



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT
**CITY COUNCIL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT &
NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE**
c/o Community & Economic Development Office
City Hall, Room 32 • 149 Church Street • Burlington, VT 05401
802-865-7144 VOX • 802-865-7024 FAX • www.burlingtonvt.gov/cedo

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District

Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7

Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Tuesday, February 23, 2016

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Fletcher Room

Fletcher Free Library

Proposed Draft Agenda

1. Review Agenda
2. Public Forum (20 minutes)
3. Approval of Minutes – 12/15 (5 minutes)
4. Update on CEDO's Community Development Programs– Marcy Esbjerg (10 minutes)
5. Map out topics for CDNR Committee through the summer (15 minutes)
6. Next meeting – review advance schedule (10 minutes)



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT
CITY COUNCIL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT &
NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE
c/o Community & Economic Development Office
City Hall, Room 32 • 149 Church Street • Burlington, VT 05401
802-865-7144 VOX • 802-865-7024 FAX • www.burlingtonvt.gov/cedo

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District
Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7
Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Monday, December 14, 2015
6:00 – 8:00 PM
Robert Miller Center
130 Gosse Ct, Burlington

Draft Minutes

1. Review Agenda

Chair Colburn opened the meeting at 6:08 with review of the agenda and a note that Councilor Ayres was unable to make this meeting due to a conflict with the Board of Finance's agenda item – Burlington College Developer Contract.

Motion to approve – made by Councilor Roof. Motion approved unanimously.

2. Public Forum (20 minutes)

Charles Simpson – *brought up concerns regarding Eagle's Landing. Because it is Burlington College land, he found out the development pay property taxes at the tax rate, yet it will be priced at market rate; it is considered in the waterfront TIF district but there will be no additional taxes. In addition, University housing is exempt from IZ ordinance.*

3. Approval of Minutes – 11/15 (5 minutes)

Motion to approve made by Councilor Roof; approval unanimous.

4. CDBG (10 minutes)

Marcy Esbjerg *presented an overview of the CDBG review and selection process; funding amounts and the role played by the CDNR committee. Additional members for the CDBG Advisory Committee were sought. CDNR members were invited to all the CDBG Advisory Board meetings and given a schedule of those meetings. The Notice of Funding Availability was discussed briefly and the timeline explained. The deadline to receive all CDBG*

The programs and services of the City of Burlington are accessible to people with disabilities.
For accessibility information, call 865-7144. For questions about the meeting,
contact Marcy Esbjerg at mesbjerg@burlingtonvt.gov

applications is January 14.

5. Housing Trust Fund (20 minutes)

Todd Rawlings explained the background and purpose of the Housing Trust Fund (HTF) and how it is funded – *through property taxes (\$.058 per \$1,000 of assessed value) to preserve or increase affordable housing stock in Burlington; This year the Mayor added \$175K. There has been significant discussion, especially during the Housing Action Plan meetings about restoring to the Housing Trust Fund to the full penny. Todd explained that the HTF Administrative Committee released an RFP in mid-August and received 8 applications but the end of September. In November the committee met and made final grant decisions. Rawlings also mentioned that CEDO has improved the way HTF information is distributed. The past 10 years of HTF funding is now on the CEDO website under Housing/HTF; minutes and agendas are also posted to allow for a more transparent process. The amount from the HTF is greater than \$375K due to a carryover from last year plus interest payment (program income from South Meadow). The next step is BOF approval. Todd noted there is a change in the Administrative Committee; Brian Lowe resigned and Jen Kaulius was added. It was noted that there was a carry forward for next year of \$157,632 because there might be more investment needed. Chair Colburn wanted to share some questions that arose at the HTF Administrative Committee meetings: what is the historical role of the HTF and the future; what is evaluative criteria applied to project applications; how finite do we need to be that the money will create new units as opposed to a strong finish of a project. Chair Colburn suggested the HTF Admin Committee bring in others to understand historical precedent. What is our evaluative criteria going forward? Are there stated target ranges and full amount that can be invested.*

Erhard Mahnke – *noted that the charter change for HTF should have been in the final Housing Action Plan and the City should make that commitment for a full penny in the budget. Erhard would really like to see it on the ballot if it needs to be on the ballot. Chair Colburn and Councilor Roof committed to move that forward and investigate how fast it can be moved forward.*

6. RFQ – Inclusionary Zoning

Chair Colburn opened this agenda item by noting that a draft was posted for public comment and she first opened the discussion for public comment.

