

Affordable Housing Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 7, 2011
2:00 pm
Hap Clark Building Conference Room, Land O' Lakes

Call to Order

Commissioner Wilson called the meeting to order

Roll Call

| Name | Present? |
|---------------------|----------|
| Commissioner Wilson | Yes |
| Crystal Lazar | |
| David Lambert | Yes |
| Joe Matissek | Yes |
| Greg Armstrong | Yes |
| Katherine Britton | Yes |
| Michael Pennings | Yes |
| Stephen Farrell | Yes |
| Susannah Caum | Yes |
| Wendi Herzman | Yes |

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Wendi - On page 7, my name is spelled wrong.

Michelle - A couple of small changes. Crystal's name should have been changed to Lazar as she was already married. Also on page 10, there were a couple of things that I could not make out on the tape. Susannah had actually confirmed that she agreed with the idea of simple but flexibility as presented by Kathy, and the voice that was unable to determine was Michael so I'll change those for the record as well.

Motion by Wendi to approve with changes.
Second by Susannah.

All in favor.

Discuss Final Report Draft - Michelle

Wanted to go through everything and make sure everyone understands what the structure of the report is and how we approached it.

Page 2 - Introduces committee members

Page 3 - A confirmation of the requirements of the committee, and from the bottom of page 3 and into pages 4 and 5 is the explanation of the current county initiatives that are presented by Community Development and Planning and Growth Management. Made a couple of notes that I want to make for purposes of clarity - noticed a little bit of redundancy that I want to clean up if the committee approves. The very beginning is an explanation of what the County has done to improve our processes and also to allow for some more dynamic approaches to planning. Any questions or thoughts?

Jeff - chronologically, your first paragraph talks about the reorganization of the departments and the streamlining of the processes, that comes after the discussion of the Urban Land institute. That was all a direct result of that.

Michelle - if everyone is okay with that, I'll shift it for chronological purposes.

Jeff - We knew it was broken, but we hadn't started fixing it yet.

Michelle - I'll go ahead and shift it. It may require me to tweak some things, but the concept will remain the same there. Sort of the same thing in the last paragraph of page 4. I realized that we used the phrase "market area" about 4 times in one sentence. I want to clean that up a little bit so it doesn't sound so redundant. If no one has any other comments, we can move into the actual report itself.

Michelle - Starting on Page 7 is where the first recommendation comes into place. Quiter a bit of this is the same type of thing that was presented at the very first meeting, going back to the beginning of November, where we talked about 2008 and what has been done up until this point. We went into a bit more detail of what the County has done thus far in a lot of these situations, but the first recommendation that this committee has come up with is on page 8. The language that we used in regard to the expedited process is to review periodically to determine if existing processes are functioning properly, and are effectively meeting expedited requirements. Everybody okay with that language?

The next recommendation on Page 9. This is the language that I think came from Gregg and **was agreed upon by the committee during the last meeting. It is "The committee has determined that implementing any alternative standards for affordable housing may stigmatize such housing, and potentially decrease the value thereof. Therefore, it is the committee's decision to not recommend any alternative standards for consideration by the County."** You'll see that language throughout the report regarding alternative standards. I wanted to make sure that I was not assuming anything that was not the recommendation by the committee members. Is everyone okay with that language?

Page 10 - This is the second sort of base language that **we're** using. It came from Jeff and everyone was in agreement regarding financial incentives. It is "The committee has determined that given the current economic situation, the discussion of any financial incentives is not feasible at this time. The community chooses to defer discussion of financial incentives until a later date when recommendations have greater potential to be implemented." Is everyone okay with that approach to financial incentives?

Kathy - Just one question. Should it be the committee, not community?

Michelle - yes. I'll change that. And Jeff, am I okay with using this language and deferring to a **later date? Do you think that's appropriate?**

Jeff - The point that I was trying to allow the committee to get to was that if they really think **that's** appropriate even though though **there's** no money there. What I was hearing from several of the **committee members was that they would have done [this] but there's no money there.**

Michelle - do you think **that's** clear enough or do you want more detail on that? I **don't** want to leave out any detail that people want to have included.

George - I know this is the basic summary report. But if you want an appendix attached to it that maybe has some sources we discussed, we can include that if you want to. So people can see what we were talking about. The minutes, stuff like that.

Michelle - so it **doesn't** have to become an official recommendation but they can be discussion items for a later date. A basis for further discussion later. I know that was very helpful for me to prepare for this committee was being able to look back at 2008 so **it's** probably a good idea to not have to recreate the wheel next time we open this committee. We can definitely put something like that together.

