



City of Ann Arbor

Meeting Minutes

Housing and Human Services Advisory Board

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
[http://a2gov.legistar.com/
Calendar.aspx](http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx)

Thursday, March 9, 2017

6:30 PM

Washtenaw County Building, 200 N. Main
St., Lower level conference room

CONVENE MEETING

Approved

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Wright, seconded by Pollack, that the agenda be Approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

N/A

A APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Pollack, seconded by Wright, that the minutes be Approved.

C NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING - 2017 URBAN COUNTY ACTION PLAN

T. Gillotti summarized the Action Plan including estimated funding for Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and the HOME partnership program, currently estimated for 2017 at almost \$3 million. She pointed out the Activities Table (last page of agenda packet), indicating the projects and programs that are proposed to be funded for 2017/2018 year.

The annual allocation is based on the previous year's HUD funding. Individual community allocations (for CDBG projects) are based on the same calculation HUD uses for the Urban County which includes total population, poverty level and housing problems (as defined by HUD)

CDBG funds would including the Urban County-wide rehab, accessibility and ramp program (15%), human services (as included in Coordinated Funding) (15%), Administration (20%) and individual community projects and programs. Ann Arbor is contributing to two community-based development organizations, Community Action Network and Peace Neighborhood Center. The City of Ann Arbor has otherwise directed their CDBG allocation to an Affordable Housing project, the Ann Arbor Housing Commission's Swift Lane project.

Other Urban-County projects receiving current or previous year's CDBG funding include sidewalk gap infill on Washtenaw Avenue in Pittsfield and Ypsilanti Townships; City of Ypsilanti ADA sidewalk ramps and tot lot play structures, Ypsilanti Township park improvements and bus shelter and sidewalk links; and Superior Township focusing on a road project.

Gillotti described the HOME RFP, which included requests for nearly \$1.5 million. As HOME funds of closer to \$900,000. To try and accommodate all three requests, the City of Ann Arbor's CDBG allocation and some previous City of Ann Arbor CDBG program income will be used for the AHC's Swift Lane project. CDBG funds can only be used for rehab unless properties have been demonstrated to not be rehabable. The Swift Lane project is the only one to meet this threshold. The other two proposals, Avalon's Maple/Hickory Way project and Habitat for Humanity's owner single family acquisition, rehab and development projects (10 houses) would be funded under HOME.

J. Steiner wanted clarity about AAHC.

T. Gillotti clarified AAHC would be receive a portion of the City of Ann Arbor's CDBG allocation and previous program income that is not part of the 2017 proposed allocation, so it does not show in the Activity Table.

T. Gillotti mentioned Washington Post article about HUD cuts for CDBG and HOME funds, so this chart and plan may change, but we're moving forward for 2017 funds as normal for now.

T. Jabzanka: Any public comment?

**J. Steiner moves to open the public hearing on the 2017 Action Plan.
D. Blanchard seconds. The motion passes unanimously.**

No public comment provided.

J. Steiner moves to close the public hearing and D. Blanchard seconds.

T. Jabzanka asked the board if there needs more time to review the Action Plan.

Z. Ackerman: Where can we find more information about specific allocations and projects (i.e. Pittsfield's sidewalk gaps)?

T. Gillotti: Explains that each year's activity table includes the projects proposed for a given year. However, some larger projects like the Washtenaw Sidewalk project sometimes will require multiple years of funding before the project can begin construction. As a result, not all infrastructure projects shown in a given year are actually completed that year. And in some cases, such as Pittsfield township listing TBD as their project, they are basically saving a slot for a project if they don't need to apply the funds to a previous year's project such as Washtenaw Avenue Sidewalks.

T. Jabzanka introduces the idea of the HHSAB passing a resolution and/or asking the City Council to take action to oppose the proposed HUD cuts mentioned in the Washington Post article.

Z. Ackerman talks about current events and the budget cuts around infrastructure and road repair, and proposes how this might change may impact working class and conditions of infrastructure. This is the opposite of President Trump saying he would be building up infrastructure.

J. Steiner: In times of disappearing money, it is important to say that some communities take their CDBG money for affordable housing development only. We've never done this here before, in which CDBG was ultimately for low-income areas. Now that money is getting tighter, it is something to consider for CDBG allocation.