Ted Wimpey – *offered the following comments and feedback*

- *What is the appropriate unit threshold to trigger IZ? Good and appropriate.*
- *Strong opinions on payment in lieu and whether units are produced off-site? That might divide affordable housing advocates*
- *Looking for diversity scattered around the City of Burlington.*
- *Should 'g' on perpetuity affordability even be considered?*
- *Selection process – wants to make sure there is a member of City Council on the internal team.*

John Davis – *private consultant – would normally answer this but won't do that at this time. This is a smart thing to do; you want to be very clear to get a proposal with a product you want. He recommended strengthening the RFP itself – communicate the structure of the proposal and the deliverables. Other comments:*

- Evaluate the performance of the ordinance as is and then how can it be tweaked;
- Can a private developer make a profit under this ordinance; how can we tweak ordinance to stimulate development to make a profit;
- State how many comparisons do you want them to do;
- State how many trips to BTV is expected; is travel reimbursable or additional;
- How many drafts will I have to do; when is the process done;
- Ask under qualifications for IZ experience;
- Extraneous information outside of IZ – density bonus as of right; how can in-lieu payments be invested;
- Comment on the budget - \$20K would work if travel is over and above.

Erhard – expressed concern that the RFP be preconstructed to say IZ isn't working. He reminded the group on what were the goals to begin with, since he was one of the initial authors. The goal was inclusion and not stimulation of new development. Additional comments on the RFP:

- What is the threshold – definitely a valuable thing to look at;
- Good to examine payment in lieu;
- Off-site is not a good option;
- How to invest funds – already in the HTF;
- Don't look at whether IZ units should have perpetual affordability, that should be off the table;
- Internal subsidization of IZ development was supposed to happen via density bonuses – why has that not happened, it should be rephrased in the RFP for a correct analysis;
- For developments with a higher market rate there is a tier system- has that been used, does it need to be continued.
- Why should a consultant come in and use the term/definition of workforce housing? That should be a community definition.
- Look at what is in the pipeline not just what has been developed in the past.

Bonnie Acker – look at IZ in a broader context – same sex marriage, kids safe, etc.

Charles Simpson – For the payment in lieu, he asked what is that amount and should it cover the market value for the percent of the whole project.

Councilor Knodell expressed her primary concern was the RFP seemed to lean towards the impact of IZ on production of units; however she reiterated that the goal of IZ is for inclusion as a community and not just about production. She asked if there has been negative externalities of units – economics of IZ – is that why we haven't seen more units. The IZ ordinance is about economic inclusion in housing and we don't want to change the goals; we have not agreed to change the goals.

Ted Wimpey – make it clear about the travel costs so we can cast the net widely for consultants. Also look at it to see if IZ has somehow prohibited development of rental housing;

Erhard – Will we require consultant to make a presentation to a public body?

John Davis – asks about the back end – stewardship of housing – not just renter or owner too;

Councilor comments –

Chair Colburn – spoke on the intent in ordinance, housing opportunities for all citizens to make sure housing meets the needs of all income groups, not about production of affordable housing. The ordinance is also about housing supply around the City and to promote health,

safety of citizens. Chair Colburn said the RFP should first evaluate the stated intent of the ordinance.

- Item 2 of scope of work;
- Evaluation should be added up front; intro paragraph
- Last sentence might need to be changed or removed from intro paragraph
- #5 – why do we need so many questions- maybe too prescriptive;
- Payment in-lieu; thresholds; student housing all should be examined;
- Support removing in perpetuity from RFP all together;
- Questions on the selection process – CDNR wants to play a role in the selection of the consultant and review the proposal; also suggested engaging beneficiaries of affordable housing along with developers.

Councilor Roof – notes the inception of inclusionary zoning ordinance in 1989 coincides with his birthday! He said it is important to ensure the RFP does not cast an assumption. There are still a lot of questions about what IZ has already done. Is \$20K our budget – what are our limitations? What is our community definition of workforce housing? What about the cost/profitability close by in other communities?

