

City of St. Petersburg
Housing Services Committee
December 15, 2016
2:00 P.M.
Conference Room 100/City Hall

Mission Statement: *To effectively address the on-going need for affordable livable rental and owner-occupied housing units within the city (by proposing legislation, developing clear-cut policies, supporting proven strategies and providing for the implementation of best practices).*

- **Call to Order and Roll Call**
- **Approval of Agenda and Additions/Deletions**
- **Approval of Minutes of November 21, 2016 meeting**

New Business:

1. Referral to the Housing Services Committee, G-5 – Infill Multi-Units within Traditional Neighborhoods, Committee Chair Nurse
 2. Referral to the Housing Services Committee, G-6 – Rezoning to Allow Multi-Family Housing, Committee Chair Nurse
 3. Referral to the Housing Services Committee, G-7 – Inclusionary Zoning, Committee Chair Nurse
 4. Referral to the Housing Services Committee, G-8 – Minimum Lot Size, Committee Chair Nurse
 5. Modification to previous loan approved for the Preserves at Clam Bayou Apartments (Res: 2016-264), Stephanie Lampe, Sr. Housing Development Coordinator
- Follow-up (information only):

Provide a copy of the status of multi-family projects that are scheduled for, or are under development/redevelopment.

Provide a copy of the status of NSP projects.

Provide a spreadsheet of past year's housing accomplishments and current status.

Provide a copy of Con Plan Actual to Budget

Provide copy of Vacant and Boarded Properties.

Adjourn

Committee Members

Karl Nurse, Committee Chair

Charlie Gerdes, Council Member

Darden Rice, Committee Vice-Chair

Lisa Wheeler-Bowman, Council Member

Ed Montanari, Council Member

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
HOUSING SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
November 21, 2016 @ 9:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Chair Karl Nurse, Vice-Chair Darden Rice, Charlie Gerdes, Ed Montanari, Lisa Wheeler-Bowman, James Kennedy, Amy Foster

ALSO PRESENT: Neighborhood Affairs Administrator Mike Dove, Housing and Community Development Director Joshua Johnson, Senior Housing Development Coordinator Stephanie Lampe, St. Petersburg Housing Authority Tony Love, St. Petersburg Housing Authority Attorney Sandy McClinton, Assistant City Attorney Brett Pettigrew, Assistant City Attorney Macall Dyer, Assistant City Attorney Rick Badgley, Assistant to the City Clerk Cortney Phillips

ABSENT: None.

Chair Nurse opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. and began with a roll call. Vice-Chair Rice moved for approval of the agenda. All were in favor of the motion with Councilmember Gerdes being absent. Vice-Chair Rice moved for the approval of the September 22 and October 27, 2016 minutes. All were in favor of the motion, with Councilmember Gerdes being absent.

Councilmember Gerdes in attendance at 9:04 a.m.

In connection with the new business regarding a draft Agreement between the City and the St. Petersburg Housing Authority (SPHA) in reference to Jordan Park, Brett Pettigrew discussed the Termination Agreement which cancels the current Agreement with the City for the funding that was allocated to Jordan Park from CDBG funding, and the Operation Agreement which includes how the facilities will be maintained and brought into compliance through 2031. He discussed that the Agreement was approved by Attorneys for SPHA and the City. In the draft Agreement the rights of tenants was included and the prohibition of retaliation from management. Details included: renovation of the development, codes compliance ability to inspect, issue logs, and annual audits of the development, among others. The St. Petersburg Housing Authority (SPHA) would like to manage Jordan Park after it is acquired.

SPHA may place ownership of Jordan Park into a subsidiary agency (one that does not currently exist) rather than taking direct ownership. The subsidiary will be controlled by SPHA. The developer and SPHA are both agreeable to this agreement, if it is approved today by the Housing Services Committee, which will be presented to Full Council on December 1, 2016.

Mr. Pettigrew discussed that the Management Agreement independently is not subject to public records, but becomes subject to public records with the inclusion of Appendix A to the Agreement. He discussed Article 3, which discuss the potential of a subsidiary that would take control of Jordan Park which has to be subject to the approval of SPHA and the City of St. Petersburg. The City will still have access to records.

Vice-Chair Rice asked about the challenges that the Richman Group and Landex encountered as the tax credits expired, and how will SPHA maintain the Property. Mr. Tony Love, Executive Director of SPHA responded that subsidies remain. He discussed that SPHA has the ability to utilize its own

Housing Services Committee Report
November 21, 2016

maintenance staff. There is an affordability reserve fund that currently exists, and will be used to make repairs. If the development continues to be 100% affordable housing, funding will be available from HUD. He also discussed that another source of funding would be proceeds from the sale of the museum to the City.