On Page 11, the first recommendation is the same language that we used before in regard to alternative standards. The second is "The committee identified siting criteria as one of the top priorities for making affordable housing more accessible and affordable. The committee would like to see the County focus on building homes close to transit and employment centers when possible." I know that we discussed quite often, and Quanlin had brought up the transit corridor and the west market area. We **didn't** explicitly define corridors that you would like to see affordable housing focused on, but I know the discussion kept going back to transit and employment. What we can do, if you would like to keep it more general we can keep it that way. But if there is a desire of the committee to get more specific for purposes of the **recommenations, we can do that as well. I'll leave it up to the committee to decide that as well.**

Wendi - **Is it feasible to do that without knowing what lands are out there to be used?**

Michelle - Well, and Quanlin you may want to speak about this more than me, but you may want to discuss connecting more to transit, to the future transit stations, etc. We may be able to get more specific. Or we may just want to direct County staff to consider affordable housing in development of transit station plans, etc. There may be a way to connect to other planning initiatives. Or we may leave it more general.

Quanlin - The TOD policies in the comprehensive plan right now generally acknowledge that we need to encourage affordable housing. And we are actually completing an analysis for transit nodes. Whatever recommendatiosn from the committee can be brought to the study. We **don't** have specifics yet of how we are going to [encourage affordable housing] yet.

Michelle - so if **you'd** like, we can make a recommendation to consider affordable housing as part of the transit centers and to bring that information back to future committee meetings. **There's an option to make that connection if you so desire.**

Wendi - I think **that's** a great idea.

Kathy - seems that it would be helpful to you to have that connection.

Quanlin - we are looking at housing affordability as part of the study, so it would be good for us to take the recommendation of the committee back as part of the study.

Greg - One thing that I think is missing, we left out schools. Did we do that on purpose?

Michelle - no. Is everyone in agreement with adding schools? And if I could get a consensus if you would like to include the discussion of the transit centers or something along those lines?

Kathy - Yes.

Greg - I'm okay with that.

Michelle - the next recommendation is on page 13 in regard to partnerships. Once again, this is another general recommendation "The committee has identified partnerships as one of the top priorities for making affordable housing more accessible and affordable. The committee would like to see expanded partnerships with agency partners in order to improve housing accessibility." **Just a general recommendation. How does everyone feel about that?**

Michael - what does that exactly mean, Michelle?

Michelle - One of the discussions that we had in one of the previous meetings was to have greater partnerships with, say, the Pasco Economic Development Council and other developers to where **you're** doing mixed use development especially, and you want to bring in a large commercial or industrial use that will bring employment, it would make sense to plan for affordable housing at the beginning so you **don't** have to plan twice. **You'll** still have to plan again when you come in for your zoning, but if you plan for affordable housing at the beginning when you are doing your master plan, it allows you to plan for those uses then versus trying to figure out how to integrate them later. **We've** done that, Quanlin can speak to that, in growth management when doing the Mitchell Property, even Wiregrass, when **you're** master planning, planning for the housing component as part of the plan versus waiting for the MPUD. There may be a better way to structure that to talk about the master planning approach versus leaving it this general. Recommendations from the committee are welcome.

Wendi - Maybe more specifics?

Michelle - we can do that. We can talk about PEDC or maybe bring up examples of how this has been done in the past. We can definitely do that.

Joe - so the partnerships you are talking **about...** are they with other housing agencies and developers?

Michelle - When we first started this a couple of years ago it was more focused on nonprofits and other housing providers. But now that **we've** even expanded it further to say that if **you're** talking about economic development and housing, **they're** connected, etc. I think that **there's** a way to expand on it a little bit.

Last but not least, on Page 14, **it's** "The committee has identified land availability for affordable housing as one of its top priorities for increasing the accessibility and affordability of housing in Pasco County. The committee would like to see a more comprehensive list of available lands prioritized by their build-readiness in order to expand housing options." So that ties in what we talked about with having the class project and also being able to put together a comprehensive

prioritized list for housing. Is everyone in agreement with that recommendation?

If you all just want to take a moment, the conclusion is sort of a starting point to what George had mentioned earlier about an exhibit or explanation. We had wanted to talk about the fact that you had some very active discussion but in the end you did not make a whole lot of recommendations. I **don't** want to limit the discussion in the conclusion. So if **there's** anything else we need to make sure that we are including, let me know so I can include it.

Kathy - By the way, the way that you took all of the conversations from the last meeting and brought it together in such a concise manner, congratulations. We had all sorts of great recommendations and talked ourselves out of them in a span of two hours.

Michelle - I had actually gone and talked to George about that yesterday because you guys had so many great ideas.

Kathy - But decided not to act on any of them.

Michelle - I wanted to make sure that we provided justification for the amount of ideas that you all had that you had talked about. And it could be that in a couple of years when things are different, or when situations are different, that this could be opened up again.

Kathy - By not having these concrete recommendations now, as you start to look at some of the bigger projects, do you need something more specific here or can you think about what you need to do to address them at that time?

Michelle - We can choose, George, at any time to open up the committee when **it's** a valuable asset to the county, right?