Chair Colburn – Since there was substantive feedback, she has requested that the committee see the next draft of the RFP and committed to meet in early January. The RFP doesn't need to include the exact language but the CDNR committee would like to be a part of the selection of the consultant. She will circulate a memo on the meeting feedback.

Marcy Esbjerg – summed up some of the comments saying that adding evaluation of the IZ as part of the RFP, simplifying number 5 were distinct recommendations. She also said that she thought she heard that we don't want a focus on production but she cautioned that we don't ignore IZ as a tool for producing affordable housing.

Councilor Knodell – doesn't want the Admin to own the process. It is important to have a city councilor on the selection process and specifically a member of CDNR to sit on the selection committee.

7. Next Meeting dates:

Proposed Wednesday 20th – 5:30 – check with Tom and City calendar and standing meetings
Motion to adjourn was made by Councilor Roof at 7:43PM. The motion was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcy Esbjerg
Assistant Director
Community, Housing and Opportunity Programs

2016 CDBG Applicants - Development				
Proj #	Project/Program	Organization	Amount Requested	Recommended Amount
	Housing			
D1	Affordable Rental Development and Preservation	Champlain Housing Trust	\$130,000	
D2	YouthBuild Energy Efficiency and Housing Rehabilitation Project	ReSOURCE	\$70,584	
	Economic Development			
D3	Women's Small Business Program	Mercy Connections	\$21,000	
	Neighborhood Development			
D4	Westview House Kitchen Renovation	Howard Center, Inc	\$66,000	
D5	Community Emergency Food Shelf	Chittenden Emergency Food Shelf - CVOEO	\$29,450	
D6	Lower Floor Remodel	Chittenden County Senior Citizens Alliance, Inc.	\$45,000	
D7	Westview House Bathroom Remodel	Howard Center, Inc	\$14,200	
		TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$376,234	\$0
		TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE	\$430,173	\$430,173
		DIFFERENCE	\$53,939	

2016 CDBG Applicants - Public Service				
Proj #	Project/Program	Organization	Amount Requested	
	Homeless & Housing Services			
PS1	Expanding Housing First Services in Burlington, VT*	Pathways Vermont, Inc.	\$50,000	
PS2	Safe Tonight*	Women Helping Battered Women	\$38,546	
	Hunger/Food Security			
PS3	FRESH Food*	Vermont Works for Women	\$30,000	
	Seniors & Persons w/Disabilities			
PS4	Complex Case Management for At- Risk Seniors*	Champlain Valley Area Agency on Aging	\$20,000	
PS5	Homesharing: People Helping Each Other*	HomeShare Vermont	\$25,000	
	Equal Access			
PS6	Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Program	Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity	\$12,000	
	Health			
PS7	Rapid Intervention Pre-Natal/Parenting Project	Vermont Parent Representation Center, Inc	\$127,000	
PS8	Safe Recovery Opioid Recovery Case Manager	Howard Center	\$47,250	
	* Two-Year	TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$349,796	
		TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE	\$108,732	
		DIFFERENCE	(\$241,064)	

CEDO's We All Belong and AmeriCorps Programs

This year **CEDO provides equity and diversity training** to more than 200 individuals from 7 city departments and 10 partner non-profit agencies. In day long and half day sessions, we are working to support organizational change, more welcoming environments, and improved service provision, with our training partner CQ Strategies.

We All Belong participating agencies have report broad and lasting improvements:

- improved community relations
- how to effectively communicate across cultures
- strengthened relationships among staff
- heightened employee morale
- implemented practices to recruit and retain staff from diverse backgrounds
- clearer strategies to achieve mission and goals
- creation of a diversity strategic plan
- inclusive customer service standards
- more diverse and engaged Board of Directors

We will launch applications for next year's program to new partner organizations in April 2016. If you would like more information, please contact our Program Coordinator, Marcella Gange at 802 865 7178 or mgange@burlingtonvt.gov

CEDO's AmeriCorps program is recruiting for 5 new AmeriCorps positions

- <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CEDO/AmeriCorpsState-Program> Please spread the word among your networks. We are hiring for Burlington-area Social Justice AmeriCorps Positions - CEDO's We All Belong AmeriCorps*State program is your chance to put your ideas into action while learning new skills and making new connections. Serve as an AmeriCorps* State member in one of the 15 or more local organizations participating in the We All Belong program, committed to creating a more welcoming and inclusive community. These positions are full time equivalent from March to August 2016. Please contact our Program Coordinator, Marcella Gange at 802 865 7178 or mgange@burlingtonvt.gov

If your organization is interested in hosting an AmeriCorps member – we have slots available for both March to August 2016 and September 2016 – August 2017.

