

**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL  
 HSOC HOUSING COMMITTEE  
 May 19, 2015, 3:00-4:30pm  
 Department of Social Services  
 3433 S. Higuera St, San Luis Obispo  
 Room 356**

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>		<b>MEMBERS ABSENT</b>		<b>STAFF &amp; GUESTS</b>			
John Ashbaugh Jim Patterson Jerry Rioux Dee Torres Martin Meltz Anne Wyatt		Bob Kelley Scott Smith Shirley Wright Tim Waag Dana Cummings		Laurel Weir Morgan Torell Sandra Gould Jessica Lorange Christian Letz			
<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>				<b>CONCLUSIONS/ACTIONS</b>		<b>FOLLOW UP</b>	
1. Call to Order and Introductions of Guests		John Ashbaugh welcomed the group and introductions were made.					
2. Public Comment		John recapped meeting discussion from April that talked about the Sunbeam hotel as a possible housing project. The unit is being sold for \$1.6 million. Scott and Anne to follow up.					
<b>ACTION/INFORMATION/DISCUSSION</b>							
3. 1 Round Table: Updates on Local Low Income Housing Development Activities and Update on State or Federal Legislation Affecting Low Income Housing Development		John updated the group about the following bills at the state legislature: AB1335, SB377, and AB35. John has requested that the committee consider supporting the bills.		Motion made to add to the Committee agenda for June: Anne: First, Marty: Second, unanimous.			
3.2 Permanent Supportive Housing Program Update (including 50 Now, HUD-VASH, and Continuum of Care units)		John reported that a report on the 50 Now program was presented to the County Board of Supervisors had on May 5, 2015. The report provided six month outcomes for the program. 27 people had been permanently housed in the first six months. There were no representatives from the other programs. The Committee suggested that 3.2 be skipped when the appropriate committee members are not present. Marty suggested that the group schedule 3 month cycles and ask representatives to be					

<p>3.3 Rapid Rehousing Program Update Regarding Implementation (including Supportive Services for Veterans Families, CalWORKS Housing Support Program, Klaproad, and Emergency Solutions Grant)</p> <p>3.4 Landlord Acceptance of Housing Choice Vouchers</p> <p>3.4.1 Report on the results of the Housing Authority of San Luis Obispo’s (HASLO) survey of landlords regarding participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program, as well as additional feedback from landlords and others</p> <p>3.4.1 (A) Attachment- report summarizing barriers to acceptance of Housing Choice Vouchers and considerations regarding efforts to prohibit landlords from refusing to rent to otherwise qualified tenants solely on the basis of the tenants having housing choice vouchers.</p>	<p>at the meetings for items 3.2 and 3.3.</p> <p>Sandra updated the group on rapid rehousing. The Supportive Services for Veteran Families program has housed 22 people since January of 2015. They are on track to reach the goal of 70 by this year’s end. Jim stated that he would like to find more support for ECHO to house in North County.</p> <p>Marty informed the group that WIB is changing to better fit outreach programs and could be helpful to persons in Rapid Rehousing programs. In 2 months WIB programs should be distributed. More discussions to come.</p> <p>Jerry recommended legislative platform to prohibit landlords from refusing to rent based on housing vouchers.</p> <p>Laurel presented summary of HASLO’s survey of landlords. While a relatively small number of landlords participated, they managed several thousand units of rental housing. Landlords who participated in the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs were the most likely to respond to the survey.</p> <p>Many of the landlords who participated in the program did not have units that fit the payment standards in all categories. Thus, even if a landlord accepts HCVs, not all of their units may be eligible.</p> <p>In general, landlords who participated in the survey reported a more favorable than negative attitude towards the HCV program. Several landlords mentioned they had had good experiences with the</p>		
---	--	--	--

	<p>program. The most frequently mentioned positive aspect of the program was that it provided guaranteed rental payments each month. The most frequently mentioned negative aspect was that people were concerned they might get a difficult tenant. A few landlords had had a difficult tenant, but several noted that their experiences with tenants were mostly positive.</p> <p>Landlords were asked about what they would suggest changing to make it more appealing to landlords. The top choice was to create funding that would be available if there was any damage that exceeded the security deposit. Notably, landlords did not view inspections by the Housing Authority to be burdensome and a number of respondents indicated that they would like to see more frequent inspections.</p> <p>Laurel also reported on emails sent to the Board of Supervisors by landlords. The Pismo Beach realtors association had notified their members that the Board of Supervisors had asked for feedback on whether to include in the legislative platform an item supporting efforts to enact legislation that would prohibit landlords from refusing to rent to otherwise qualified tenants solely on the basis of the tenants having a Housing Choice Voucher. The emails were predominately opposed. The emails were reviewed to determine the nature of the concerns. To the extent that a reason was given, the most commonly expressed concerns were that it was viewed as more government intrusion, and that commenters expressed a belief that persons with HCVs would be problematic tenants. She also noted that some commenters appear to believe that the proposed legislation would require landlords to rent to HCV recipients regardless of their credit scores, past rental history, or other factors. Laurel noted that under the proposal, the landlords would not be prohibited from doing normal background checks, including rental</p>	<p>For Motion First: Dee Second,: Jim, Marty</p> <p>For: Jim, Marty, Jerry,</p> <p>Against: Anne</p> <p>Motion Passed</p>	
--	---	---	--

<p>3.4.2 . Action Item: Vote to make a formal recommendation to HSOC regarding legislation to prohibit landlords from refusing to rent to otherwise qualified tenants solely on the basis of the tenants having a Housing Choice Voucher</p>	<p>history and credit checks, nor would they be prevented from considering the amount of income the clients had or requiring the clients to have an income of a certain amount, as determined by the landlord.</p> <p>Laurel also reported on a federal study that examined the impact of similar ordinances in other communities. According to the study, implementation of an ordinance resulted in increases in voucher utilization rates from 4 to 11%, depending on the community.</p> <p>Anne voiced her concern about the possibility of landlords taking units off the market if the legislative recommendation happened. She expressed her hope that if the provision were passed, that it would result in more units being made available and noted that the HUD study suggested that might be the result. She noted she was voted against the amendment only because of the concern about whether it might affect the number of units on the market in a negative way.</p>		
<p>4. Future Discussion/Report Items:</p>	<p>Marty requested the Committee consider a list of housing options to pursue</p>		
<p>5. Next Meeting Date: June 23, 2015</p>			
<p>6. Adjournment</p>	<p>Jim adjourned the meeting</p>		