

Habicht, Kelli

From: Ball, Calvin B
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2015 7:53 AM
To: Feldmark, Jessica
Subject: Fwd: See Attachment: SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA.docx
Attachments: SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA.docx

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Roy Appletree
Date: 04/10/2015 7:21 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Sigaty, Mary Kay" , "Weinstein, Jon" , "Ball, Calvin B" , "Terrasa, Jen" , "Fox, Greg"
Subject: See Attachment: SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA.docx

Dear Councilmembers,

Many of us are looking forward to the work session on Monday on Downtown affordable housing. As we all know, it has been a long long process with no positive results as yet.

A few weeks ago I made the effort to review the final worksession from back in January 2010. It was the end of what was then already a drawn out process. Candidly, I was prompted because many believe that the Trust Fund was the priority / push of Advocates. In fact we were always looking for a more flexible, tailored MIHU program for Downtown. While we believed a Trust Fund might work under certain conditions, it wasn't our #1 priority.

Attached are some straight forward notes from that final work session at the Board of Education. I thought they might be helpful in partially reconstructing how we have gotten to our current challenge. I'm sure we all view it a bit differently.

Thank you for continuing to work towards a fair share of affordable housing in our new Downtown.

Roy

Roy Appletree
410-312-9044

See Attachment: SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA.docx

SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA

The Final Work Session in 2010

The final legislation was passed by the County Council on February 1, 2010. Their final work session took place on January 29, 2010. Affordable Housing remained as a major unresolved issue.

Documents and a video of the work session are available at [Final Council Work session on Downtown](#) (look up 1/29/2010 Work Session). Item A is about an hour discussion of the alternatives under discussion. Participants included DHCD, FSHC and GGP. Item D is a few minutes and addresses in general how Advocates and GGP are suggesting moving forward.

At the end of the Downtown process there were four major alternatives under consideration:

Alternative Considerations

1. Straight 15% MIHU

This would be the standard MIHU program

2. Straight Housing Trust Fund

GGP projected \$31.3m based on \$5m up front and \$4k per unit

3. Mixed or Hybrid

This was discussed as 12% MIHU and some additional \$'s into a Trust Fund.

4. Scaled MIHU

This was the "Carbo Scale" worked on by DHCD and Advocates. It would trade off a % of MIHUs for deeper subsidies.

Basic Policy Positions

1. DHCD - wanted high quality, affordable units with an assurance of actual "doorknobs"; generally favored Straight MIHU but did speak to creativity and flexibility

2. Advocates - also wanted "doorknobs" but wanted to help fill the gap between 40-55% of median

3. GGP - indicated a willingness to go for 15% Straight MIHU or Trust Fund; did not want the complexity of a Hybrid. GGP had championed the Trust Fund and outside the Work Session spoke to not wanting to deal with government regulations when it came to affordable housing)

General Proposal by GGP and Advocates to Council

GGP and Advocates (Greg Hammy, Roy Appletree, Tim Sosinski) met as requested while the Work Session continued on other topics. They were then called back as the end of the Work Session. The Advocates then reported out as follows:

1. 1st Choice is the Hybrid
2. 2nd Choice is the Trust Fund

Advocates recognized the priority GGP placed on the Trust Fund. In addressing this alternative they indicated three (3) areas that needed to be addressed:

- a. There needed to be more \$'s. (GGP was at \$31m, DHCD had used a value of about \$50m)
- b. The rights of the Trust Fund to be involved in the development process has to be made clear
- c. The governance of the Trust Fund has to be established.

In presenting support for the Trust Fund, Tim Sosinski made clear: "You can have money but if there is no place to spend it, it is useless"

Afterwards

The Work Session ended Friday afternoon. GGP and Advocates continued to meet. They reached an agreement that GGP turned into legislative language. On Saturday evening the language was passed onto Councilman Ball, who had the lead on housing. It was shared with the Administration on Sunday. By Monday evening it was turned into a Council approved legislation.

Roy Appletree
March 2015