoded service inventory (mental health sites, food pantries, 311 data by tract)

These are the main findings I presented:

1. The 125% Affordability Gap

So-called "affordable" units actually require incomes that are \$81,102 higher than CB9's median of \$64,698. This means the regional AMI standard does not match what West Harlem residents can afford. As a result, 70% of current residents cannot afford these units.

2. The 450-500 Unit Deep Affordability Deficit

Of 1,226 units in the 2014-2026 pipeline:

- 591 units (48%) require $\geq 60\%$ AMI income – inaccessible to 58% of CB9 households
- Only 439 units (36%) provide deep affordability ($\leq 60\%$ AMI)
- Deficit: CB9 needs 450-500 additional units at $\leq 50\%$ AMI to meet documented need

3. The Service Saturation Crisis

- Tract 219 (Manhattanville): SSI = 137% (over-saturated)
- Tract 221 (Hamilton Heights south): SSI = 42% (critically underserved)
- CB9 overall: 3.5× citywide average supportive housing density (18.6 vs 5.3 per 1,000 residents)
- Upper East Side (CB8): 53× less supportive housing density than CB9

The Housing Committee had mixed reactions, but the discussion was productive. One member said, "This is the most rigorous thing we've ever had. HPD can't dismiss this as anecdotal anymore." Another asked, "What's our leverage? We've had good analyses before and the city ignored them."

That question brought us to the key part of the discussion: the three enforcement pathways included in the report.

Initial Reactions and Observations

The committee saw that this analysis is more than just documentation—it gives CB9 leverage. The report outlines three clear ways CB9 can push for policy change:

Pathway 1: Negotiation (cooperative)

Use the tiered framework as a CBA template. Developers who want Board support can see exactly what's required. This works *if* developers value CB9's support and *if* HPD adjusts subsidy structures.

Pathway 2: Systematic Opposition (adversarial)

Use the framework to oppose any projects that do not meet the standards. The 591 units that require at least 60% AMI income are out of reach for 58% of CB9 households. This is not just an opinion—it is backed by the data. This approach works *if* CB9 can keep up political pressure and shape the conversation.

Pathway 3: Charter Enforcement (structural)

Use the Fair Share audit findings (Audit MD22-101A) to demand Cumulative Impact Assessments and refuse to review proposals that skip 197-a community review requirements. The Comptroller has already found that 38% of CB9's sitings broke Charter procedures. This approach works *if* CB9 has legal support for possible litigation.

One committee member—a longtime tenant organizer—said something that crystallized the strategic choice: "Negotiation is what we've been doing for thirty years. It hasn't worked. The city only responds when there's a cost to ignoring us. We need pathway three."

Another member pushed back: "Litigation is expensive and slow. Can we combine all three? Negotiate where possible, oppose strategically, and hold the Charter enforcement as a threat?"

This is actually what the report recommends: that CB9 use all three pathways simultaneously. The tiered framework allows for negotiation (Tiers 1 and 2), systematic opposition (Tier 3), and Charter enforcement (Tier 4, which includes Service Saturation requirements supported by Fair Share violations).

Analysis – What the Report Accomplishes

After two months of work, I can see what this report really accomplishes:

1. It shifts the burden of proof

For decades, CB9 has had to explain its opposition to certain projects. Now, the report turns that around: the city must explain why it approves projects that go against CB9's documented, evidence-based standards. When HPD proposes housing at 80% AMI in Tract 219, where the median income is \$17,584, CB9 can use the tract-specific analysis to say, "This is structurally inaccessible to 99% of residents. Explain how this serves the community."

2. It quantifies over-concentration

The Service Saturation Index (SSI) is not just a description—it is a political tool. When CB9 says "Tract 219 operates at 137% saturation while Tract 221 is at 42%," they are not making a subjective claim. They are showing clear geographic inequality that goes against Fair Share principles. The city cannot dismiss this as NIMBYism. It provides actionable standards.

The tiered framework and tract-specific approval standards give CB9 a clear tool for every ULURP review and CBA negotiation. Board members do not have to start from scratch for each project—they can use the framework and refer to the report's evidence.

4. It creates enforcement leverage

By bringing together the Comptroller's Fair Share audit findings (38% of sitings skipped 197-a review), the report gives CB9 a legal basis to demand Charter compliance. If the city keeps ignoring CB9's standards, the Board can threaten or pursue litigation for Fair Share violations.

