
Path to a Home



**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL (HSOC)
Housing Committee Meeting Agenda**

June 23, 2015, 3:00-4:30 p.m.
*Department of Social Services
3433 S. Higuera, Room 356*

Revised

***San Luis Obispo
Countywide 10 Year
Plan to End
Homelessness***

We envision a future in which the housing and comprehensive services necessary to remain housed are available for all, affording everyone maximum self-sufficiency, and the opportunity to be productive and participating members of our community

1. Call to Order and Introductions of Guests
2. Public Comment
3. Action/Information/Discussion:
 - 3.1 Action Item - Recommend that the Homeless Services Oversight Council ask the Board of Supervisors to write a letter in support of AB1335, SB377, and AB35.
 - 3.2 Discussion –List of Affordable Housing Alternatives prepared by Anne Wyatt
4. Future Discussion/Report Items:
5. Next Meeting Date: July 21, 3-4:30 p.m.
6. Adjournment

HOUSING OPTIONS FOR LOW AND EXTREMELY LOW INCOME PERSONS

HSOC: Advocate for the changing of policies and codes, where they prevent the development of the following possible types of affordable housing. Also, encourage the initiation of incentives for the same, such as reduced fees, tax credits, etc. Encourage development of new affordable housing and also the more efficient use of existing resources to provide a variety of housing type and housing choice for residents.

Multifamily residential rentals: Smaller, shared-wall rental units can be de facto affordable at higher densities and may not require public subsidy to be affordable. They are an efficient way to provide housing with minimal public subsidy. Encourage non-profit construction and management of such units, so they remain affordable in perpetuity.

Manufactured housing/Manufactured home parks: Approximately nine percent of County housing is manufactured, half in parks and half outside manufactured home parks. This housing comprises much of the County's affordable housing stock. More programs should be put in place to protect this existing resource, including: mortgage funding pools to help low-income residents purchase manufactured homes; resident park purchase assistance to help residents and non-profit entity purchase of manufactured home parks from outside (for profit) owners; repair assistance to help home owners maintain older units, install earthquake strapping and utility upgrades.

Homesharing: Make use of underutilized space (extra bedrooms) by matching room providers with room seekers. Create a countywide program similar to other existing programs, such as Ventura County Homeshare.

Granny Units (Second units): Small units placed in yards of existing or new residences can provide affordable rental housing. Programs could include: a grace period and incentive program to permit unpermitted units; lower permitting fees; marketing program to promote benefits of granny units; pre-approved plans; and pre-approval of certain manufactured units

Tiny Home Communities: Change policies and codes to allow for the construction of tiny home villages, where very small residences without kitchens, showers, laundry facilities or storage lockers could be built around or adjacent to a central community facility housing same. Would also have a multi-purpose room.

Organized Campgrounds: Reduce (by code changes) the area requirement (now 10 acres) in the definition of an organized campground. The campground could be tents or small homes built on raised platforms or trailers designed for occupancy by

persons ineligible for other residency opportunities. Support efforts of groups, such as Hope's Village of San Luis Obispo, to provide basic campground housing.

Residential Hotels (SRO/studio units): These units can be as small as 150 square feet, by state law. (HUD allows rooms as small as 114 feet. HUD housing choice voucher: special housing types allowed: http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=DOC_11761.pdf ; shared housing, SRO, group home, etc.) Individual rooms serve needs of single residents and couples. Rooms may contain private bathing and cooking facilities or share these facilities with other rooms. Establish clear criteria and allowances for residential hotel rooms, such as "furnished rental units in a dwelling used a primary residence; with a minimum number of units (six?); flexible unit sizes (say from 70-500 square feet); a kitchenette in the unit or shared; a full bathroom in the unit or shared; a maximum occupancy of two individuals; in a building with common amenity, such as front desk, housekeeping, etc.; rental term may be weekly or monthly

Boarding houses/Group homes: Boarding houses, smaller versions of residential hotels, with nine rooms or fewer, fit into residential neighborhoods. Individual rooms may offer full bathing and cooking facility, or these may be shared, similar to residential hotel rooms.

