

**BUCKEYE LAKE VILLAGE
MAYOR'S REPORT
October 10, 2022**

September 27, 2022 Webinar with Jo Polk with PNC Bank and Jill Taylor

They wanted to discuss our banking needs, but Jennifer and I told them that we use Park National.

September 28, 2022 Meeting with Linda Goodman and Toby Miller regarding the

Harbor. The Lease is being violated because the Harbor is sub-letting and collecting money. Our Lease clearly states that we are not to sublet the building.

Ribbon cutting for our new EyeCare on Walnut Road.

October 3, 2022 Meeting with news reporter from the Newark Advocate Michaela

Regarding our Replacement Levy.

Meeting with Father Bill with Our Lady of Mount Carmel

We discussed working more together on many areas and about the Diocese and the churches that they are closing. Father Bill is looking for a projection of our growing population over the next five years.

October 5, 2022 Employee Meeting

11:00 – 1:00 Meeting with the ODNR – Mark Hoffines, Captain Jason Millikin, Chief Harget, Chief Ruton

Discussed helping with the safety issues on the water and the Dam and how we can further assist them in those areas and help to be more of an impact. We will meet again after they take the conversation to the top.

Then Toby Miller and I continue the meeting with the TAP project, Curbs and Sidewalks and again Mark was going to take to the top ranks and get back to us.

October 6, 2022 Meeting Grandview Yard affordable housing Columbus and out

Lying areas rural. I have attached the hand – out for you to look over.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor Jeryne A. Peterson

- From Mayor Oct 10, 2022

Our goal is to leave today's Big Table Conversation with active - and actionable - ways each individual present can create solutions for the current affordable housing crisis in Columbus, and how collectively we can drive great change.

5 Key Questions to Consider:

- How do you manage NIMBYism (Not in My Backyard)?
- Is affordable housing meant to be a permanent solution?
- When considering modularity for building, what has more power - the pros or cons?
- What cities can we look to that are doing well with affordable housing - and which aren't?
- What will the impact of Intel being on the affordable housing crisis in the Columbus metro area?

How do you manage NIMBYism (Not in My Backyard)?

Supporting Topics + Resources for Conversation

- Current example: of what's happening in Bexley, The Community Builder (TCB) have two projects that border Bexley and how the community has reacted negatively and pushed back for the development.
- How do we address the location of affordable housing in different neighborhoods and how to respond to negative reactions to convince them of the benefits?
- Consideration: LIHTC (Low income housing tax credit) developments require housing and availability to the demographics within the area AMI (Average Median Income) which lends itself to areas of low income because there is less infrastructure in place for community pushback - and less negative community response to additional low-income housing - rather than a medium or high economically developed area.
- Does the Pro Forma have to include things that are built into the building, or can it include things built outside of the building?
- Dayton's "The Arcade" project has a LIHTC component critical to the realization of the project



Is affordable housing meant to be a permanent solution?

Supporting Topics + Resources for Conversation

- If we consider a shared economy - what is affordable housing? Ownership? Renting? Rent to own?
- Is affordable housing the permanent solution? If not, what do some of the steps after look like and how can they be designed for?
- What should the future of housing look like? How can we set affordable housing families up for future success? Ideas: more integrated care within the home, aging in place, ability to work from home
- We are only discussing one aspect of these people's lives - income exclusively - and not considering a standard or quality of life. How can we bring more of a human factor into designing for affordable housing? How do we look at people as more than statistics and metrics?
- Is there a way to foster better care, better community, for these housing communities?

When considering modularity for building, what has more impact - the pros or cons?

Supporting Topics + Resources for Conversation

- Where does modularity fit into this? Does it help us or hurt us?
Help to reduce costs that increase performance of the Pro forma itself
- Do tiny homes have a place in the affordable housing market? Consider the European model of less is more for living.
- Consider types of modular products; light gauge metal (ideal for vertical design) or wood (ideal for horizontal builds)
- Consider obvious pros; cost, construction time
- Consider obvious cons; aesthetic of the product, few manufacturers
- Does modular design create more room for a green approach for affordable housing?

What cities can we look to that are doing well with affordable housing - and which aren't? What are they doing for best practices we can borrow from?

Supporting Topics + Resources for Conversation

- 20% of the units on a market rate projects have to be allocated as affordable - passed Q1 2022 in Columbus - Ordinance 1843-2022, pass as amended, 7/27/2022
- Cities doing it well: Atlanta (LIHTC 65 years of cost affordability), Minneapolis (4d Affordable Housing Incentive)
- Cities not doing it well: Austin, Nashville - urban planning perspective exploding without control

 <p>Minneapolis 4D Affordable Housing Incentive Article</p>	 <p>City of Atlanta - Housing Affordability Action Plan Article</p>	 <p>Stabling Housing for Portland, By Portland Article</p>
--	--	---

What will the impact of Intel being on the affordable housing crisis in the Columbus metro area?