5. It documents the deep affordability gap

The 450-500 unit deficit is now measured and tied to specific tracts. CB9 can use this to ask HPD to designate CB9 as a Deep Affordability Priority District, which would speed up funding for 30-50% AMI units in Tracts 219 and 221.

Reflexivity – What I've Learned

This project has changed how I see policy analysis. I started out thinking my job was to produce solid, objective evidence that would speak for itself. But I have learned that data does not speak on its own—it is used by people.

The AMI mismatch analysis, the Service Saturation Index, the tiered framework—these aren't neutral tools. They're *political instruments* designed to shift power. Whether that makes me uncomfortable is irrelevant. CB9 has been systematically excluded from housing in its own neighborhood for decades. They need weapons, not just information. I have also faced my own role in this issue more directly. Columbia's Manhattanville expansion is driving gentrification in Tract 219, which is the poorest and most service-saturated tract in CB9. I work for the institution that is displacing the residents I want to help. This contradiction does not have an easy answer. But by naming it clearly in my analysis, I am framing the work as advocacy, not just technical problem-solving.

The most important thing I have realized is that rigorous analysis is necessary, but not enough. The report gives CB9 evidence, but evidence alone does not create change. Change needs:

1. Political will (CB9 has to decide whether to use pathway 2 or 3—opposition or litigation)
2. Organized power (coalition with other CBs, tenant unions, elected officials)
3. Sustained pressure (Fair Share violations won't self-correct without enforcement)

My job is not just to provide insights and then leave. It is to build systems that support long-term organizing. That is what this report is—an accountability tool that CB9 can use for years.

Project Implications – Beyond the Report. The comprehensive report is finished, but the work is not over. The report creates *potential, but whether it leads to change* depends on how CB9 uses it and what support is built around it.

Immediate next steps (CB9 internal):

1. Full Board vote (March 15) – Adopt the tiered framework and tract-specific standards as official CB9 policy
2. Test the framework on live projects – Apply to 2975 Broadway (Tier 3 case: 40% affordable at 60-100% AMI in underserved Tract 221) and 3333 Broadway (Tier 3 case in same tract)
3. Formalize the Service Equity Fund – Legal structure for developer contributions from high-saturation tract projects.

External coalition-building (3-6 months):

4. Partner with ANHD and Enterprise – Build coalition for HPD subsidy reform (create 30-40% AMI tier with higher per-unit subsidies)
5. Coordinate with CB10 and CB11 – East and Central Harlem face similar burdens; joint Fair Share advocacy multiplies pressure
6. Engage elected officials – Present report to State Senator Cordell Cleare and Assemblymember Al Taylor; propose tract-level AMI legislation at the state level

Charter enforcement pathway (6-12 months):

7. Demand Cumulative Impact Assessments – Formal letter to HPD/DCP/DHS citing Audit MD22-101A: CB9 will not review proposals without completed CIAs
8. Establish 197-a compliance monitoring – Refuse to waive community review rights (violated in 38% of sitings)
9. Secure legal support – Urban Justice Center or Legal Aid Society for pro bono Charter enforcement representation
10. Publish Annual Fair Share Equity Report – Longitudinal dataset showing whether the city is improving or worsening compliance

Long-term systemic change (1-2 years):

11. Pursue Charter litigation if necessary – If HPD continues approving projects that violate CB9 standards without community review, file Fair Share violation lawsuit
12. Advocate for tract-level AMI reform – State legislation requiring neighborhood-specific affordability standards for high-poverty census tracts
13. Build the Deep Affordability Priority District designation – Formal HPD recognition triggering accelerated 30-50% AMI funding for CB9

Next Steps – Finalizing and Launching

1. Incorporate final Housing Committee feedback – Two minor revisions to Tract 221 service recommendations and CBA template language.
2. Complete data reproducibility documentation – All calculations must be replicable using publicly available datasets (ACS, HPD, DOHMH, 311, Comptroller audit)
3. Design executive summary and policy brief – Board members need a 2-page version for media and elected officials
4. Prepare a full Board presentation – 30-minute walkthrough with slides, maps, and a framework overview.

5. Coordinate report release strategy: publish simultaneously with Board vote, send to media (Gothamist, City Limits, Amsterdam News), and post on CB9 website.
6. Schedule elected official briefings – Sen. Cleare, Asm. Taylor, City Council Member Shaun Abreu, needs advance copies.
7. Set up an implementation–tracking subgroup within the Housing Committee to monitor the application of the framework and annual Fair Share reporting.
8. Plan coalition outreach – ANHD, Enterprise, CB10/CB11, tenant unions get copies with request for partnership

1.