



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, November 14, 2019

6:30 PM

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

CONVENE MEETING

INTRODUCTIONS/WELCOME

PUBLIC COMMENT

J. Mogenson: I'm from Religious Action for Affordable Housing. The meeting notes have the wrong date as it should be October, not September. The affordable housing conversation is wild. A couple weeks ago, I was with a group of people that wanted to create a fund to include the religious community for affordable housing. There are also people who are confused, and it's important for us to understand the things like this are happening. I FOIA'd all the documents for YLOT, and the basic themes are already there like public engagement.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The date on the Minutes should be October 17 not October 7

REVIEW OF MEETING NOTES FROM 10-7-19

BUSINESS

A CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

Board members completed the annual conflict of interest disclosure forms and D. Beck collected the documents.

B ONE ON ONE MEETING WITH BOARD CHAIR

G. Pratt: I want to suggest reaching out to individual member willing

to meet one-on-one with Council members to discuss the feasibility of developing the 10 city sites and 3 scenarios. I understand it could be seen as lobbying, but it's we have good set of aff hsg scenarios that could create some good conversations. I talked to some of them such as Council members A. Ramlawi, E. Nelson, Z. Ackerman, J. Lumm, and Mayor Taylor. I think the interest is there, and the time is good for conversations as we have budget dollars. Until we appropriately fund the housing commission or fund, we're not going to meet our goals we set in the 2015 Affordable Housing Equity Study. I would like to start conversations soon before holidays are over.

E. Pollack: For Anne and Zach, how useful do you think it'd be for us to do this to educate councilmembers who aren't supportive and hear their ideas and feedback?

A. Bannister: As we go to Monday's vote on our agenda, I think it'd be useful for members besides Zach and I. The priority could be for other members and could be supportive, though all 10 might not get approved, but there is support going into Monday night.

Z. Ackerman: We will be getting the same presentation that we got in October. On the agenda, there are 2 sites that are ready to go. There are also 3 more properties where community engagement would be good to do as they're in neighborhoods where the input would be most effective.

G. Pratt: Basic level is to have conversations.

A. Bannister: We did get one concern from a resident with disabilities this afternoon for the Catherine/4th location as that is where they park for the Farmer's market. Would there be alternate parking for disabled people?

G. Pratt: That concern is noted, and we can follow up offline.

C HOMELESSNESS / WARMING CENTER UPDATE

A. Kraemer presented on the 2018 Continuum of Care (CoC) Annual Report on the state of homelessness in Washtenaw County. The CoC is a volunteer organization that cares about homelessness and are a homelessness response system that serves Washtenaw County. It is interconnected with government organizations and

citizens that are trying to deliver services in the most responsible way.

There are four types of services:

- **Prevention:** This is for those at risk of homelessness. Small payments can be offered to help keep housing
- **Emergency shelter:** We just started winter expansion this week for weather.
- **Rapid rehousing:** These are short/mid-term solutions that try to cover rent initially. We will provide case management, try to give them a stable platform, and stabilize them.
- **Permanent supportive housing:** They pay 30% of income and provide other services. 100% will have a form of disability. Most people in this program have been homeless for 1-3 years. There aren't too many units, and they're typically full.

We are proud of getting people housed quickly. The time to get people permanently housed went from 300 days to 150 days. We try to get them through the system quickly and use our resources effectively. We had 844 people housed in 2018, 80% remained housed from 2016, □ did return (below national average), and we saw 38% decrease in people experiencing homelessness since 2015. There's some level of support for people to help them avoid homelessness

R. Sarri: What is the median age of those 844 people housed?

A. Kraemer: About 50% are below thirty, and we have 60-70 unaccompanied minors a year. We will be talking to coordinate youth efforts better. There are a lot of ways to define homelessness. We follow HUD's definition for homelessness which is people who are in places that aren't meant to be habitable not those in cohabiting places. We are trying to coordinate better in schools to help, as we don't have resources to meet the need. There is absolutely a need for youth aid. The youth are resilient and resourceful, but trying to meet the definition of the system is difficult.

We name the list of people experiencing homelessness, and there are 762 people are still on that list and that's just the ones we know about. To date that number is in 500s now and about 3,312 people are experiencing literal homelessness which is a 4% decrease in

2015. The length days is down, and return rates are low at 20%.

We do see racial disparity as 74% of the people we serve are black, while the general population is only 36% black. 12% of the people we serve are white while they are 61% of the general population is white. There are slightly more men than women (52-47) with 1% identifying as transgendered or gender nonconforming. 53% of our clients are adults, 22% are under 18, 14% are seniors, and 11% are ages 18-24.