W. Leaf: Could the board research more about this for the next meeting?

J. Steiner: We would need to speak with Urban County Board since it is money to share among the County, not only Ann Arbor.

E. Pollack brought up Trump how he speaks on behalf of a population that will be most impacted and constituents and local leaders could use the language of “forgotten people” to throw that back to federal leaders.

J. Steiner: There was also language used to describe inner city populations in a negative way.

Z. Ackerman: how is Macomb County addressing CDBG cuts?

D. Blanchard: It is interesting to look at Macomb County, a county with just as many working class populations.

Discussion about crafting the motion to encourage City Council and federal officials to oppose HUD cuts.

J. Steiner moved to pass a resolution to city council to request federal representatives oppose HUD cuts. And/or provide a resolution themselves to the same extent. D. Blanchard- moved, E. Pollack seconded. Motion to approve resolution/craft communication to City Council unanimous

WORK SESSION #2 - CITY REVIEW PROCESS

T. Gillotti noted that last month the work session was on City of Ann Arbor fees and their impacts on affordable housing development. However, there wasn't much opportunity to discuss the City's approval process in general. Gillotti introduced Alexis DiLeo, City Planner and Wendy Carty-Saxon, lead developer for Avalon Housing, and asked them to present on Avalon's current Hickory Way development project.

A. DiLeo provided the HHSAB with a handout providing a timeline for planning and zoning reviews (for the average project). She then talked through timeline for approval and the impact on the timeline if the site plan or other elements gets tabled. She also talked about how annexation plays into the timeline. For example, an annexation may be an extra 4 weeks and rezoning another month. The review process is “dead time” due to reviewing and processing because

the Planning Commission does not want to consider a project until it is approvable.

W. Carty-Saxon explains the name changed from Maple, based on the Planning Staff requiring them to have a less common name. Hickory Way was the result. Avalon gained site control occurred in September 2015. Avalon began the site plan review process with the required Citizen meeting, which 7 community members attended. W. Carty-Saxon said the process has gone smoothly overall, and took 8 months from application to planning commission and city council approval. There's a deadline for city reviewers to review site plans and other documents, which can be a slow process. Otherwise, there has been no tabling for the project (either annexation or site plan approval, etc), so it has gone smoothly.

Z. Ackerman asked about challenges with the City's process. W. Carty-Saxon mentioned about infrastructure costs. She described the parcels as long and narrow, which could have been an issue with two owners. If there were two owners, and drainage/storm water would likely be on one parcel and not the other which could be problematic. There are also different requirements with fire and landscaping (for example), the issue is trying to hit all requirements without overlapping. A. DiLeo says this issue brings up more conversation about the fire and where trees may be planted. The issue of buffers with landscape and parking with adjacent properties. Lots of code compliancy to keep track of. A. DiLeo said it was well received to discuss and figure out parking requirements, tree buffers, and setbacks.

W. Leaf asked of some discretion from the planning department regarding a Planned Project (PUD-lite).

J. Steiner: how does the 8 months of approval match with the site plan review process (colored handout)?

W. Carty-Saxon and A. DiLeo walked through the handout. Week 8 lines up with October 18 and November 1st. Weeks 12-16 line up with November 21st for annexation. Because it was an annexation, there was nothing happening between the time of November 6 and the meeting. There was some work with cleaning up, but nothing to approve. W. Carty-Saxon was hoping for a first reading to be scheduled, but had to wait for the State approval. A. DiLeo called the

State diligently for the annexation approval..

J. Steiner asked if a first reading is consider an approval?

A. DiLeo answered yes.

Z. Ackerman asked if the city/state knew about timeline

A. DiLeo confirmed, and mentioned there are 28 days to prepare for submission

Z. Ackerman: what's the cost per parking?

W. Carty-Saxon was not sure of construction of parking space

A DiLeo estimated the amount per space, noting that underground parking is the most expensive.

T. Gillotti asked about next steps now that annexation and site plan approval has been completed. What comes next with engineering, building permits, etc?.

W. Carty-Saxon: We will find out in July and September about LIHTC funding. Once funding is approved. After that they will submit construction plans for building permits with the goal to close by December 2017, begin construction in 2018 and start moving people in by November 2018..