Cohousing: Private homes in settings with shared facilities (typically common kitchen, meetings rooms, library, pool, gardens and parks) with parking off to the side. Similar to a condominium complex, cohousing provides private space, but it emphasizes community. Unlike a condominium complex, cohousing residents often plan and participate together in community design and construction.

Independent Living Facilities: These provide minimal support and amenities, such as grab bars, common facilities and activities, to help seniors thrive in individual homes. Encourage the development of at least one or two (new) such facilities in every jurisdiction in the county, available to a range of income level.

Assisted Living Facilities: These senior facilities could resemble a boarding house or residential hotel, but provide services to those with special needs. Often meals, housekeeping and personal care are provided or offered. Encourage the development of at least one or two (new) such facilities in every jurisdiction in the county, available to needy medically fragile seniors.

Emergency shelter beds: Emergency shelters are a place of last resort for those faced with homelessness. They provide basic meals and a roof over the head while resident enters case management and sorts out housing and other needs. Support construction and operation of CAPSLO's 40 Prado Shelter, ECHO's Atascadero shelter and 5Cities' Coalition's South County shelter.

Transitional Housing: Temporary housing to support special needs until resident is ready for permanent housing, e.g. recovery facility. Transitional housing may take

the form of individual homes, boarding houses or larger facilities. Support development in all zoning categories.

Supportive housing: Permanent housing, with supportive services for special populations, such as those coping with mental illness and addiction recovery. Support construction in all zoning categories.

Unutilized/underutilized housing: Census estimates show 15,000 empty houses in San Luis Obispo County. Look at programs and policies which may help bring existing units into the affordable housing pool. This may include incentives for longer term rental residential use of vacation homes, conversion to residences of houseboats in Morro Bay, use of military housing (Camps San Luis and Roberts) and conversion of older motels to housing.

ASSEMBLY THIRD READING

AB 1335 (Atkins)

As Amended June 3, 2015

2/3 vote. Urgency

Committee	Votes	Ayes	Noes
Housing	5-1	Chau, Burke, Chiu, Lopez, Mullin	Beth Gaines
Appropriations	12-4	Gomez, Bonta, Calderon, Daly, Eggman, Eduardo Garcia, Gordon, Holden, Quirk, Rendon, Weber, Wood	Chang, Gallagher, Jones, Wagner

SUMMARY: Establishes the Building Homes and Jobs Act of 2015 (the Act) to provide funding for affordable housing. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Includes legislative findings.
- 2) Defines "Department" to mean the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
- 3) Defines "Governing Board" to mean the Building Homes and Jobs Trust Fund Governing Board.
- 4) Establishes the Building Homes and Jobs Trust Fund (the Trust Fund) within the State Treasury.
- 5) Beginning January 1, 2016, imposes a \$75 fee on every real estate instrument, paper, or notice that is required or permitted by law per each single transaction per parcel of real property, excluding real estate instruments, papers, or notices recorded in connection with a transfer subject to a documentary transfer tax.
- 6) Defines real estate instrument, paper, or notice as a document relating to real property, including but not limited to the following: deed, grant deed, trustee's deed, deed of trust, conveyance, quit claim deed, fictitious deed of trust, assignment of deed of trust, request for notice of default, abstract of judgment, subordination agreement, declaration of homestead, abandonment of homestead, notice of default, release or discharge, easement, notice of trustee sale, notice of completion, Uniform Commercial Code financing statement, mechanic's lien maps, and covenants, conditions, and restrictions.
- 7) Requires the fee, minus any administrative cost to the county recorder for collection, to be transferred quarterly to HCD and deposited into the Trust Fund.
- 8) Requires any moneys appropriated by the Legislature to be deposited into the Trust Fund as well as any other moneys made available to HCD for the purposes of the Trust Fund from any other sources.
- 9) Requires a county to pay HCD any interest, at the legal rate, on any funds that are not transferred within 30 days of the end of a quarter.