AmeriCorps members can support your organization by providing direct services to underserved communities, or strengthen your equity and diversity programming.

From September 2016, our program will expand to support direct services for safer and healthier communities; AmeriCorps members can provide training and mentoring for economic opportunity and employability support services, and provide support to research and promote best practice and direct services for programs working with prevention and intervention on opiate abuse.

Please contact us - Program Coordinator, Marcella Gange at 802 865 7178 or mgange@burlingtonvt.gov

COTS Winter Warming Shelter Statistics - January 26, 2016

Shelter opened November 3, 2015.

Shelter will close March 30, 2016.

January 6th we began decreasing beds from 50-43 because of safety issues.

The permitted capacity is 43 beds with 4 additional beds for CWE overflow.

The data below covers 83 nights (up through January 25, 2016).

Unduplicated Guests = 162

Male = 114 (70%) Female = 31 (19%) Transgender = 1 (.06%)

**Data not collected on 14 and 2 refused*

Age Composition

Average Age=39 Oldest=78 Youngest=18

- Over 50 = 29% 42/147 (15 guests no data so Denominator = 147)
- 30 to 49 = 36% 53/147
- 18 to 29 = 35% 52/147

RECEIVED EA/GA MOTEL VOUCHER FOR CWE only last year = 36 (23%)

RECEIVED EA/GA MOTEL VOUCHER DURING CURRENT EPISODE OF HOMELESSNESS (excluding CWE only assistance) = 46 (28%)

CHRONICALLY HOMELESS = 37 (23%)

To be considered chronically homeless, a person must have a disability and have been living in a place not meant for human habitation, in an emergency shelter, or a safe haven for the last 12 months continuously *or* on at least four occasions in the last three years *where those occasions cumulatively total at least 12 months*; occasions separated by a break of at least seven nights and stays in institution fewer than 90 days do not constitute a break.

HIGHEST LEVEL OF SCHOOL COMPLETED

Grades 9 -11	29 (17%)
High School diploma	50 (31%)
GED	15 (09%)
Some College	40 (25%)

HOMELESS CAUSE

Asked to leave shared residence	22
Benefits loss/reduction	4
Divorce/breakup	4
Domestic violence	7
Drug/alcohol abuse	12
Eviction	14
Job income loss/reduction	17
Mental health/disability	5
No-cause eviction/non-renewal of lease	6
Release from prison/jail	8
Relocation	18
Significant change to household	9

INCOME SOURCES AT ADMISSION

Earned Income	14 (09%)
SSDI	15 (09%)
SSI	17 (10%)
VA Service	02 (01%)
<i>*SNAP (food stamps)</i>	<i>60 (37%)</i>

HEALTH INSURANCE TYPES

MEDICAID	100
MEDICARE	24
None	43
State Health Insurance for Adults	4
Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Services	4

HEALTH CONDITIONS

CHRONIC HEALTH CONDITION at admission	71 (35%)
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY at admission	04 (.02%)
SUBSTANCE ABUSE	76 (46%)
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE EXPERIENCE OCCURRED	55 (34%)
MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEM	94 (58%)
PHYSICAL DISABILITY	56 (35%)

LENGTH OF STAY

Average length of stay = 6 days

7 nights or less =	99 (61%)
8 to 21 nights =	31 (19%)
22 nights up to 84 =	32 (20%)

Coordinated Entry

16 guests have signed releases and been referred for Case Management at CVOEO.

*Because of the busy nature of the shelter, or the incapacitated state of guests, we often cannot get a complete intake at night and ask guest to come back in the morning for intake. These 14 only stayed one night and did not come back for intake.

Notes:

1. All answers are self- reported.
2. Some guests answer all questions, others do not know or refuse.
3. Categories with less than 4 responses were excluded.