372 households were at-risk of homelessness, but were stabilized. 764 households were served in our shelters with a total 79,930 nights of shelter provided. 98 households were placed in permanent supportive housing, and 96% are still there or went to other permanent housing. It took 57 days on average to rehouse 346 households. Now, we are so close to ending veteran homelessness. We've been hitting $\frac{2}{3}$ requirements for factors to end veteran homelessness, but it means that we have a system to quickly house vets.

Some goals that we have are to:

- **End veteran and chronic homelessness**
- **Increase funding and resources**
- **Improving youth services**
- **Work closely with housing authorities to get more resources**
- **Trying to learn more on racial equity**
- **Reforming diversion resources and working with people to leverage resources to help keep people out of shelters and in homes**

A. Bannister: Are there any goals for financial planning?

A. Kraemer: We try to sit down and see how the family got in to their current situation. We work with them and help them to get the resources they need, whether it's reaching out or asking for help.

A. Carlisle: Flexible funding would help. For example, food cards could help them or mediation with family and friends.

A. Kraemer: A lot of funds are designated, but the goal is to be flexible and get flexible funding. Usually, one big financial shock can lead people to homelessness, and we are trying to help with that.

A. Carlisle: For National Hunger and Homelessness Prevention Week, We have service Sunday and will be marching for housing. Monday night is a panel discussion, Tuesday will be campus sleep outs at the University of Michigan and Eastern Michigan University. Wednesday is a snap challenge, Thursday is health and wellness, and on this flyer, Friday will be a lunch and learn with a keynote address by Luke Shaefer.

Reviewed and Filed

D AFFORDABLE HOUSING WAITLIST REVIEW

Mirada Jenkins Carter: presented on an Affordable Housing Waitlist from OCED and asked the Board to assist with criteria. The waitlist would be for non-federally funded, private developer units. It would be marketed through the Ann Arbor Community Development, which is under OCED. For now, the review purpose the goals is to have a simplified waitlist process since there are no state or federal rules mandating additional criteria. Applicants would initially enter their name, contact information, household size, annual income, and wage information. OCED would then review income documentation before sending the application to the developer. Income sources would include award letters, tax returns and/or pay stubs.

Board discusses possibilities of students applying for affordable housing units

A. Erickson: If students are being subsidized from their parents, they're likely not the demographic to apply for this.

G. Pratt: I think it'd be good to make the process have as less barriers so that more people would have the opportunity to get affordable housing even at the cost of some people receiving units that over-qualify.

Z. Ackerman: If the process may be slightly over permissive, doesn't this still mean that there's lesser units for people who need it?

G. Pratt: Fair point, but I would want people to get housing easier than all the red tape and bureaucratic barriers. I don't have the data to support it, but there are likely more people that would be

excluded from barriers than units given to people who don't need it

Board discusses asking for tax returns or pay stubs from those who do not file for tax returns.

M. Jenkins Carter: The basic application materials would be that if you file returns, then we would ask for them. If not, we'll ask for the pay stubs. Developers would want some source of income to prove they can pay rent.

Board discusses preferences and priorities for the waitlist such as vouchers, elderly or disabled, local residency, etc.

G. Pratt: What about people with zero income?

D. Blanchard: If people have vouchers and other options, do we need to have them as preferences? I don't think that it should be a preference

A. Carlisle: Unfortunately, we know that people need services, but can't receive them.

M. Jenkins Carter: Should we give preferences for families?

A. Carlisle: We have programs for rental assistance (not technically vouchers). I wouldn't want to exclude people whose source of income isn't vouchers but rental assistance.

N. Wright: That sounds like it could be hard for income verification.

Board discusses and agrees that if an applicant is matched to a unit, but are rejected by developer, than they would regain their spot at the top of the waitlist.

Zach: If we can get a reason from developers for rejection, it could help inform policy changes if there are unnecessary barriers. Also, do credit scores play into this?

A. Carlisle: Generally, the concern is more about eviction history or criminal backgrounds.

Board discusses current law for felonies and misdemeanors that

can affect receiving services

M. Jenkins Carter: For marketing, besides the city website, we'd want to put it up in more than one place. For waitlist management, we need to have some checkpoint dates as it could be stale. We also need to set a deadline to turn in documents such as April 15, or Tax Day.

