

Countywide Housing Affordability Taskforce (CHAT) February 8, 2008 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-Pro; 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; Barbara Brenner; and Stan Snapp.

Members Absent: Mayor Bromley, Ted Mischaikov, Stan Snapp, and Barbara Brenner.

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

Guests: Tom Beckwith and Steve Price represented the consulting team

Seth Fleetwood called meeting to order at 9:05 am

1. Approval of Notes

2. Discussion

The discussion continued on the CHAT Action Plan Survey results.

DISCUSSION LED BY TOM

- 71-74 - OPEN FOR DISCUSSION.

Tom suggested combining those questions together and using the language Paul suggestion during the last session to “explore using land trust to the extent possible to provide for mixed-income single-family and multi-family affordable housing projects”.

Seth wanted to know what role the local government plays in this situation.

Paul responded that local government could play a number of roles. They could provide the land and retain ownership by leasing it to a project, or they could request proposals and invite developers to build out. He explained that the local government could provide funding, and adopt suggested code changes to allow a mix of housing; thereby requiring less subsidy, and making the homes more affordable for 80% AMI and below. He pointed out one area of concern is finding the right balance between homeowners having the opportunity to build equity or receive a reasonable rate of return on their investment and the community’s need to protect what they invested to make the home affordable.

MOVED TO APPROVE 71-74. SECONDED.

VOTE: ALL AYES

- 75-76 – OPEN FOR DISCUSSION.

Tom explained that these questions would place a lien on the property; thereby allowing the property to be sold (if necessary) at market value to recover the remaining balance on the rehab loan.

Tom clarified that it would be public money.

THERE WAS A MOTION FOR 76. NO SECOND. - WITHDRAWN

Dave clarified that the program that the City offers is more a mix of 75 and 76. The individual status of the homeowner is taken into consideration when determining whether the interest is included in the loan or not.

MOTION TO COMBINE 75 AND 76 AND ALLOW LOAN TERMS BE DETERMINED BASED ON INCOME LEVEL. SECONDED.

VOTE: ALL AYES

- 77-79 – OPEN FOR DISCUSSION.

Tom explained the differences between the 3 questions.

Ralph wanted to know how are these questions different from 108.

Tom explained that it is the rehabilitation component, allowing the payment restructure to be suited to individual needs.

Larry expressed his concern that the homeowners are giving up the title to their property.

John H. explained that this process allows for a rehabilitation to take place, and the owners not turn around and sell for a windfall profit.

Gary wanted to know if the equity of the property will be returned to the owner, or if it would be given to the lien holder.

Tom clarified the owners, or the family, would be entitled to any equity after the loan has been repaid.

MOTION TO APPROVE 77-79. SECONDED.

Friendly amendment – **SEPARATE 77-78 FROM 79. ACCEPTED.**

Gary would like them to go to Council as two separate tools. He expressed his concern about “permanent”.

VOTE: ALL AYES

- 79 – FURTHER DISCUSSION.

Gary expressed his concern that the homeowner would not understand that if they accepted these terms, they would no longer own their property and become renters. He suggested removing permanent.

Paul expressed his objection. He stated that if public money is being used to preserve housing and make it affordable for a homeowner in distress, the City needs to be able to recapture their investment and keep it affordable for the next buyer.

**MOTION TO APPROVE 79 WITH “PERMANENT” REMOVED.
SECONDED.**

VOTE: 13-1 (SCHISLER, OPPOSED)

- 99 –

Derek distributed handouts that help demonstrate some of the LEED projects that are happening locally. Derek would like to see an emphasis on lowering operating costs for affordable housing.

MOTION TO APPROVE 99. SECONDED..

FRIENDLY AMMENDMENT - Hart reminded the group that the question was changed to include “and / or”.

Derek suggested giving more consideration to projects that are “green” be included in the guidelines for the committee who will distribute the money for affordable projects.

There was discussion about how the recommendation should be reworded. There was consensus that it should read: Encourage green energy efficient building codes that include but are not limited to solar energy, passive heating, increased insulation, energy efficient appliances, and / or other features that may increase initial construction costs but reduce long term operating and utility costs.

VOTE: ALL AYES

2. Discussion of Phone Survey

Tom distributed the results of the phone survey and led a discussion on the responses.

Jon S. pointed out that there are still tools that have not been included in the CHAT Action Survey, such as the 20 lot SEPA and the 9 lot short-plat.

3. Next Meeting’s Agenda (2/22/08)

- Taskforce will discuss what they would like to have included in the Draft Ordinance.

4. Public Comment

Adjourned: 11:03 am