Supporting Topics + Resources for Conversation

- Intel is projected to bring in 1 million new residents in the next 10 years - 2.5 million in total
- AMI numbers for reference in relation to Intel:
 - AMI of Bexley \$109,000
 - AMI of Intel Employees \$130,000
 - AMI of Columbus \$55,000
 - Franklin County AMI \$45,000
 - Licking County AMI \$70,00
 - State of Ohio AMI \$58,000

Guide To Affordable Housing in Licking County, Ohio

There are 47 low income housing apartment communities offering 2,248 affordable apartments for rent in Licking County, Ohio.

Income Based Apartments in Licking County, Ohio

Licking County features 1,238 income based apartments. Tenants of income based apartments typically pay no more than 30% of their income towards rent and utilities.

Low Rent Apartments in Licking County, Ohio

There are 974 rent subsidized apartments that do not provide direct rental assistance but remain affordable to low income households in Licking County.

Housing Choice Vouchers in Licking County, Ohio

On average, Section 8 Housing Choice vouchers pay Licking County landlords \$500 per month towards rent. The average voucher holder contributes \$300 towards rent in Licking County.

The maximum amount a voucher would pay on behalf of a low-income tenant in Licking County, Ohio for a two-bedroom apartment is between \$929 and \$1,135.

2022 Licking County, Ohio Fair Market Rents and Housing Choice Voucher Payment Standards

Fair Market Rents can be used to better understand the average housing costs of an area. Fair Market Rents are used by HUD to establish payment and rent standards for federal rental assistance programs like the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program.

	Studio	One BR	Two BR	Three BR	Four BR
Licking County, Ohio Fair Market Rent	\$730	\$829	\$1,032	\$1,281	\$1,426
Licking County, Ohio Payment Standard Range	\$657 to \$803	\$746 to \$912	\$929 to \$1,135	\$1,153 to \$1,409	\$1,283 to \$1,569

Research Notes from Rolando Matias; MA Design's Affordable Housing Market Lead + Design Strategist

Zoning - what can we do to provide form based code (FBC) zoning versus the current used-based zoning?

Form-based zoning would be great to promote environments around these areas; fostering health, finances, promote green spaces, promote good quality of living

The most common rule of thumb to determine how much you can afford to spend on housing is that it should be **no more than 30% of your gross monthly income**, which is your total income before taxes or other deductions are taken out. For renters, that 30% includes rent and utility costs like heat, water and electricity

The rent does not exceed 30 percent of the annual income of a family whose income equals 50 percent of the median income for the area, as determined by HUD, with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

Income limits developed by HUD. HUD sets the **lower income** limits at 80% and **very low-income** limits at 50% of the median income for the county or metropolitan area in which you choose to live

Affordable Housing in Scandinavian Countries

Different from the UK and US examples, AH has been integrated in port areas where the property prices are very high in the large cities of Norway and Sweden. In Sweden, Gothenburg municipality requested housing production with reduced rent amounts from private developers for a temporary period, 15 years, in 2015 (Gibbs, 2020). **In Oslo, Norway, the City Council required that 10% of the housing in the harbor areas of Bjørvika with the Fjort City port project would be available with affordable rental rates** in 2010 (B. Andersen & Røe, 2017). However, because of the reluctance of private developers, the requirement of **10% AH for low-income groups changed to 5% student housing** (B. Andersen & Røe, 2017). (NIMBYism)

In the United States, public housing is restricted by income level. Affordable housing developers who build housing often have to cobble together financing from bank loans, tax credits such as the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, federal block grants, rental assistance and many more sources. It is not uncommon for affordable housing developers to rely on 20 or more financing sources to fill the gap of total costs to begin construction. In Denmark, because the nonprofit housing development sector is more simplified and receives its financing largely from the Landsbyggefonden, the financing breakdown for social housing construction is fairly straightforward:

- **10% of construction funding comes from a soft no-interest loan from the city for a 50-year term**
- **88% of construction funding comes from a government-backed real estate loan (from the Landsbyggefonden) with a very low fixed interest rate for a 30-year term**
- **2% of construction funding comes from tenant rents**

The Landsbyggefonden, LBF, (is a cornerstone of the Danish affordable and social housing model, ensuring a high housing stock standard and better tenant well-being.) is authorized by the Danish Parliament to spend its funds (estimated at \$505 million in 2019) only for the following types of activities:

- **Co-financing projects within the social housing sector, such as renovation of buildings, improvement of infrastructure and social efforts in challenged housing areas**
- **Providing subsidies to regulate tenant rents**
- **Financing research and analyses of the social housing sector**
- **Social work including tenant services and master plans to strengthen disadvantaged communities**

Because the financing is almost entirely from government-backed, low-interest-rate loans, the rents for social housing can be set based on actual operating costs and do not fluctuate based on market conditions. Tenants exert some control over the operating budget, repairs and overall maintenance, which are overseen by nonprofit housing organizations. Because construction and land costs have increased steeply in Copenhagen over the past decade, new social housing units tend to be more expensive to rent than older ones, and rents must cover the full operating costs, including financing.