Questions were asked in reference to short term repairs, long term repairs, incorporating tenant obligations in the current lease by an addendum, a provision of assignment at the end of the Agreement which discuss the Mayor and City Council as having final approval.

Councilmember Gerdes asked has SPHA refined its wish list from the \$12-\$12 million to the now \$9.5 million. Mr. Love responded that the immediate needs are for \$2 million to make the necessary improvements. He discussed that future needs may be \$9 million plus an additional \$7 million, but that SPHA does not currently own the development.

Councilmember Kennedy asked what input has residents of Jordan Park had in the development of the Agreement. Mr. Pettigrew responded that to his knowledge residents have not been involved. Mr. Love responded that the charge from the City was to have attorneys from the City and SPHA work on an Agreement. Sandy McClinton, Attorney for SPHA responded that she is not aware of any meeting held with tenants.

Councilmember Kennedy discussed that he is concerned with a \$6 million and \$7 million of future improvements without a list that provides a scope of work that has to be conducted. Ms. McClinton responded that SPHA cannot get in and determine all maintenance needed until acquisition of the property, after which an inventory of all needs can be conducted. She is comfortable with providing repairs that will be conducted with \$2 million currently on hand.

Councilmember Kennedy does not feel the City has the ability to enforce the Agreement without a list of the scope of work of the substantial improvements to be conducted. Ms. McClinton discussed that the interest today is to move forward to close the loan. SPHA will come back and show the City its plans for conducting substantial renovations moving forward 12-18 months. Mr. Love discussed that an estimate of the costs will be \$9.5 million and include roofs, doors, water closets, interior walls, in 12-18 months.

Councilmember Gerdes asked Mike Dove, Neighborhood Affairs Administrator to ensure that in 45 days for the Codes Compliance Assistance Director to get his complete list to SPHA, have a meeting with residents to discuss the renovation plan, after which it will be brought back to Housing Services for recommendation for approval. Mr. Dove responded that SPHA has resolved the short list with approximately two items that remains and needs to be addressed.

Mr. Love responded that SPHA will meet with residents after it takes ownership and will maintain Jordan Park and make it a desirable place to live. Chair Nurse asked Mr. Love provide a list of work to be done as an attachment to the Council document.

Councilmember Gerdes moved that the agreements be brought to full Council on December 1, 2016. Ayes: Gerdes, Nurse, Rice, Wheeler-Bowman. Nays: Montanari. Motion passed.

In connection with new business, Stephanie Lampe began discussion regarding affordable housing projects submitted by developers of multi-family low income housing tax credits developments. Ms. Lampe discussed that the request submitted will be brought before Full Council on December 1, 2016 for approval. This year we only had one developer to submit an application and Administration is requesting a minimum

Housing Services Committee Report
November 21, 2016

contribution. The process was changed this year to allow a priority project, which allows funding of \$607,000 for a project.

The project that Administration will submit for funding is not a priority project, she believes that a priority project will be submitted by Pinellas County, and if that project is not approved, the City's project may be designated for funding. The request for assistance was \$90,000 but when discounting the assistance by 5 percentage points, it results in a loan of approximately \$75,000.

A question was asked to describe a priority project. Ms. Lampe discussed that a local entity would have to fund a project with \$607,000. The aim is to scatter the development and not have all of them located within close proximity to each other. It takes into account 2 Factor and 3 Factor areas that includes low income and minority concentrated areas. The development will still have to meet state requirements of being in close proximity to a grocery store, hospital, public transportation, etc.

Councilmember Gerdes moved that the item be presented to full Council for approval on December 15, 2016. All were in favor of the motion.

The next meeting to be held on December 22, 2016 beginning at 10:30 a.m.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

COUNCIL AGENDA NEW BUSINESS ITEM

TO: **Members of City Council**

DATE: **November 28, 2016**

COUNCIL DATE: **December 1, 2016**

RE: ***Infill Multi- Units within Traditional Neighborhoods***

ACTION DESIRED:

Respectfully requesting a referral to the Housing Services Committee for discussion.

RATIONALE:

The older neighborhoods in St. Petersburg included several housing styles beyond single family homes including small apartment buildings, duplexes and houses with garage apartments. The result was a spectrum of housing costs and styles. The City outlawed most of these in the seventies. Allowing "accessory dwelling units" or garage apartments again has only resulted in the construction of a dozen or so in 10 years. Banks sharply discount the potential rental income available from the construction of a garage apartment while including the additional construction or purchasing cost. The effect of this bank policy is to make it much more difficult to finance the purchasing of a house with a garage apartment which obviously discourages their construction.