Z. Ackerman asked about approval and move-in dates and when this would count for the City's affordable housing goals.

T. Gillotti mentioned that it depends on when the Certificate of Occupancy is issued and/or the unit has tenants.

Z. Ackerman: Are we tracking market rate apartment units too?

T. Gillotti: Yes, we will need to make sure we are tracking both sets of numbers, f market rate and affordable housing. We are tracking both through C of O's

W. Carty-Saxon: mentioned overall funding challenges

T. Gillotti: any other questions about development?

W. Leaf: what can be improved?

A DiLeo: Ann Arbor requires approval from Council for site plan approval. If site plan approval was just at planning commission it would cut off about three months of approval time. There's the factor of improving standards for affordable housing and accountability.

W. Carty-Saxon: the coordination between fire and other departments for review can be made to go more smoothly.

T. Gillotti Some communities expedite affordable housing projects. Would that make the process go faster? Is there an option to pull a project from the bottom of a pile to the top?

A DiLeo: the staff review could be expedited to a day or two. The comments are then sent back to the developer, and there is some back and forth. There's more control in the first 8 weeks of the review process. The better the plan at the beginning, the better the process. Can't expedite time between readings, but within the 8 months, there could be 2 or 3 months to cut off or shorten.

T. Gillotti: at the City of Ypsilanti, the process for readings was different. The public hearing was at the first reading, and there is no requirement to wait two meetings for the second reading. In that case, public hearing at the first meeting, edits could be made, and then potential for approval at the same meeting. At City of Ann Arbor, the public hearing is scheduled two meetings after the first. And with the public hearing at the second meeting, any tweaks needed can require the ordinance (planned project, PUD, zoning change) to restart back at the first reading. It could be shortened.

W. Leaf: should we be implementing policy changes that align with the City of Ypsilanti?

T. Gillotti: It's a possibility, but the City of Ann Arbor does likes to have the public weigh in and provide time for consideration, so I don't know if a change would be likely.

S. Kailasapathy: there is a typical governance approach to double

up and prosperities. With the discussion of buildings, the few extra months to listen to constituents is not a waste of time. It is rightly so to bypass City Council approval as democracy continues with the current approach.

T. Gillotti: it is fairly rare that city council approves site plans. Most communities have the planning commission approve site plans.

E. Pollack: it comes down to the need to be on top of your documents. There are times when you can tell when a plan is well-done and thought through because the process goes smoother than a plan that is fractioned (i.e. asking questions of where's this, where's that, where's fire). It would be hard to give up that control.

T. Jabzanka: any other comments?

J. Mogensen uses the example of smoking laws, which was passed in August, in a time where people are out of town. One can understand why people are upset in public hearings if decisions are made while public is absent throughout the process.

J. Carlberg: At planning commission meetings, you can see the same people attending. Process could be shortened if public are present and if/when city council reviewed the plan before the meeting. There is still opportunity for the public to speak up and speed up the process for developers. City Council does not have to approve site plans.

J. Steiner asked if she could propose to expedite the time between the first and second meeting

J. Carlberg: Planning: yes

AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUND & BUDGET

T. Gillotti brings up the spreadsheet with the trust fund revenues and expenditures. She reminds the board that Anna talked us through some background last meeting. Previously, planned unit developments (PUDs) were more common, and required a payment in lieu of providing affordable housing, which was a steadier way to ensure funding in the affordable housing fund. The downtown area has not used PUDs for affordable development trust fund due to

changes in downtown zoning. However, if the library lot sells, half of the proceeds have been committed by Ann Arbor City Council to the Affordable Housing fund.

There is \$9,217 left in the trust fund and \$6,762 for sidewalks. The water utility funds of \$130,004 were just approved by City Council to be used for the Hickory Way project by Avalon housing.

W. Leaf: it's good because we are using and giving the money

D. Blanchard: there is a steady commitment from the City until the budget became tight. There were a few strong years and then funding peters. One or two years ago, Sabre Briere had introduced companion resolutions including \$100,000 that would pass through the Housing Fund but go to Ann Arbor Housing Commission for operating (due to RAD conversion) and another \$100,000 for the Affordable Housing Fund. I don't know that we received that \$100,000. There was a new commitment a few years back.

