

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes
February 1, 2008

Present:

Dave Norris
Cheri Lewis
Charlie Armstrong
Art Lichtenberger
Donna Scott – Region Ten
Natasha Sienitsky
Overton McGehee
Theresa Tapscott
Noah Schwartz
Peter Loach
Mike Heckman
Kathy Galvin

Absent:

Carol Clarke
Joy Johnson
Ron White
Vicki Hawes

Guests:

Angela Vanderhoof
Tom Twomey

Summary of Meeting Notes:

- Meeting was called to order at 12:10 and began with introductions of Kathy Galvin to the group.
- Next on the agenda was a presentation and discussion led by Dave regarding Housing Trust Fund proposal and setting up a dedicated source of revenue:
 - Dave gave an overview of last year's CAHIP proposal and compared and contrasted this year's CAHIF proposal with it.
 - This year's CAHIF proposal is much simpler – no different buckets of funding
 - If there is a surplus again this year, those funds can be substituted in lieu of general fund dollars
 - Developer contributions would go to this fund when received
 - Planning Commission currently working on a Proffer Policy
 - There is also a bill before the General Assembly which would have some implications on our housing abilities
 - This proposal also includes a goal of trying to set up a 50% match to the local dollars –
 - Continue looking for ways to grow this fund in the future
 - Proposal will be given to Council at Monday night (02/04) meeting – come show support

Questions raised during discussion included:

1. Would there still be an application process for these dollars?
2. Can we keep CDBG/HOME dollars separate from the proposal?
3. Which councilors are already on board with the proposal?
4. How much/many applications were unfunded from last year's application process?

5. Can projects being funded be classified as an asset?
6. Can any of the funding from the Economic Development's fund be used to fill the gap in housing dollars?
7. Why does the Housing Committee get to have such a large role in the set up of these funds when members are applying? – CDBG Task Force would like a larger role in future funds.
8. How does this group compare to the County's Housing Committee? – similar discussions?
9. How do the non-profits fit in to the committee in terms of voting?
10. Should the priorities for these funds be reviewed on an annual basis or less frequently?
11. Could we set aside a certain percentage of funds each year for a certain purpose and leave the rest open and more flexible?
12. Where have the Housing Initiatives Fund dollars come from in the past?
13. Can we add language to the proposal to include mixed-income and mixed-use projects?
14. Where does the 25% lodging tax come from? Already being used for something else?
15. What are the incentives for developers to participate in affordable housing?

Cheri made a motion to approve the proposal Dave presented with the following friendly amendments: 1) Will call the funding the Charlottesville Housing Fund instead of CAHIF, 2) Add language about it being a revolving loan fund, 3) p.2 #3 - Expand the sources of the matching grant/loan funds, 4) Add language to include mixed-use and mixed-income projects, 5) More inclusion of the CDBG Task Force members in this process.

_____ seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor, none were opposed.

- Work Program Discussion – Charlie led a discussion about what the future of the HAC group was to be and gathered opinions from the group about how to move forward:
 - Talked about whether the Joint City/County/UVA Task Force would become a more permanent group or continue to be short-term
 - Would HAC become a more advisory group that met less often?
 - Several folks agree that they enjoy the County's higher-level participation with the Joint Task Force and would like to see that continue
 - Also don't want to see the group pared down to one group or the other...both will continue to exist
 - IMPACT is interested in seeing results and having higher level officials involved

At the February meeting, groups members are asked to bring forth their issues and initiatives for discussion. What are the group's goals and objectives? What are the policy possibilities that are unrealized? How to break down into sub-committees to get more work done?

- Tax Abatement program discussion – Overton provided an update on the Tax Rebate program he had been researching. It was decided to invite Lee Richards to come to the Feb. mtg. for further discussion.
 - 377 people earning less than \$25,000 applied last year, so raising the amount available per family would have larger budget consequences than originally thought

Meeting adjourned at 1:30.

- **Next *REGULAR* meeting date is set for: Thursday, February 21, 2008** (Location: Basement Conference Room, City Hall)