

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District

Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7

Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Thursday, February 23, 2017

6:00 – 8:00 PM

City Hall, Conference Room 12

Draft Minutes

Attendance: Chair Selene Colburn, Councilors and Committee Members Tom Ayres and Adam Roof, CEDO Director Noelle MacKay, CEDO Assistant Director Gillian Nanton, CEDO Housing Program Manager Todd Rawlings, CEDO Staff Ian Jakus, Comprehensive Planner Meagan Tuttle, John Caulo (Champlain), Joe Speidel (UVM), Michael Monte (CHT), Councilor Sarah Giannoni, Stephen Marshall, Sandy Wynne (Ward 1), Rita Markley (COTS), Samantha Howley, Anna Wyner

1. **Review Agenda** – Chair Colburn called the meeting to order at 6:05PM and called for Introductions. Reviewed agenda. No one chose to address the committee in the public forum.
2. **Approval of Minutes** – Chair Colburn called for an amendment to the 1/17 CDNR meeting minutes: Correction to Rita Markley’s name; additionally under the continued Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) report presentation section on page 3, the fourth bullet item, it says:

“Does it provide affordable units – yes – but not at a scale that kept pace with its regional share of housing, generating 2500 fewer units over the past 25 years than it should have compared to the population growth of the county; The variables that influence the lower share of housing – limited supply of vacant land, high land prices; higher construction costs; finance costs; interest costs, development review process; regulatory environment to name a few”

Where ‘It’ refers to the IZ ordinance it should be changed to reflect that.

Chair Colburn moves to accept minutes, Councilor Ayres seconds, Councilor Roof confirms.

3. **Inclusionary Zoning Next Steps Discussion** – (20 minutes)

CEDO Director Noelle MacKay kicked off the discussion recapping progress and suggestions. She explained the consultant report has been finalized and the report as well as policies and procedures for monitoring of IZ have been posted online with a comment period. This information was also posted on Front Porch Forum. The data used in the Inclusionary Zoning report has been reviewed by CEDO staff Todd Rawlings and Valerie Russell and some discrepancies were found, but they do not affect the consultant report. The discrepancies are due to the different number of units for building permits versus certificates of occupancy. The corrected data, along with the original data, will be posted on the website. Chair Colburn suggested feedback on the IZ monitoring policies and procedures be added to the March agenda.

Ms. MacKay suggested composition of an IZ working group: 2 city councilors, 2 for profit developers, 2 non-profit developers, 1 affordable housing advocate (someone who can speak to the original ordinance), City staff Gillian Nanton, Noelle MacKay, and David White could be included as some changes may involve P&Z. Ms. MacKay explained that the working group should focus on prioritizing issues and recommendations from the report that should rise to the top to work on as a community. The working group would take the recommendations and decide on next steps and direction. It would be a technical group that understands and can speak to specific results, costs, and numbers surrounding the policy. This working group would take public input to the process.

Chair Colburn proposed, on the issue of public process, to continue to take public comment until the group convenes and they can take that into account. Councilor Roof asks who would be making the appointments. Ms. MacKay responded that the CDNR Committee would most likely make the decision, but that CEDO can make suggestions and put a list together. Chair Colburn suggested procedurally it should go to City Council and asked if Councilor Ayres has any comments or questions, he defers.

Chair Colburn commented that looking at the makeup of the committee, there is a big share of city staff (3 proposed). It gives a strong seat at the table for the administration, while their expertise is valued, could it be only one CEDO representative. Ms. MacKay suggested that staff doesn't need to be on the committee but can staff the meeting to provide expertise as needed.

Chair Colburn stated this working group should go to City Council for approval and that composition could be discussed now or March. Ms. MacKay responded that CEDO could put together a formal summary for this regarding tasks and composition and a list of who has been involved in the process. Councilor Roof stated that as an alternative the City Council president and the Mayor could make appointments. Chair Colburn responded that since CDNR has been so heavily involved in the project that it should have separate input.

3. Neighborhood Stabilization Project – Gillian Nanton (20 minutes)

Gillian Nanton Assistant Director of SHED at CEDO explained the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the 'Neighborhood Project' has gone through several iterations, and benefitted from the

partners input after an initial meeting including Champlain, UVM, Preservation Burlington, and the City. Ms. Nanton adds that Meagan Tuttle from Planning and Zoning has done a lot of work on this document.

Ms. Nanton summarized the document explaining the basis for this RFP was to establish a more proactive strategy for neighborhood stabilization in the short and long term, the 3 main focus areas being: achieve balance, improve quality of housing stock, and improve quality of life for the residents in the historic neighborhoods around UVM and Champlain. She explained that in the beginning it summarizes the Housing Action Plan and the efforts that UVM and Champlain have made up to this point. It is noted that on page 4 the statement regarding Champlain's commitments with the Burlington Town Center project has been corrected. Throughout the process some essential issues kept coming up, that the consultants will need to weigh in on, including the geography of the study, whether it should be confined to wards 1,2,6,8 and what the financial commitment will be to achieve the goals of the neighborhood project. What similar communities have done is in the back of the document. Ms. Nanton emphasized that Identifying a sustainable funding strategy is key to making this project a success and the consultant should develop a timeline and decide who should be in charge of moving forward with implementation steps. The hope is to issue the RFP by middle of March, and get proposals by middle of April; get consultants under contract by May, and have a draft by October, with final deliverables in December. This schedule would meet the requirements of the HAP.