Lessons for the Bay Area

Many of Denmark's housing options are products of broad political consensus between Danish citizens and leaders — a very different foundation from our political and economic system in the United States. There are many differences between what Copenhagen has been able to achieve and what is possible in the Bay Area, largely due to the ability of Danish leaders to be nimbler and more effective in responding to unintended policy outcomes. But Denmark's successes can still provide guiding paths to affordable housing policy in the Bay Area. The challenges the Danish have overcome in implementing their policies offer valuable lessons for achieving equity and sustainability in housing practices.

Lesson 1. Vastly simplify financing for affordable housing.

In the United States, developers must rely on a patchwork system to identify and pursue financing for projects. This system already includes substantial public money for affordable housing. Denmark's system of nonprofit housing development uses simplified mechanisms to secure financing, and has established a system of loan repayment under a revolving fund. A key takeaway for the Bay Area is to move toward a system of housing where certain types of housing are not expected to generate a return so much as sustain a revolving fund. One important step toward this goal is to place land and buildings in public or nonprofit ownership to encourage long-term housing affordability. By empowering a new regional housing finance agency to acquire, manage and dispose of land and property, the region can enact effective policies that maintain affordable housing under a simplified and revolving fund that can be supplemented by public and philanthropic institutions.

Lesson 2. Diversify tenant and owner incomes within buildings.

Existing social housing and co-op models in Denmark offer lessons on income diversity within buildings. Affordable housing policy in the Bay Area often skews toward encouraging 100% affordable projects, where all of the units are subsidized for low-income households. But this approach fails to account for the difficulties in scaling up housing development.

The Bay Area needs to produce a significant number of units in order to address its housing shortage — and it cannot meet this goal when developers are challenged to build projects that must be almost entirely covered by government subsidies. Having a diversity of incomes within buildings allows for more flexible ways of meeting repayment terms, and it has wider social benefits. Research continues to find that upward mobility tends to reflect socio-economic proximity. Raj Chetty’s findings, including the Opportunity Atlas, show the importance of what he calls “cross-class interaction,” or interaction in childhood with people from different socio-economic groups.

Lesson 3. Continue pursuing co-operative housing policies, and set price controls to protect affordability.

Laws establishing tenants’ right to purchase their units have led to a substantial and comparatively affordable housing option in Denmark, where purchasing a stake in a co-op essentially represents a step in between renting and home ownership. Regulations on selling prices and tenant co-op management provide guardrails against market forces in cities like Copenhagen. These models, and their challenges in implementation, inform next steps for Bay Area cities, where jurisdictions such as San Francisco and San José have begun to make headway in furthering co-operative housing policies, such as the Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) and Tenancy In Common (TIC). However, the Bay Area can also enact price controls on subsidized nonprofit co-ops that can be structured and regulated between ownership transitions. This would solve for the patterns of exclusion in the current Danish co-op housing model, where tenants often sell their unit to a friend or other well-connected buyer.

Lesson. 4 Consider other income policies that complement affordable housing.

Denmark’s national housing policies have led to a social housing system that is not income restricted, and the country has the benefit of over a century of implementing equitable housing construction and management. But the system’s success is also in part due to a nation-wide network of safety nets that provide for broader social benefits. Denmark’s welfare state policies provide free universal access to healthcare, sick leave, education, transportation and unemployment benefits. In fact, university students are paid to attend school. Additionally, Denmark’s labor market model operates under a system where pay and working conditions are established by collective-bargaining agreements between trade unions and employer organizations. As a result, (except for a few emerging labor markets) much of the country’s workers earn livable wages. Denmark’s income policies contribute to a housing system where fewer people need additional income support and subsidies because they already have access to a wide spectrum of social benefits. Income policies matter when developing and enacting housing policy.

Conclusion

Copenhagen’s and Denmark’s approaches to housing policy, while not perfect, have benefited from political leaders’ ability to course-correct and inform decision-making by looking at data. More importantly, broad political consensus and compromise have allowed Denmark to sustain housing models that can inspire the Bay Area. In a region faced with an extensive housing affordability crisis, we hope that local leaders and communities will be inspired by what could be possible and take action for transformational change.