Suggested possible solutions: consider under what conditions we should allow infill duplexes, narrow townhouses, and small apartment buildings within traditional neighborhoods. Require a portion of these be either affordable or workforce housing.

Karl Nurse
Council Member

COUNCIL AGENDA NEW BUSINESS ITEM

TO: **Members of City Council**

DATE: **November 28, 2016**

COUNCIL DATE: **December 1, 2016**

RE: ***Rezoning to Allow Multifamily Housing***

ACTION DESIRED:

Respectfully requesting a referral to the Housing Services Committee for discussion.

RATIONALE:

There have been approximately 900 houses built in St Petersburg in the last decade at an average price of \$450,000 and an average size of 2,900 square feet. The market is not building housing for the large majority of our needs. There are several major streets in St. Petersburg that have good transit service, older functionally obsolete housing and present an opportunity to combine multiple progressive housing strategies.

Suggested possible housing strategies: allow rezoning along some major streets to multi-family units with the following conditions:

- Reduce the parking requirements for affordable housing units if within 3 blocks of a transit stop with at least 30 minute service.
- Require that a portion of the housing units meet the "affordable housing" definition and an additional portion meet workforce housing (150% of median) criteria.
- Establish regulations for both rental and for sale units to encourage continued affordability.

Karl Nurse
Council Member

COUNCIL AGENDA NEW BUSINESS ITEM

TO: **Members of City Council**

DATE: **November 28, 2016**

COUNCIL DATE: **December 1, 2016**

RE: ***Inclusionary Zoning***

ACTION DESIRED:

Respectfully requesting a referral to the Housing Services Committee for consideration as part of a package of housing proposals.

RATIONALE:

Inclusionary zoning is a strategy used in over 300 communities across the country to encourage and/or require the construction of affordable housing. The research suggests that flexible choices such as opting out by paying a fee toward an affordable housing fund, combined with incentives such as density bonuses, use of affordable housing funds, relaxed parking requirements and transit oriented development regulations have a larger impact than simply mandatory requirements. St. Petersburg, being a land locked community with few large tracts of land available for development, has for the last decade built almost exclusively for the most affluent market. Therefore, an inclusionary zoning program in St. Petersburg may need to be aimed more broadly at both the traditional affordable housing market and a broader moderate-middle income market.

The collection of a fee for the construction of exclusively luxury housing may be a viable option in lieu of a requirement to construct more diverse housing. It could be used to subsidize the construction of affordable housing in mixed income projects. Affordable housing will not be built in any volume without a subsidy. Middle class housing construction in volume will likely require the use of incentives as well.

Attached is an article on Alachua County's consideration of an inclusionary zoning ordinance. While they are not land locked, a number of the issues are similar.

<http://meetingdocs.alachuacounty.us/documents/bocc/agendas/2009-03-24/c3099aac-6e26-436a-be76-c0697d40fd87.pdf>

Karl Nurse
Council Member

COUNCIL AGENDA NEW BUSINESS ITEM

TO: **Members of City Council**

DATE: **November 28, 2016**

COUNCIL DATE: **December 1, 2016**

RE: ***Minimum Lot Size***

ACTION DESIRED:

Respectfully requesting a referral to the Housing Services Committee for discussion.

RATIONALE:

The minimum size buildable lot, according to the LDR's in Neighborhood Traditional zoning neighborhoods is 5,800 square feet. A large percentage of the lots, with and without houses on them, in many of these neighborhoods are 4,200 - 5,500 square feet. If a person is considering buying a lot in these neighborhoods that is under 5,800 square feet, they are running both a risk that a variance will not be approved to build on the lot and certainly an additional 2-6 weeks and an additional fee (\$300?) to request a variance to be allowed to build on the lot. It also creates uncertainty if the existing house on the lot is in such bad shape that it makes more sense to tear it down and replace it with new construction. Many of these lots are the same size as a significant number of lots, with or without houses, on the same block and therefore would be in keeping with the neighborhood.

Suggested possible solution: Grant, by right or permission to build on undersized lots if they are at least as large as 35% of the lots on the block. This information is readily available on line from the Pinellas county property appraiser's office.