Chair Colburn opened the floor to public comment on the RFP. Sandy Wynne (Ward 1) asked on page 1 if 60% renter occupied include dormitories (group quarters)? Councilor Roof added that regarding the demographics, he would like to see how the neighborhoods subject to this study differ from the city as a whole. Chair Colburn asked for a clarification of the methodology for this statistic.

- Ms. Wynne continued asking on page 4 – why UVM makes a payment for services of 1.4 million and on page 5 it says Champlain makes a payment of 2.4 million, what accounts for that disparity? Ms. Wynne made the point that the numbers don't make sense given institutional size. Joe Speidel (UVM) responded that if it includes all payments the correct number is 2.7 million for UVM.
- Ms. Wynne continued, requesting that the consultants for this project be in-state firms to promote economic development. Councilors Colburn and Ayres stated that would require different criteria and that it is also important to bring in the most qualified consultants but Chair Colburn suggested a marketing strategy could put the RFP in the hands of local consultants. Ms. Nanton agreed. Mr. Caulo (Champlain) stated he wouldn't support limiting it to only in-state firms. Mr. Speidel added that regarding the selection process partners should look at all proposals from the beginning of the process.
- Mr. Speidel (UVM) commented that it is important to emphasize that we are all working on this together. There should be a more inclusive statement on page 8 - stating we're working with all partners not just the institutions.
- Councilor Giannoni commented that we consider creating condos as a strategy for

stabilization. As a recent condo buyer, it is a great way of helping people build equity and stay in Burlington, and stabilize the community. CHT condos are a good option for long term buyers but for someone looking to build equity and move on, other options need to be considered. Councilor Ayres agreed that the approach has a lot of merit particularly in turning the absentee landlord student properties into more stable situations.

- Ms. Wynne commented that we have had the same housing study done since 1980. She has copies of all the MOU's with UVM and each one has concluded the same things. She lived in a student housing area and it was hell and the neighbors fought the city and the city was not there to support them. When they took out the party houses, the value of the homes went down. When the max number of occupants was reduced to 4 students the prices went down for families, the landlords started selling and it became a livable area. It took the neighbors enforcing code and code answers to the mayor. Nobody wants to move their family onto Isham St. UVM has institutional zoning and unlimited density and therefore should not build downtown because college students shouldn't get everything they want. While it has gotten better over the last 20 years we must put pressure on UVM. Also fines against landlords are not actually imposed.
- Mr. Speidel (UVM) responded he has more optimism about how to make this latest effort work. UVM has created more units than anyone in the city of Burlington and is in the process of building new housing now. Going back 20 years they are housing more students than they used to, and now have a 2 year requirement to live on campus. Regarding the Trinity campus, the zoning prevents Trinity from being fully developed, in the next few years that is where UVM will be building next. UVM sees a trend of upper classmen choosing to live on campus. Finding funds for someone to assist with implementation would be necessary for success because CEDO doesn't have the capacity to do it. He also suggested landlords be approached as business owners. Ms. MacKay noted the state does have a small funding program for housing related work.
- Chair Colburn commented that the RFP delivers a strong process to us with engaged stakeholders and an organized product, and thanks Ms. Nanton. She made the following comments regarding the RFP:
 - Page 4 should include the inspection schedule that will create a rating system of landlords.
 - Page 8 the presentation of the final report should come to the CDNR committee AND the city council allowing for a more in-depth conversation like the IZ consultant last month.
 - Page 8 it is good that we are asking consultants to give budget and fees in relation to their scope of work.
 - Page 9 adding to the composition of the select committee from the NPA's for resident buy-in, but it is understood this would be adding additional membership.

- Ms. Nanton explained that for the budget \$25,000 is committed each from the City, UVM, Champlain College, and \$5,000 from Preservation Burlington. Reserving some for administration would result in about \$72,000. Mr. Speidel and Ms. MacKay suggested that 6 weeks should be given for consultants to respond to the RFP.
- Mr. Caulo commented that where the rubber meets the road is funding. If the Neighborhood Project study looks to the institutions for funding, as they typically do, they are already making direct investments in housing and cannot afford this. In the inclusionary zoning report, in terms of the recommendations, the one that 'moves the needle', has the best chance of creating a source of funding. If the residents are serious about the affordable housing issue than they should fund it through the Housing Trust Fund. The seed money to purchase the assets from the landlords today could come from the HTF. There is the interest to make this happen. There are some examples out there in Lancaster PA, it is a strategy that would allow for change over the long term.
- Mr. Speidel commented that Champlain Housing Trust has found a way to fund the rehab of the St. Josephs school, where UVM has provided some patient capital and it has allowed the project to move forward. Mr. Caulo agreed that there is a model for institutional involvement there and said to think about streamlining services and not just about funding new initiatives.
- Chair Colburn commented that the RFP should move forward on issuance without coming back to the committee. The next agenda will include the IZ working group summary of next steps relying on an initial proposal from CEDO and review the monitoring for IZ. This will be Chair Colburn's last meeting. It would be good to revisit the discussion on micro housing and set some direction on that. Councilor Ayres stated he has decided to back off on the idea of a Micro-housing summit so that is likely to happen next council term.

Stephen Marshall announced that the Chittenden County Homeless Alliance has a meeting Tuesday Feb 28 6:00 in Contois that includes some discussion on Micro Housing.

Chair Colburn made a motion to adjourn at 7:28 pm. This was seconded by Councilors Roof and Ayres.