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Housing Programs and Policies

- Rental Housing Development Assistance
- Land Use Policies
- Tenant Assistance Funds
- Homeownership Programs
- Housing Services Programs
Rental Housing Development Assistance

• Target is 350 rental CAFs per year
• Produced average of 189 from FY10-FY14
• Majority of funding from developer contributions
• Meeting goals for family units, but few 3BR
• Most CAFs since 2009 in Columbia Pike corridor, but most replaced MARKs
• Challenged by likely future funding reductions and rising subsidy costs.
Land Use Policies

- 3,137 CAFs produced since adoption of new Affordable Housing Ordinance in 2006
- 95% of new units via cash contributions to AHIF; only 41 units were on-site ADUs
  - Nearly all CAFs are in separate projects, few in Metro corridors
- Cash contribution amount clearly too low to steer developers to ADU option
Tenant Assistance Funds

- New policy established in 2013 standardizes future TAFs
- Provided assistance to 100% of qualified households in six projects; average support of $141/month
- Very effective at preventing displacement
Homeownership Programs

• No dedicated funding for programs
• Target is 50 per year, has averaged about 10
• Little available supply due to maximum purchase price of $362,790
  – Nearly all purchases have been of condos
• County discontinued LNYW, APS still has it
• HIP wasn’t widely used, is on hiatus
• Homebuyer education is popular and effective
Housing Services Programs

• Information center processes more than 1,000 calls per year
• Mediation services have resolved 90% of disputes before trial
• Neighborhood Strategic Area program resolves hundreds of code violations each year
• These services reinforce other housing programs at a modest cost
Human Services Programs

- Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8)
- Housing Grants
- Real Estate Tax Relief
- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Homeless Services
- Carter-Jenkinson Memorial Homelessness Prevention Fund
- Group Homes and Transitional Housing: Mental Health Populations
- Transitional Housing for Substance Abusers
- Residential Services and Housing for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities
- Senior Independent Living and Assisted Living
Housing Grants

• Housing Choice Voucher program is not going to expand, waiting list remains closed

• Housing Grants are critical to retain nearly 1,200 low-income senior households

• Provides average of $575/month in assistance
Real Estate Tax Relief

• More than 1,000 households use exemption, 73% claim full exemption
• Essential tool for seniors to remain in their homes
• Not a “free” program: $5.2M in revenue was foregone
• Demand will increase as population ages
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

- County goal is to have 425 PSH units
- Current total: 193, but 66 added since 2011
- Critical for preventing homelessness, particularly for intellectually disabled
- Very hard to convince landlords to participate
- No transition program for youths aging out of foster care
Homeless Services

• 2008 county goal was to reduce homeless population 50% by 2015, eliminate by 2018
• Expanded services and PSH units have reduced homelessness, but more resources and regional information sharing needed
• Carter-Jenkinson Fund is critical to provide immediate assistance, especially for non-rent costs
Group Homes and Transitional Housing for Mentally Ill

• County operates four group homes and two transitional homes
• Served 79 individuals in FY13
• Very long waiting list, as it is difficult to place departing residents
  – More PSH units would relieve pressure
Transitional Housing for Substance Abusers

- Independence House: 14-bed facility, up to 12-month stay
- Served 26 individuals in FY13
- Very hard to find landlords willing to take those leaving the program
Residential Services and Housing for Intellectually Disabled

• County operates 12 group homes for ID populations
• Served 21 residents, placed 9 more in PSH units
• Very hard to find locations for more group homes
• Group homes no longer eligible for VHDA loan program—classified as “institutional”
Senior Independent Living and Assisted Living

- Culpepper Garden: 340-unit independent and assisted living
- Mary Marshall Residences: 52-unit assisted living for ID/mentally ill populations
- Provides alternative to nursing homes for nearly 400 residents
- Has freed up space in group homes
Profile of Affordable Housing Programs in Other Jurisdictions

- Alexandria
- District of Columbia
- Fairfax County
- Montgomery County
- Prince George’s County
### Summary: Other Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Local Housing Authority?</th>
<th>Local Rental Assistance *</th>
<th>Inclusionary Zoning</th>
<th>Home-ownership</th>
<th>Local Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Yes, owns 1,150 units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Optional, achieved via proffers</td>
<td>Up to 80% AMI</td>
<td>Developers, bonding, dedicated tax assessment, loan repayments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Yes, owns 8,363 units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory, must be on-site if no economic hardship</td>
<td>Up to 80% AMI for most, DC gov’t worker limit is higher</td>
<td>Recordation tax, condo conversion fees, loan repayments, bonding, special appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>Yes, owns 1,060 units</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandatory for new multi-family</td>
<td>Up to 70% AMI</td>
<td>No dedicated source; trust fund capitalized by proffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Yes, but phasing out public housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory for all projects of 20+ units</td>
<td>Up to 120% AMI</td>
<td>Appropriations, developers, bonding, loan repayments, condo conversion tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>Yes, owns 376 units</td>
<td>Yes, but temporary and only up to 30% AMI</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Up to 120% AMI</td>
<td>No dedicated source</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Local supplements to Housing Choice Vouchers for low-income renter households*