- 10) Requires any interest or other increment resulting from the investment of money in the Trust Fund to be deposited into the Trust Fund.
- 11) Prohibits the transfer of any money in the Fund to any other fund except for the Surplus Money Investment Fund.
- 12) Requires 20% of the money deposited into the Trust Fund to be used for affordable owner-occupied workforce housing.
- 13) Requires 10% of the money deposited into the Trust Fund to be used to address affordable homeownership and rental housing opportunities for agricultural workers and their families.
- 14) Allows the remaining 80% of money in the Trust Fund, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to be expended for the following purposes:
 - a) Development, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households including necessary operating subsidies;
 - b) Affordable rental and ownership housing that meets the needs of a growing workforce up to 120% of area median income (AMI);
 - c) Matching portions of funds placed into local or regional housing trust funds;
 - d) Matching portions of funds in the Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Asset Funds of former redevelopment agencies retained by successor agencies;
 - e) Capitalized reserves for services connected to the creation of new permanent supportive housing, including, but not limited to, developments funded through the Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program;
 - f) Emergency shelters, transitional housing, and rapid re-housing services;
 - g) Accessibility modifications;
 - h) Efforts to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed, vacant, or blighted homes;
 - i) Homeownership opportunities, including but not limited to down payment assistance; and
- 15) Allows a state or local entity that receives an appropriation from the Trust Fund to use up to 5% for administrative costs.
- 16) Provides that if a local government does not expend the moneys allocated to it within five years of the allocation than those moneys shall revert back to the Trust Fund.
- 17) Establishes the Governing Board made up of the following members:
 - a) A representative from California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA);
 - b) A representative from HCD;

- c) A representative from the Treasurer's Office;
 - d) No fewer than two real estate licensees one from northern California and one from southern California with not less than 10 years of real estate experience and membership in a real estate trade organization with not less than 20,000 licensees;
 - e) A local government representative from northern California, appointed by the Governor;
 - f) A local government representative from southern California, appointed by the Governor;
 - g) A representative from the home building industry from northern California, appointed by the Governor;
 - h) A representative from the home building industry from southern California, appointed by the Governor;
 - i) Six public members including:
 - i) One nonprofit affordable housing developer, appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly;
 - ii) One nonprofit affordable housing developer, appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate;
 - iii) One for-profit affordable housing developer, appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly;
 - iv) One for-profit affordable housing developer, appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate;
 - v) Two additional members, one appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and the other by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, that represent or has experience in one or more of the following areas:
 - (1) Private sector lending;
 - (2) For-profit affordable housing development;
 - (3) Nonprofit affordable housing development;
 - (4) Working with special needs populations, including persons experiencing homelessness;
 - (5) Architecture;
 - (6) Housing development consultation; and
 - (7) Housing issues related academia.
- 18) Requires the overall public membership of the Governing Board to contribute to a balance among geographic areas and between rural and urban interests.

- 19) Gives the Governing Board the authority to review and approve recommendations from HCD for all funds distributed from the Trust Fund.
- 20) Requires HCD, in consultation with the CalHFA, the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, and the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee, to develop a Building Homes and Jobs Investment Strategy (investment strategy).
- 21) Requires HCD to submit the first investment strategy to the Legislature as part of the Governor's May Revision of the Budget Act in 2015-16 and every five years thereafter as part of the Budget Act beginning in 2020-21.
- 22) Requires the investment strategy to do all of the following:
 - a) Identify the statewide needs, goals, objectives, and outcomes for housing for a five-year time period;
 - b) Requires the goals to include targets of the total number of affordable homes created and preserved with the funds;
 - c) Provides for a geographically balanced distribution of funds including that 50% of monies in the Trust Fund must be allocated directly to local governments;
 - d) Emphasize investments that serve households that are at or below 60% of AMI; and
 - e) Meet the following minimum objectives:
 - i) Encourage economic development and job creation by meeting the housing needs of a growing workforce up to 120% of AMI;
 - ii) Identify opportunities to coordinate among state departments and agencies to achieve greater efficiencies; increase the amount of federal investment in housing production, services, and operating costs; and promote energy efficiency in housing produced;
 - iii) Incentivize the use and coordination of nontraditional funding sources, including philanthropic funds, local realignment funds, non-housing tax increment, the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act funds, and other resources; and
 - iv) Incentivize innovative approaches that produce savings to local and state services by reducing the instability of housing for frequent high-cost users of institutions such as hospitals, jails, detoxification facilities, psychiatric hospitals, and emergency shelters.
- 23) Requires local governments to comply with the following in order to receive a direct allocation from the Trust fund:
 - a) Submit a plan to HCD detailing how the local government will allocate funding consistent with the allowable uses listed in the bill; and
 - b) Have a compliant housing element with the state, submit the annual housing element report required by Government Code Section 65400, and submit an annual report to HCD detailing the use of the allocated funds.

