

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room, City Hall
September 17, 2014
12:00 pm

Attendance Record	Present	Absent
MEMBERS		
Bob Hughes	X	
Carmelita Wood	X	
Charlie Armstrong	X	
Chris Murray	X	
Connie Dunn		X
Dan Rosensweig	X	
Frank Stoner		X
Joyce Dudek		X
Jennifer McKeever	X	
Joy Johnson	X	
Kaki Dimock	X	
Kira Drennon		X
Kristin Szakos	X	
Mark Watson	X	
Nancy Kidd	X	
Lesley Fore	X	
Phil d'Oronzio		X
Ryan Jacoby	X	
Ridge Schuyler		X
NON VOTING MEMBERS		
IMPACT		X
Ron White (Albemarle County)		X
Trish Romer (UVa)	X	
STAFF		
Kathy McHugh	X	
Melissa Thackston	X	
Brian Haluska	X	
OTHERS		
Lena Seville	X	
Edith Good	X	
Jen Jacobs	X	

The meeting was called to order by Chris Murray around noon. Given that UVa has designated a new person to the HAC, round table introductions were made and Trish Romer was welcomed to the group.

The July 16, 2014 minutes were not considered, as Kathy McHugh noted that she had forgotten to include this on the agenda. Everyone was asked to review and make her aware of any changes so that these could be formally acted on at the next meeting in November.

Chris Murray then asked Kathy McHugh to provide a status update regarding the Housing Studies Scoping Sub-Committee efforts.

Kathy McHugh went on to explain that the group met on August 20th and decided that they needed additional assistance to examine the following topics:

- 1) What housing do we have?
- 2) What are the gaps between people (income, work location, personal limitations, personal preferences, etc...) and the current housing stock (affordability, availability, location, desirability, etc...)?
- 3) What can / should we do about addressing the gaps?

To help facilitate looking into these questions, the City has asked an on-call consultant to meet with the group to talk through each issue. Mr. Lee Sobel and Ms. Erin Talkington of Robert Charles Lessor Company (RCLCO) will be attending the 10/15/14 meeting to help the group with figuring out the scope questions.

Kristen Szakos then asked if UVa has looked at affordable housing available to students (i.e., housing demand study). Trish Romer replied that a housing demand study has been done, but not a supply study.

Kristen went on to ask if there was anything the Sub-Committee needed from the HAC. Kathy replied that she did not think so, as the group will come back to the HAC after they meet with RCLCO to form a tentative scope of work. Kathy also mentioned that Arlington County has developed a system for tracking affordable rate market units and that perhaps the HAC interest in this aspect of housing might be modeled after what is being done there.

Dan Rosensweig mentioned that there are also non-housing related barriers that need to be examined such as credit, criminal record, lack of transit, housing judgments, etc...

Chris Murray then asked Kathy McHugh to discuss the proposed homelessness symposium. Kathy explained that she is proposing that the HAC support the 2nd Homelessness & Housing Symposium tentatively scheduled for January 29, 2015 to be held at the same location as last year - UVa Garrett Hall. The plenary session items tentatively include a discussion of: a) housing efforts by AHIP BXBC; Habitat Burnett Commons II/III/Harmony Ridge; Orangedale Neighborhood Stabilization Project, etc...; b) rapid rehousing/prevention programs; and c) revised plan to end homelessness. Kathy then asked Kaki Dimock to explain further.

Kaki stated that she was looking for the HAC to support, sponsor, and volunteer to help with the event. Dan Rosensweig then made a motion to sponsor and support the event. Carmelita Wood seconded the motion. Chris Murray then asked if there was any discussion. Joy Johnson asked if TJACH had seen any changes in homelessness since the last symposium, particularly in light of the Haven being closed half a day. Kaki Dimock responded that the system of care housed 47 people through rapid rehousing and that even with the hardest to serve group, that they are seeing lots of success. She further explained that 27 have been prevented from becoming homeless, most of whom have children. She noted that even with narrow eligibility requirements that they are still finding folks to help, but that there needs to be additional efforts with local landlords. As to the Haven, Kaki denoted that the decision to close half a day is based on the fact that they had less than 10 people in the afternoons and that using staff time to work on housing stabilization and services seemed to be a better use of staff time.