DATE: January 20, 2016

TO: Peter Owens (CEDO Director), Gillian Nanton (Assistant CED) Director for Sustainability, Housing and Economic Development) and Brian Lowe (Chief of Staff, Mayor Weinberger)

CC: Tom Ayres, Ward 7 City Councilor and Adam Roof, Ward 8 City Councilor

FROM: Selene Colburn, East District City Councilor and Chair of Community Development and Neighborhood Revitalization Committee

RE: Inclusionary Zoning Review RFP

The City Council's Community Development and Neighborhood Revitalization Committee (CDNR) met on December 15, 2015 to review a draft Request for Proposals (RFP) for a review of Burlington's Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance.

Councilors Colburn and Roof were present; Councilor Ayres was absent.

There was substantive public feedback on the RFP. The suggestions contained in this memo are indicative of areas of agreement between committee and public feedback. We request that a subsequent draft of the IZ RFP come back to the CDNR for final input and buy in.

Suggestions:

- Before asking how IZ can or should be changed, it's important to evaluate how current practices are working. This evaluation must be measured first and foremost against the stated goals of the ordinance¹, which emphasize inclusion and socio-economic integration, not housing production. If we want to make housing production the primary goal of our inclusionary zoning ordinance, as the RFP at times implies, that is a change that would need to be made through an ordinance revision (not an RFP process or consultancy).

¹ "The intent of these regulations is:

- (a) To meet the specific mandates of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117 related to housing opportunities for all of Vermont's citizens, particularly for those citizens of low or moderate income;
- (b) To ensure the provision of housing that meets the needs of all economic groups by precluding construction of only market rate housing on the limited supply of available land within the City;
- (c) To improve the quality of life for all residents by having an economically integrated housing supply throughout the City; and
- (d) To prevent overcrowding and deterioration of the limited supply of affordable housing, and thereby promote the public health, safety and general welfare."

- It's okay to ask about negative externalities as part of the consultant's work, such as whether or not the IZ ordinance has slowed development, but they need to be recognized as such. We also want to understand, quantitatively and objectively, if it's possible for a developer to make a profit under the current inclusionary zoning ordinance.
- There was widespread concern and agreement that the question "should the ordinance continue to require affordability in perpetuity" was in considerable conflict with state and city policy and should not be included in the scope of work for this RFP.
- There is support for looking at the threshold trigger; many who spoke agreed that the current trigger is likely too low.
- Structurally, the current RFP focuses on a scope of work posed as a series of very specific questions which some believe might weight applicants toward a criticism of inclusionary zoning. Let's break the scope of work into clear categories and workflows, such as:
 - *evaluation* of the current ordinance
 - *comparison* to other inclusionary zoning programs
 - *analysis* of financial feasibility, payments in lieu of production, threshold triggers, etc.
 - *recommendations*
- The scope of work as written needs more clarity and may limit applicants. Does the \$20,000 include travel? If so, this will probably limit us to regional applicants. How many visits are expected? What's the volume of the peer comparisons we're looking for? How many drafts need to be submitted? What's the process for review and revision? Is the consultant expected to make a final presentation? The city could do more to define the process, expectations and timeframe upfront. Qualifications should include experience with inclusionary zoning.
- Both members of the public and the committee wanted to know more about the make-up of the internal team that will be reviewing RFP responses. We would like a member of the CDNR committee, ideally the chair, to serve on this team.



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT
CITY COUNCIL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT &
NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE
c/o Community & Economic Development Office
City Hall, Room 32 • 149 Church Street • Burlington, VT 05401
802-865-7144 VOX • 802-865-7024 FAX • www.burlingtonvt.gov/cedo

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District
Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7
Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Tuesday, February 23, 2016

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Fletcher Room

Fletcher Free Library

Draft Minutes

Chair Selene Colburn calls the meeting to order at 6:05. She discussed that this will be a planning meeting to discuss how the committee will be going forward. The Chair distributed the memo she wrote as a result of the last meeting on Inclusionary Zoning.

Those in attendance are listed above.