- 24) Requires HCD to hold at least four public workshops in different regions of the state to inform development of the investment strategy.
- 25) Requires the Governing Board to review and advise HCD regarding the investment strategy prior to its submission to the Legislature.
- 26) Requires expenditure requests contained in the Governor's proposed budget to be consistent with the investment strategy.
- 27) Requires moneys in the Trust Fund to be appropriated through the annual budget act.
- 28) Requires the State Auditor to conduct periodic audits to determine if HCD is awarding the annual allocation to individual programs in a timely manner and consistent with the Act.
- 29) Requires HCD to provide the following information in its annual report to the Legislature:
 - a) How funds were allocated in the prior year;
 - b) Efforts to promote geographic balance when distributing the funds;
 - c) An assessment of the impact of the Trust Fund on job creation and the economy;
 - d) The effectiveness of programs directed toward persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness at keeping those persons housed; and
 - e) A determination as to whether any moneys derived from the recording fee are being allocated by the state for any purpose not authorized by the Act and this information must be provided to the county recorders.
- 30) Provides that if HCD determines that any moneys collected from the recording fee are being allocated by the state for any purpose not authorized by the Act, the county recorders will immediately cease collection of the fees and only resume collection of the recording fee after receiving notice that the fees are being allocated by the state for the purposes of the Act.
- 31) Declares the Legislature's intent to enact legislation to create a Secretary of Housing to oversee all activities related to housing and that all professional entities that play a role in the housing market would be authorized to be incorporated in order to have a clearer and more unified approach to housing in the state.
- 32) Includes an urgency clause.

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee

- 1) On-going recording fee revenues in the range of \$300 and \$500 million annually (Building Homes and Jobs Trust Fund).
- 2) Onetime costs to HCD of approximately \$230,000 (General Fund (GF)), for three positions for six months, to develop the investment strategy, including holding public workshops, forming an advisory committee, and establishing the Governing Board.

- 3) On-going, intermittent costs of approximately \$200,000 (GF) for consultations necessary for the required five-year updates to the investment strategy.

COMMENTS:

Background: California is facing a housing affordability crisis on many fronts. According to the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), as of February 2015, roughly 36% of mortgaged homeowners and approximately 48% of all renters are spending more than one-third of their household incomes on housing. California continues to have the second lowest homeownership rate in the nation and the Los Angeles metropolitan area is now a majority renter region. In fact, five of the eight lowest homeownership rates in the nation are in California metropolitan areas.

California has 12% of the United States population, but 20% of its homeless population – 63% of these homeless Californians are unsheltered (the highest rate in the nation). At any given time, 134,000 Californians are homeless. California has 24% of the nation's homeless veterans and one-third of the nation's chronically homeless. The state also has the largest numbers of unaccompanied homeless children and youth, with 30% of the national total.

Purpose of this bill: According to the author, "increased and ongoing funding for affordable housing is critical to stabilize the state's housing development and construction marketplace. If developers know that there is a sustainable source of funding available, they will take on the risk that comes with development – and create a reliable pipeline of well-paying construction jobs in the process. The Building Homes and Jobs Act will utilize a pay as you go approach and generate hundreds of millions of dollars annually for affordable housing through a \$75 fee on real estate recorded documents, excluding those documents associated with home sales. Funds generated will leverage an additional \$2 to \$3 billion in federal, local, and bank investment."