Nancy Kidd interjected that the Hope House fills the gap and addresses the barriers. That they work on cleaning up credit issues, paying off judgments, and connecting with all the services that each family needs. They work with four families at a time.

The HAC then voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Chris then asked Kathy to provide an update on the status of Housing Policy 1. Kathy provided a handout showing her proposed revisions and apologized to the group for not sending earlier, stating that she was

waiting for some feedback on one particular issue that had not come in until the day before this meeting. Kathy then noted that the group reviewed and approved recommending the last version of the policy as presented at the July 16th meeting (with noted changes per minutes); however, at the City Council work session on housing (held on July 17th) some issues had come up that need to be resolved before the policy is ready for City Council consideration. Specific concerns identified during the City Council work session focused on three main issues: 1) allowance of funding for projects including assistance up to 100% of Area Median Income (AMI); 2) residency preference versus a requirement; and 3) use of funds for predevelopment / soft costs. To address these issues, City staff proposed various changes, as follows:

1) Under Guidelines for Use of CAHF, reference to 100% AMI was eliminated and instead the text now refers to use of funds in “mixed-income” projects, with a strong preference for applications that benefit the lowest level of AMI. This change allows participation (as Council deems appropriate) in projects that include a mixed-income component, while also preserving the focus of the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) to the lower income tiers.

2) Under Guidelines for Use of CAHF, reference to resident preference has been modified to state that beneficiaries should **primarily be City residents** and/or be employed in the City. The text also includes a statement that recipients will be required to track and report on previous residency to ensure compliance. This change is a compromise between requiring City residency and use of a more basic preference. Exceptions to preferences have been maintained as originally proposed. These include the homeless, persons who were living in the City during the previous 2 years, and conflicting funding requirements that have no residency preference.

3) Under How to Apply for CAHF & Potential Use of Funds, a note has been added that requires a 50% cost share requirement for any predevelopment effort that is not directed or requested by the City. Also, repayment of funds (if project is deemed infeasible) is not required; however, recipients will be required to share/disclose findings with the City. This change will address both Council concerns over the need to have a cost share provision and HAC concerns over repayment of CAHF in the event that predevelopment funding results in a determination of project infeasibility.

Other minor changes from the July 16th version seen by the HAC include: 1) inclusion of a standard for calculation of qualified income to adopt the HUD standard at 24 CFR Part 5; 2) addition of a note that in the case of rental units and compliance with Virginia Code 58.1-3295, that properties financed under specified programs meets our definition of affordable rental (as required to allow affordability to be considered in assessment of real property; 3) addition of a note that new supported affordable units refers to either physically new or newly supported affordable (existing) units; 4) addition of rehabilitation under accountability measures “CAHF Assistance” for project based rental housing and housing rehabilitation as this was omitted by oversight in the prior version; and 5) minor rewording to next to the last paragraph under Guidelines for Use of CAHF to provide clarity as follows: *Funding will be primarily reserved for access to or the creation, reservation, and development of Supported Affordable Units.*

Jennifer McKeever noted that while the changes were simplistic that these work nicely. Dan Rosensweig agreed. The group asked to add the word “previous” to the section on residency reporting (added to the fourth from the last paragraph under Guidelines for Use of CAHF).

Dan Rosensweig added that he still doesn’t like the policy on residency, as we state a preference for low income residents on one hand and then look to recruit higher income workers to move into the City on the other. He felt that this approach is incoherent, but he was generally okay with what has been presented. Kristen Szakos stated that while this is a financial policy, it can be seen as unwelcoming.

