

# Countywide Housing Affordability Taskforce (CHAT) November 9, 2007 Meeting Notes

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

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

Members Absent: Mayor Bromley, Charlotte Eastman-Pros, Paul Schissler, Ralph Black, Barbara Brenner, and Don Gischer.

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

Guests: Tom Beckwith, Bill Schenkin, and Steve Price were representing the consulting team.

Seth Fleetwood called meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

## **1. Approval of October 26, 2007 notes**

Terry Bornemann moved to approve the minutes. They were seconded. **ALL AYES.**

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

11/09/07: Tom Beckwith stated that the discussion today will focus on the spreadsheets that were handed out.

11/16/07: Continue any discussion regarding the spreadsheets and review the draft mail out / phone back survey.

12/4/07: County Council will be given a progress report.

There is no date with City Council at this time due to schedules.

Follow-up with the Small Cities Council's are being scheduled.

It was clarified that 12/14/07 is the **new date** that the CHAT meeting will be held in Council Chambers and not 11/30/07.

## **3. Discussion**

Tom referenced the spreadsheets that were handed out. He reiterated the fact that the implication of choosing the cash offset (waiving of permit, utility, or impact fees), then the money realized in savings up front needs to be paid by another source. There was continued discussion on how developing smaller units, utilizing manufactured units, and using the land trust approach can cut the cost of development.

Ted requested more details around line 35. There was discussion about the \$25,000.00 non-profit donated and it was determined that it would need to be subtracted out to determine what a private sector developer would realize.

There was discussion relating to the difference between primed and un-primed sites, and the differences it makes to the cost of development.

Nancy stated that if there was interest, she would submit subdivision numbers.

Ted referenced line 16 (sales tax) and stated since it does not provide any direct benefit to the project and it is only recycled through the system; maybe there is a way that can be used to reduce the immediate cost. There was discussion around the percentage difference between Federal and County sales tax and what portion could be used to offset a project, and is it even a viable request to make. Tom stated the financial statement illustrates what the County uses their taxes for.

#### PROJECTING NEED:

Tom reviewed the official projections for 2000 – 2025 that the OFM published for the State to abide by and to use as they assist the Counties and Cities to determine their goals for growth management act proposes. He referenced the spreadsheet that was handed out, and directed discussion around the trends that the projections are showing. There was also discussion around how many households are currently in the different age groups that the taskforce would like to target.

Dave Cahill clarified that the 11,000 housing unit goal had the objective to accommodate the projected number of increased households that will be paying 80% of AMI between now and 2022.

Larry West suggested that the “per unit cost” figure be determined. There was further discussion about subsidy.

Gail de Hoog pointed out that the homeless population is not reflected in the figures the group is discussing. She suggested including them in the 30% and under AMI, and emphasized the need to keep them in mind as the target groups are determined.

Tom led a discussion on the different tools that are being used by the cities and jurisdictions to show that they have an affordable housing component in their comprehensive plan. Ted suggested adding reduction of utility costs to the list of tools.

Gary pointed out that the list of tools used by the different cities and jurisdictions are additional incentives that should be considered.

Steve pointed out that some of the small cities have one planner that travels between the cities and does the planning; therefore there is continuity between the tools. He also

stated that through his discussions with the “small cities” Mayors, he has found out that they do not know how they can help the taskforce achieve their goals. He suggested that if we don’t bring the small cities on board, in some capacity, there will be various areas of non-conformance.

There was discussion about how the small cities could become involved at this point. Steve suggested that the City Councils and County Councils decide together what role the small cities will have, in the affordable housing solution, at a policy level.

Dave suggested instead of trying to bring the small cities in to the planning stage at this point, they should be invited to the County’s presentation so they have the opportunity to hear the recommendations prior to the language being presented to the policy makers.

Hart expressed his concern about the conversations, regarding what the taskforce feels is important, practical, and likely recommendations to present to City Council, has not happened yet.

There was discussion about the utility costs being reduced to specific addresses that qualify for affordable housing and how that might jeopardize the operating funds; as well as, the general fund if money needs to be transferred to cover the discounts.

Tom stated that for the revenue options, a levy will be the most viable option; however the criteria for dispersing the funds is still something that the taskforce will need to develop.

Ted would like to formally request working with the City to have direct reduction of operating cost for low-income housing, and he would also like to discuss land supply again. Tom suggested waiting for the revenue projections that contain the utility costs before talking to the City so that the costs will be known.

There was a comment from the public suggesting that each member of the group submit 3-5 things that they feel should be included in the recommendations.

#### **4. Next Action**

- 11/30 - all the analysis will be completed.
- Walk through original toolkit and confirm support / don’t support, and in some cases what is the majority / minority and move those reasons why.
  - Consider the Governor’s Tier 1 - consensus by everyone. Tier 2 - not total consensus, but could have an impact. Tier 3 – explore further, can not quantify by this group.

#### **5. Next Steps**

Several meetings ago the discussion around the schedule is have the product drive the schedule, not the schedule drive the project

**6. Next Week's Agenda:**

- Revenue projects
- Draft of survey document