D. Blanchard: Would this be marketed as an alternative or overlapping waitlist from other organizations?

M. Jenkins Carter: This would be different as it is a waitlist for non-federally funded units.

Board discusses making a streamlined process where they can apply for a waitlist that would connect them to multiple vouchers or programs such as HAWC or Housing Commissions.

A. Bannister: Citizens want the one-stop shop instead of having to apply to many different services.

M. Jenkins Carter: References the City of Austin, Texas where they're trying to move all applications for affordable housing units into one database. Our current intern is benchmarking our website based on some of the data in Austin.

Board discusses possible penalties for developers that don't follow compliance.

Received and Filed

E PLANNING DEVELOPMENT UPDATES (DOWNTOWN PREMIUMS)

Zach: The new premiums were passed unanimously with one small technical amendment.

F YLOT AND 415 W. WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The dates are listed on the flyer.

M. Jenkins Carter: Teresa and J. Hall will be at council meeting on Monday.

Reviewed and Filed

G WORK PLAN

Board discusses

G. Pratt: Question of definitions, does defining aff housing and workforce housing enough detail? Should we be defining other terminology? Should add more definitions (workforce housing has negative connotation) and the need to change narrative on that.

A. Carlisle: Teresa had good details that focuses on income levels and common jobs for those levels, when/how we should be encouraging housing developments.

M .Jenkins Carter: We plan to bring the Affordable Housing terminology document back at January meeting.

G. Pratt: Can we send out sheet that David's referring (affordable housing terminology sheet)?

M. Jenkins Carter: Absolutely. I will forward to the board via email.

Z. Ackerman: For #2, it would good to get planning staff to talk about zoning.

D. Blanchard: It seems like we brought that up a few times.

Z. Ackerman: If there are specific zoning or policy recommendation that would be relevant for discussion.

D. Blanchard: Also add "barriers to developing aff housing (city/county regs)" Then #3 would be review of by-laws. If you enter a row. It would move all thing down one by adding review of by-laws as #3

A. Bannister: Could we work in (under zoning changes) to make a pass at the vast lands from UM and AAPS?

Board discusses

A. Bannister: U of M should be helping to build housing for hospital

employees and grad students as opposed to putting that on communities to solve.

A. Carlisle: We did a review of this about four yrs ago. We should have might have some minutes and dialogue about it.

A. Bannister: It could be helpful.

Board discusses

M. Jenkins Carter: I will add to #1 (work with UM to partner and ask to provide aff housing). This will include analysis for UM and AAPS properties and opportunities.

G. Pratt: I think its good idea to have these discussions but we're advisory board and can talk to regents about plausibility and asking how they can contribute.

A. Erickson: We should work on messaging for how it can be mutually beneficial.

Board discusses

David moves, R. Sarri seconds to approve the 2020 Work Plan including the updates as presented.

H 2020 CALENDAR

Board discusses either not having a meeting in July or August.
Board agrees on July.

A. Erickson moves, E. Pollack seconds to approve the 2020 Calendar with removing the July meeting.

I BOARD ELECTIONS

G. Pratt shares that he is open to serving again as chair, but also wants to give the open opportunity if others want to serve as chair.

Board discusses possibilities.

D. Blanchard moves, P. Sher seconds to re-elect chair and

vice-chair

CITY COUNCIL (COUNCIL MEMBER UPDATES)

Z. Ackerman: On Monday, we will be discussing funding the warming centers.

A. Bannister: I've been submerged in the environmental commission. We are working with Food Gatherers and presenting to council a resolution to fund \$130K a year. We are also working on a tree ordinance. Lastly, on 11/4, we worked with Mayor Taylor to declare a climate action emergency and plan to roll out a recommended plan in time for Earth day.

GENERAL UPDATES

PUBLIC COMMENT

J. Mogenson: For the Broadway units, there was private development that needed an easement on Maiden lane, but UM only allowed gave one if students were to live there. This violates human rights ordinance for student status. For the waitlist, accountants for DHHS have done every way to check income, and we are trying to monitor developers.

Lastly, for Coordinated Funding, there's not enough funding. It is creating dysfunction, and there needs to be acknowledgement for human services in affordable housing communities.

ADJOURNMENT

N. Wright moves to adjourn meeting, **D. Blanchard** seconds
G. Pratt, chair, adjourned meeting at 8:40 pm.