Jennifer McKeever moved to accept the changes as presented by Kathy McHugh. Joy Johnson seconded and the motion carried by a unanimous vote. Chris Murray then motioned further that the group also vote to “recommend the policy to City Council as written.” Bob Hughes seconded this and this motion carried by unanimous vote also. The group thanked Kathy McHugh for getting this done.

Chris Murray then asked if there was other business to consider and Kathy McHugh noted that she wanted to make everyone aware of the Orangedale & Prospect Focus Group Meeting scheduled for 9/24/14 (everyone is welcome to attend, but staff have attempted to target specific persons and groups not traditionally involved with the HAC to serve). Kathy then went on to state that Charlie Armstrong would be stepping down effective 12/31/14 and that we will need a developer to serve on the HAC. She asked for people to let her know if they had ideas for people to serve and that she would be glad to do outreach. Dan Rosensweig then mentioned the on-going work on the Code Audit and asked that Kathy send out the staff report to the HAC as well as a Habitat job posting for an Outreach Worker / Community Organizing position. He then invited the HAC to attend a joint work session with Council on the Code Audit to be held at the TJPDC Water Street Studio the following Tuesday (9/23/14). Dan then asked Kathy if she could add a discussion of the Code Audit to a HAC agenda. Kathy noted that she would send out the staff report and work with Dan to identify a date and appropriate way for the HAC to become involved with the code audit (perhaps use of another straw man).

At approximately 1:00 PM, the meeting shifted to the special agenda discussion on Housing Policy 2 and 3. Chris asked Kathy to introduce the topic, so she explained that policy 2 has not been updated since previously adopted by Council on 11/3/08 and that it needs to be reviewed and perhaps fleshed out a bit. She also noted the Incentives for Creation of Affordable Private Housing Sub-Committee issued a report in October 22, 2012 that needs to be reviewed as the group recommends revisions to policy 2.

Kathy highlighted the need to expand the criteria for the expedited review process through the code audit adding that she had recently met with David Blount to discuss going back to the General Assembly to modify the authorizing legislation to potentially lower the compliance term of 30 years and to raise the income level threshold from 60% to 80%.

Chris Murray stated that it would be a good idea (as a first step) to roll together Policy 2 and the Sub-Committee report into one combined document so that the HAC can review these at the same time.

There was then a discussion about the housing specialist job and that it was initially meant to be like the preservation planner, only to concentrate and to champion affordable housing projects. Kathy noted that while she understands the group's concerns that she answers to a formalized chain of command and that this chain does not specifically include the HAC. The group discussion noted that there needs to be someone to meet one-on-one with developers and to provide an initial consultation over the need for and potential incentives available for adding affordable housing units. Convening at the concept stage to provide education and then champion the project (combining items 1 and 6 from the Incentives Sub-Committee report) was described as what is needed. Kathy explained that she would be glad to discuss this with Jim Tolbert, but that there needs to be a procedural change in NDS operations to allow this to happen.

Brian Haluska then stated that the Planners are looking at site planning changes that would allow for a true "preliminary site plan" and that getting Kathy involved in the development review process would make sense, but by then the plan is 80% developed. If the City can move to more of a true preliminary process, then there would be more opportunity to get the type of input the HAC is seeking.

Chris Murray stated that the elements of Policy 2 are moving in the right direction, but that he worries these are not enough and that we need to ask other groups what incentives they would like to have. He wants to get private developer buy in and figure out how to best incentivize from the public sector. There was mention of something like an online handbook of "how to build in Charlottesville."

As time was running short, the group wound up their discussions on Policy 2, with Kathy promising to merge the documents as requested and send to the group for feedback. With insufficient time remaining, the group postponed a discussion of Policy 3 for a future meeting.

The meeting was then adjourned at approximately 1:45 pm. The next meeting of the full HAC will be on November 19th, with a scoping subcommittee meeting to be held in October as previously noted.