

# Countywide Housing Affordability Taskforce (CHAT)

## October 5, 2007

### Meeting Notes

*(copies of all handouts / draft reports are available at cob.org)*

Members Names: Seth Fleetwood, Co-Chair; Terry Bornemann, Co-Chair; Bob Mitchell; Charlotte Eastman-Pros; Derek Long; John Shorthill; Hart Hodges; Larry West; Nancy Larsen; Gary Reid; Ted Mischaikov; Jon Soine; Paul Schissler; Barbara Brenner; Don Gischer; Ralph Black; Gail de Hoog; John Harmon.

Members Absent: Gary Reid; Barbara Brenner; Don Gischer.

Staff Present: Dave Cahill, Heather Aven, Gary Williams, and Samya Lutz.

Consultants: Tom Beckwith; Steve Price; and Bill Schenkin.

Terry Bornemann chaired the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

#### **1. Approval of September 21, 2007 notes**

Ralph Black moved to approve the minutes. Hart Hodges seconded. **ALL AYES.**

#### **2. Review of CHAT Schedule & Deliverables**

Tom Beckwith reported that nothing has changed in the schedule, but did point out that the small city meetings might run into the last part of October.

Ted asked about the scheduling for the public survey. He wants to be sure outreach is well-crafted so the public understands the reasons why they are being asked to provide revenue for housing. He feels there needs to be a clear and concise explanation of the housing issues being faced.

Tom replied that the session to put together the public survey has not happened yet. He proposed using the "mail-out / phone back" method. This method will begin with cold calls into the community, of registered voters, to invite people to participate in the process. If they agree to participate, a packet of information, containing the material the taskforce feels is important, will be sent out to them. The individual will have 1-2 weeks to review the material and answer the questions, and then they will receive a phone call to go over their answers. Once the quota has been reached, a letter will be sent out to those that agreed to participate informing them that if they did not receive a phone call, but have feedback to submit, they should send it in. He pointed out there will be greater participation if this process can be completed before the holiday season begins.

Ted wanted to know if the survey was standardized or customized for each community.

Hart wanted to know what might be asked for in the survey.

Tom responded that the survey is customized and should be as quantified as possible. It is important to find out what the public will support. He suggested proposing a minimum and maximum range instead of specific dollar amount. He also encouraged that the survey be open-ended so that more information can be gathered.

John H. suggested the survey include the scope of the problem that needs to be solved.

Tom agreed that it is important to give the public enough information that will allow them to respond and show where their support is, by doing this they feel they have had a chance to look at all the options, and were part of the process. This is key when it comes time to ask for their support.

Ralph Black expressed concern over working through all the discussion points, having the interviews with the stake holders, and then doing the survey and finding out there is no public support for the recommendations.

Gail de Hoog expressed concern over what material could be sent out to the public that they would understand, and commented that she is convinced that the survey was acceptable.

Nancy Larsen wanted to know how the survey would be laid out.

Tom relied it is usually created with a variety of questions, some short and some long, that the individual can rank 1 to 5.

Hart pointed out that there has been a lot of research done surrounding the design and effectiveness of surveys. He agreed with Tom that they can be a useful tool.

### **3. Continuation of the discussion points:**

Tom started by listing some of the other topics that were submitted and discussed at the last meeting:

- Manufactured housing sites
- Reduce regulatory cost
- Renovate existing stock
- RFP's – mixed income / products
- Gap funding competition
- Public reaction – especially to funding
- IZ or incentive based zoning (mandatory / optional)
- Mobile home parks
- Package tools
- Prioritize households in need
- Developer profit
- Retain affordability (mix)
- New 501(k) 3 entity

The group then continued to build on the discussion points: See Diagram.

Larry pointed out that one obstacle that will need to be addressed is the feeling that there is a scarcity of land. He stated some people may feel that the land is scarce, and what is not already built on should be left alone.

Discussion moved from Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) to Target Population.

**Target Population:**

During the discussion in regard to which need will be met at the highest level, Seth reminded everyone that the taskforce had previously agreed on 80% AMI. Ted expressed that tenure in the community should be a determining factor in eligibility, and also pointed out that the 80% AMI should not be looked at independent of the applicant's ability to earn a wage and lifestyle choices.

It was decided that a delivery tree be created with the guidelines of over 50% housing costs and under 50% AMI determining the target population. The delivery tree will allow different solutions to be created for different situations.

**Inclusionary Zoning:**

During the discussion of IZ, Tom pointed out that it does not work in the same fashion throughout the county, the tools are different depending on the area of choice. John H. mentioned that some states have made IZ a mandatory part of the development process in order to level the playing field. Hart pointed out that IZ should not be a tool used by itself, it will have to be combined with other tools and can not be done without an offset. Ralph feels the development community would support IZ being factored into the project, but expressed concern over it becoming mandatory.

**4. Next Action:**

The next meeting will be held on October 12, 2007. This meeting will continue the review discussion points including IZ and reports on Focus Groups and Small Cities presentations.

**5. Public Comment:**

None.