1. Review Agenda

The Chair reviewed the agenda as posted and as distributed. The Motion to accept was made by Councilor Roof and seconded by Councilor Ayres. Motion approved. 2. Public Forum (20 minutes)

Comments:

Joe Speidel from UVM spoke of UVM investigating the possibility of building a new arena in conjunction with South Burlington, possibly using TIF money; locating the arena by City center. He noted that the South Burlington location would be an equal distance from Church and Main. He also explained that the University would not be the sole owner but a big tenant. Speidel also suggest that putting it at the University Mall was a possibility. It was suggested UVM consider the Memorial RFP which should be released in the next couple of months. Councilors also brought up the importance of discussing what is done with the redevelopment of the existing space and the need in Burlington for good size convention/meeting space – which is a big economic driver.

Speidel mentioned the International Town Gown Association Economic Development Conference -

The programs and services of the City of Burlington are accessible to people with disabilities.
For accessibility information, call 865-7144. For questions about the meeting,
contact Marcy Esbjerg at mesbjerg@burlingtonvt.gov

regional meeting in Ithaca end of March and they are presenting; information was shared with CEDO to see if others want to attend.

Chair Colburn spoke on the purpose and ongoing nature of committee.

Sandy Wynn mentioned that she continues to be concerned about the enforcing of 4 unrelated people ordinance and the length of time it takes to enforce.

Chair Colburn said she plans on some quality of life issues that need to be addressed on upcoming CDNR agenda. She plans to have meaningful next steps and a clearer mandate.

3. Approval of Minutes – 12/15 (5 minutes)

Councilor Ayres noted that he was not in attendance at the last meeting and his name should be removed.

A motion to accept the minutes with that change was made by Councilor Roof and seconded by Chair Colburn and the motion was unanimous.

4. Update on CEDO's Community Development Programs– Marcy Esbjerg (10 minutes)

M. Esbjerg presented updates on three programs:

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) – The Entitlement amount we will be getting this year is \$724,881; applications that came in under Public Services totaled \$349,796 for \$108,732 in funding and Development requests totaled \$376,234 for \$430,173 of funding available. The first meeting of the Advisory Board on Public Services took place recently. The next meeting on Development projects occurs in mid-March. In April, the Action Plan will be presented to CDNR, Board of Finance as well as City Council meetings.

AmeriCorps Program– Update was provided based on information on the current program, the number of organizations involved and the focus of diversity and equity. A report is attached for reference. The report also discussed the upcoming grant and the new focus on creating a healthy and safer community.

Warming Shelter – The Shelter was opened in November and a report was submitted that encompassed the numbers served year to date. There were few questions on the data and also when the shelter will close this year (March 30). The report is attached.

New Public Engagement Specialist – Marcy announced that CEDO hired a new Community Development Specialist – Public Engagement who started in early February. Phet Keomanyvanh comes from United Way and is already out assisting NPAs and planning the Internship Program.

4. **Next meetings** – review advance schedule (10 minutes) – 3rd Tuesday at the Library

3/15 – Tom has a conflict

4/19

5/17 – Adam traveling

6/21

7/19 – Adam traveling

8/16

Check on shifting to the 4th week – 3/22, 4/26, 5/24, 7/26

Post all meeting dates on line once the dates are confirmed.

5. Map out topics for CDNR Committee through the summer (15 minutes)

March – Inclusionary Zoning RFP, will meet with the Mayor first as a response to Memo; Update from UVM on the off campus tracking system

April – 2016 Action Plan, CEDO Assistant Director Gillian Nanton- Neighborhood Revitalization Plan/RFP to hire a consultant – this discussion on the plan and ideas could take several meetings.

May – setting targets for types of housing stock, demand versus production, CEDO Assistant Director Gillian Nanton.

June

July

August

Other Topics – 4 unrelated ordinance – when to bring that back; ADU – tiny homes for homeless and aging population with a possible speaker; underused affordable housing programs; meet with landlords – what do they need – how does it work well.

Chair Colburn is looking at what kind of housing students are looking for. This might not be a meeting but she may report back to the committee.

Councilor Roof noted the value in knowing the work plan to come in advance to mull it over, have conversation and plan in advance.

There was a motion to adjourn made by Councilor Roof and seconded by Councilor Ayers. The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcy Esbjerg

Assistant Director

CEDO