Previous state funding for housing: Historically, the state has invested in low- and moderate-income housing primarily by providing funding for construction. Because of the high cost of land and construction and the subsidy needed to keep housing affordable to residents, affordable housing is expensive to build. Developers typically use multiple sources of financing, including voter-approved housing bonds, state and federal low-income housing tax credits, private bank financing, and local matching dollars.

Voter-approved bonds have been an important source of funding to support the construction of affordable housing. Proposition 46 of 2002 and Proposition 1C of 2006 together provided \$4.95 billion for affordable housing. These funds financed the construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of 57,220 affordable apartments, including 2,500 supportive homes for people experiencing homelessness, and over 11,600 shelter spaces. In addition, these funds have helped 57,290 families become or remain homeowners. Nearly all of these funds have been awarded.

Until 2011, the Community Redevelopment Law required redevelopment agencies to set aside 20% of all tax increment revenue to increase, improve, and preserve the community's supply of low- and moderate-income housing. In fiscal year 2009-10, redevelopment agencies collectively deposited \$1.075 billion of property tax increment revenues into their low- and moderate-income housing funds. With the elimination of redevelopment agencies, this source of funding for affordable housing is no longer available.

California has reduced its funding for the development and preservation of affordable homes by 79% – from approximately \$1.7 billion a year to nearly nothing. According to the California Housing

Partnership, California has a shortfall of 1,465,884 affordable units for extremely low- and very-low income households.

Funding mechanism: Although an important source of funding in the past for affordable housing, voter-approved bonds are not a permanent or reliable source. To provide for a stable and permanent source of funding for affordable housing, several states have set up state housing trust funds funded by a document recording fee. This bill would establish the Building Homes and Jobs Act, to be funded by a \$75 fee on recorded real estate documents, excluding those recorded in connection with the sale of a property. Estimates suggest that the recording fee would generate an average between \$300 and \$500 million a year for affordable housing. This bill caps the amount of fees that could be charged per single transaction to \$225. This means that an individual will only be charged on three documents recorded in a transaction. The fee would be charged on a "real estate instrument, paper, or notice." This bill includes a list of possible documents on which the fee could be charged, however, this is not an exhaustive list and there may be others.

How the Trust Fund can be used: This bill authorizes funds in the Trust Fund to be appropriated for a variety of uses. Twenty percent of the Trust Fund is set aside for affordable homeownership activities. The remaining 80% can be used for the development, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of low- and moderate-income housing; affordable rental and ownership housing that meets the needs of a growing workforce up to 120% of AMI, match funds in local housing trust funds and funds in the Low and Moderate-Income Housing Asset funds of former redevelopment agencies; capitalize the reserves for services for new permanent supportive housing including developments funded through the Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Program; emergency shelters, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing; accessibility modifications; efforts to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed and vacant homes, and for homeownership opportunities including down payment assistance. Unlike voter-approved bond funds, the Trust Fund could be used to support services and operating expenses for supportive and transitional housing.

Investment strategy: This bill gives the Legislature the authority to appropriate funds that are deposited into the Trust Fund. In order to direct that investment through an informed and strategic process, the bill requires HCD, in consultation with other relevant state housing agencies and committees, to develop an investment strategy for the Trust Fund. HCD would be required to submit the first investment strategy to the Legislature as part of the May revision to the Governor's proposed budget in 2015-16. Every five years after, beginning in 2020-21, HCD would be required to revise the investment strategy. To inform the investment strategy, HCD must hold four public hearings throughout the state. HCD is already required to develop a Statewide Housing Plan every four years to identify the statewide needs, goals, objectives, and outcomes for housing, which would inform the investment strategy.