J. Steiner asks about the operating needs

D. Blanchard: there's another piece, the annual \$200,000 dollars of DDA support for affordable housing

S. Kailasapathy: DDA has to put down \$150,000 a year.

J. Steiner: DDA has to, but the city of Ann Arbor doesn't do it

S. Kailasapathy: DDA's income increased more than City of Ann Arbor and would make sense to increase money contributed to affordable housing.

D. Blanchard: this is not a competition. It's not time to go back to DDA to see how much they contribute

J. Steiner: what about the City?

D. Blanchard clarified that both the DDA and City needs to return to how much can be given to the affordable housing projects.

S. Kailasapathy explained the ordinance for DDA in which there is a cap of when and how much to commit for affordable housing (State

Enabling Act)

D. Blanchard: if the money is there, what are they spending it on? It is still up to the DDA of how to spend the money.

J. Steiner remembers a spreadsheet of the DDA spending more on affordable housing, which she goes back to ask why the City is not giving to the affordable housing fund

Z. Ackerman: the City has provided funds straight to Housing Commission rather than the Affordable Housing Fund..

J. Steiner referred back to the minutes from February 9, 2017 and asked about the \$100,000 a year for operations. **J. Hall** agreed that funding should go to the Trust Fund for capital projects, not operations.. **J. Steiner** asks whether we should create a resolution to go to the City to ask for funds.

Z. Ackerman offered to both check on what is included in the proposed budget currently, and request that \$100,000 be included for the Affordable housing Fund.

T. Gillotti brings up the resolution from last year. The action from last year: \$100,000 for operations and \$100,000 for trust fund.

T. Gillotti offered to request an update/report from DDA on their affordable housing investments.

F CITY COUNCIL COMMENT

Z. Ackerman: Updated the HHSAB on the Library Lot working session on March 13.

Z. Ackerman: Planning Commission Retreat March, 30th at 2-6pm.

S. Kailasapathy: non-solicitation ordinance had a first reading. This would be a way to protect documentation information without violating Trump's order. Second reading is next month.

PUBLIC COMMENT

J. Carlberg: shared a comment on the HHSAB resolution of concern

regarding HUD funds. Urged HHSAB to respond in their own name and not just request from City Council a specific action. Second question, are you keeping your eye on the old Y lot? The city might have to rebuy the lot. The plan had a good proposed plan that would include residential and commercial. It is available at the City. Start to think about a plea for affordable housing on city property.

W. Carty-Saxon: HOME funds are used in every one of Avalon's 21 projects. Without it, Avalon might not be able to develop any more units. Regarding vouchers, 235/260 vouchers used by Avalon to prevent homelessness are provided through HUD grants. Federally, both are at risk right now.

Separately there is hope in Platt Road, which has targeted housing for people with special needs through permanent supportive housing. Avalon partnered with Veridian on the proposal. Land is a critical thing, but there is the need for the people to work together (i.e. landlords).

Chris Brown Habitat for Humanity: Habitat also relies on HOME dollars. Typically we utilize \$45,000 in HOME funds and \$12,000 from MSHDA which is also HOME dollars and. \$10-20,000 in additional funding on a single rehab project. If HOME was reduced or eliminated, Habitat would go from 20 rehabbed properties (and 20 owner-occupied homes) down to 1 or 2. C. Brown asks for the resolution to state that housing is infrastructure.

Jim Mogensen: Religious community raises money, yet it's difficult to close gap based on religious philosophy of donating to other places and being residents themselves. The city budget is coming up in May, and if there is time in the April meeting to request "where is all the money coming from," this could be used as a resolution for conversation of budget and from the committee/as the policy committee. AAATA is in the process of evaluating the CEO and board of director's responsibility through a framework document. It is a change in the relationship between the board and CEO.. One side is the University of Michigan asking about regions and Ann Arbor City Commission at the other side of the spectrum.

T. Jabzanka: next meeting will cover the Platt Road RFPs and which plan offers more affordable housing opportunity

ADJOURNMENT

D. Blanchard moved to Adjourn; E. Pollack seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:25pm

All persons are encouraged to participate in public meetings. Citizens requiring translation or sign language services or other reasonable accommodations may contact the City Clerk's office at 734.794.6140; via e-mail to: cityclerk@a2gov.org; or by written request addressed and mailed or delivered to:

**City Clerk's Office
301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104**

Requests made with less than two business days' notice may not be able to be accommodated.