George - Many counties have this committee meet once every three years. Some communities meet regularly, and have other roles, too. That can be a recommendation, too, that instead of waiting for three years, meet a year and a half from now, or meet a year from now, every 6 months.

Michelle - one of the recommendations that came in 2008 was to do a more regular occurring meeting of agencies, which we have done with the POP program. But in this committee, there are other people that are not involved in our daily operations. We can make a recommendation to re-evaluate circumstances a year from now, etc. We can leave ourselves open.

Greg - What if we said that the committee must meet every 3 years but can be re-opened at the sole discretion of Community Development?

George - I would put that on the Chairman.

Michelle - And maybe that will make sense, instead of limiting us to a particular timeframe we **can choose to reopen it when we see it's useful.**

Greg - That way George can come to you and say tht things have changed and we need to deal with it, and we do not have to be limited by a timeframe.

Joe - Economic situations have changed and you have developers that want to develop property, you might want to bring thecommittee together.

Greg - Like you said, things will hopefully pick back up again in a couple of years. What **they're going to look like...**

George - **It's** been 5 or 6 years since **we've** had a county-wide housing symposium. **We've** done that twice in the past 10 years. We have the nonprofit agencies meet, we have the homeless meet, but they **don't** meet together. We have the housing authority reconstituted. Everyone **doesn't** get together. This committee all has different agencies and interests. Getting everyone together may be appropriate. Maybe a recommendation could be to meet biannually.

Michelle - If you all feel that would be appropriate, I can add that as well.

Jeff - it might be appropriate to have the committee meet at least during the time period that y**ou're** evaluating the Land Development Code. **We're** taking it to stakeholders anyway, but if they want to have input on the process, **that's** going to be an ongoing process for the next couple of years.

Michelle - Do we have a schedule or milestones of that, or would we want to coordinte with Carol **bsed on where they're at?**

Jeff - there is a scyhedule that the Board has approved, but there are multiple phases going on through 2014.

Greg - But if the committee has the Chair have the ability to reconvene, **doesn't** that take care of that?

Commissioner Wilson - (Not verbatim) I'm not sure if I'll remember

Greg - That's what you have the staff here for, to remind you.

George - I guess we can follow the process, and at significant points, when they want more input, we can ask the Chair to reconvene.

Michelle - Quanlin and I can coordinate that.

Commissioner Wilson - We can do that.

Michelle - **Let's** go back to **George's** housing symposium discussion. Is that all something you want to be recommending?

Commissioner Wilson - When was the last time we had one?

George - It was about 5-6 years ago.

Commissioner Wilson - things have changed since then.

George - We had it at Marchman. We had some state people come in, some speakers.

Kathy - With everything that has gone on over the past couple of years, it would be very interesting.

Commissioner Wilson - especially with the housing authority being revamped.

Michelle - we'll make the recommendation.

Greg - I **don't** know if it needs to be in here, but the recommendation from 2008 about the training every two **years**... save the staff time and go the way that most of the real estate training has gone and do it online. You can have questions along the way so you know that **they're** there. You do it once and staff shoots it, and **it's** up. **That's** what I do now - I have a link for training for HUD homes. Saves staff time and **you'll** probably see better follow through on people doing it. I just think **that's** the wave of the future.

George - You're probably right. Or have a live webinar.

Kathy - That would be interesting.

Greg - It wouldn't have to be live. It could be videoed.

George - How would you handle questions?

Kathy - You're focused on the realtor training, not the homebuyer training, right? Homebuyers still need to be in person.

Greg - How I handle questions is that I give them my email address if they have questions, and I answer them that way. Or tell them to call me. Just to cut down on staff time.

George - we have the capability through our website now.

Greg - What I did is that I videoed a live class so I got questions in it, the common questions.

Michelle - Does anyone else hve any other recomenations, any thoughts? What I can do is make these changes as specified here and recirculate to everyone. Wyhat we can do is on the 22nd have the official final hearing for the approval of the report and we can get the ad out and get it posted on the website so the public has access to it. Plan on the 22nd being the formal adoption of the recommendations.

Greg - so that meeting will be short?

Michelle - Probably. The last time we actually walked through the report, but we did that this time, so it will probably be short. If we want to go over it again if there are people in the audience with questions.. Otherwise we can adopt the recommendations.

Commissioner Wilson - Any other questions/comments?

Greg - Did this report meet the objectives?

Commissioner Wilson - I think so. George/Michelle, you guys agree?

Michelle - Yes.

George - You know, **it's** not necessarily that you have this reactionary/aggressive **let's** eminent domain the entire county and build affordable housing plan. It shows that you think about it and report about it.

Wendi - for the meeting on the 22nd, you're going to have something about accessibility?

Michelle - Yes, for purposes of the ad, yes.

George - if people request it.

Michelle - we have standard language about accessibility and requesting services.

Call to Adjourn

Meeting Adjourned by Commissioner Wilson.