In preparing the investment strategy, HCD would be required to identify the statewide needs and goals for housing for the next five years and to attach targets of the total number of affordable homes created and preserved with the funds. HCD would also be required to promote a geographically balanced distribution of the funds, including some consideration of providing funds directly to local governments. In addition, the investment strategy would have to emphasize investments in housing affordable to households at or below 60% of AMI, generally referred to as low-, very low- and extremely low-income households. This bill also sets out minimum objectives that must be met in the investment strategy.

Local funding allocation: This bill would require a geographically balanced distribution of 50% of the Trust Fund directly to local governments. In order to qualify, local governments would need to provide HCD with a plan detailing how they would spend the funds consistent with the allowable uses provided for in the bill. Local governments would have to have a compliant housing element and have submitted an annual report on their progress in meeting their regional housing needs to qualify for funding. They would also be required to provide HCD with ongoing tracking of the use of the funds. If a local government does not spend their allocation within five years then those funds would revert back to the Trust Fund.

Related Legislation: Last session, SB 391 (DeSaulnier) of the 2013-14 Regular Session, would have imposed a \$75 fee on every real estate instrument, paper, or notice that is required or permitted by law, excluding real estate instruments, papers, or notices recorded in connection with a transfer subject to a documentary transfer tax. The bill was held in Assembly Appropriations Committee.

This bill differs from SB 391 in the following ways:

- 1) Sets a cap of \$225 on fees charged on a per parcel per transaction basis;
- 2) Creates a 20% set aside of funding for homeownership programs;
- 3) Creates a 10% set aside for affordable homeownership and rental housing for agricultural workers and their families.
- 4) Requires 50% of funding go directly to local governments provided that the local government provide HCD with a plan for how they will spend the funds consistent with the uses allowed in the bill and meet other reporting requirements.
- 5) Requires the creation of a Governing Board to review and approve recommendations from HCD for all funds distributed from the Trust Fund and to advise and approve the Investment Strategy that HCD must develop for the Trust Fund.
- 6) Directs the county recorders to stop collecting the fee if HCD determines that the funds are not being used to support the purposes authorized by the Building Homes and Jobs Act; and
- 7) Declares the intent of the Legislature to create a Secretary of Housing to oversee all of the housing activities related to the state and to have a clearer and more unified approach to housing in the state.

**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**

MEMBERS PRESENT		MEMBERS ABSENT		STAFF & GUESTS	
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	
AGENDA ITEM				CONCLUSIONS/ACTIONS	FOLLOW UP
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.			
ACTION/INFORMATION/DISCUSSION					
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>		

HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL
ACTION ITEM
June 23, 2015

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 3.1

ITEM: Recommend that the Homeless Services Oversight Council (HSOC) ask the Board of Supervisors to write a letter in support of AB1335, SB377, and AB35.

ACTION REQUIRED: Vote to ask the full HSOC make a formal recommendation to the County Board of Supervisors, asking the Board to write a letter in support of AB1335, SB377, and AB35.

SUMMARY NARRATIVE: The lack of housing affordable to persons with incomes equal to or less than 30% of the Area Median Income contributes to and exacerbates homelessness in San Luis Obispo County. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the mean wage needed to rent a two bedroom apartment in San Luis Obispo County is \$25.17 for a person working full time. Additionally, the multi-family housing vacancy rate in San Luis Obispo County is less than 2%.

Local homeless services agencies report homeless clients have difficulty finding affordable rental units, even with Housing Choice Vouchers, which provide a long-term rental subsidy. Transitions Mental Health Association staff have reported that the lack of affordable housing has lengthened the time that it takes to place 50 Now clients into housing. Staff from the Housing and Urban Development-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) Program report that some homeless veterans have had to turn back housing vouchers because they could not find a apartment that would accept the vouchers.

Many other counties in California face similar housing affordability challenges. As a result, housing advocates have been promoting AB1335, SB377, and AB35. These bills propose to increase the number of units constructed in California. Analyses of these bills are provided in Attachments 3.1A, 3.1B, and 3.1C.

BUDGET/FINANCIAL IMPACT

No current fiscal impact is anticipated from an HSOC recommendation.