Karl Nurse
Council Member

**Alachua County Department of Growth Management
Update on Inclusionary Housing**

I. Introduction/Description of Inclusionary Housing

“Inclusionary housing policies promote the production of affordable housing in a local jurisdiction either by requiring that all new housing developments include a percentage of affordable units or by providing incentives to developers for voluntary inclusion of affordable units.” (Anne Ray, June 2001)

There are generally two objectives of inclusionary housing policies:

- Increase the supply of affordable housing; and,
- Disperse affordable housing units throughout the community in order to avoid concentration of low-income housing units.

The key to producing a feasible inclusionary housing policy requires a balance between these objectives, which can sometimes conflict with each other.

According to a recent article in the *Florida Bar Journal*:

In Florida, the state legislature has authorized cities and counties to adopt inclusionary zoning measures in the land development codes. In 2001, the Florida Legislature enacted legislation stating that municipalities and counties “may adopt and maintain in effect any law, ordinance, rule, or other measure that is adopted for the purpose of increasing the supply of affordable housing using land use mechanisms such as inclusionary housing ordinances.” (Section 125.01055, Florida Statutes, 2005)

Under the foregoing legislative framework, local governments in Florida may examine a number of affordable housing strategies. As suggested by the legislature, a local government may attempt to establish an inclusionary zoning program. The local government must decide, however, whether the program should be made voluntary or mandatory.

Under a voluntary program, a local government would encourage affordable housing by offering various incentives to the developer in exchange for either providing affordable housing as part of the new development or paying a fee in lieu of providing any inclusionary units. Incentives could include any combination of density bonuses, impact fee waivers, expedited permitting, or more flexible development standards (e.g., less strenuous setback requirements).

Under a more aggressive mandatory program, local governments would require new development either to set aside a specified number of residential units to be sold as affordable housing units, or pay a fee in lieu of providing units. Mandatory programs sometimes provide a density bonus to the developer, and, in some instances, the developer may be allowed to provide offsite inclusionary units. A local government could also decide to impose

mandatory linkage fees on all new development instead of allowing the option to provide inclusionary units and then use the revenues raised to construct affordable units on its own. In any event, a mandatory program leaves the developer with no choice as to whether an affordable housing element will be part of the project.¹

As noted in Chapter VIII of the 2007 Department of Community Affairs Affordable Housing Report, there are pros and cons to inclusionary housing programs. Among the “pros” are its potential to create economically diverse communities at little or no direct cost to local governments; reduction in the potential for enclaves of affordable housing units; and benefits to employers in areas lacking housing affordable to low and moderate income workforces. Some of the “cons” include potential increases of costs of providing affordable housing being passed on by developers to purchasers of market rate housing in new developments; and a heavy reliance on the market and market forces so that it may work when there is a strong economy but not work when the economy falters.

The Florida Housing Coalition in its article “Inclusionary Housing – A Challenge Worth Taking”, notes the potential for legal challenges to inclusionary housing ordinances but states that such ordinances “will withstand legal challenge provided they are well crafted...include[ing] developer incentives to offset potential financial burden, and the opportunity to obtain a waiver...”.

In May 2003, the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) received a presentation on the just completed Alachua County Affordable Housing Study, which can be viewed at: http://growth-management.alachuacounty.us/housing/housing_docs/Alachua%20County%20Affordable%20Housing%20Study.pdf. Three options to establish an inclusionary zoning policy were presented:

- **Incentive-based inclusionary housing;**
- **Inclusionary housing for planned developments;**
- **Mandatory inclusionary housing for all new residential developments.**

¹ Marshall and Rothenberg, “An Analysis of Affordable/Work-Force Housing Initiatives and Their Legality in the State of Florida, Part I”, *Florida Bar Journal*, June 2008; Part II, *Florida Bar Journal*, July/August 2008. This article reviews inclusionary housing strategies relative to the Florida and US Supreme Court case law on takings, development exactions and the “rational nexus” test for impact fee regulations, and notes questions about whether mandatory inclusionary housing programs would withstand the requirements under this case law, i.e. generally for regulations involving these issues to meet legal requirements there has to be a clear factual connection between government imposition of a condition on a development approval, and the condition would either prevent or remedy a harm to a legitimate public purpose that would result from the development in the absence of the condition, and/or help to address a public need that would be created by the development. In the instance of mandatory inclusionary housing, the questions raised by the article include “how or whether new (residential) development itself actually (adversely) affects the supply of affordable housing”, and whether “a mandatory affordable housing impact fee or exaction...could ...be tailored to benefit ... the developer or the new residents of the project” or development that would bear the costs of providing for affordable housing as a condition of approval.”

In November 2003, staff presented the Affordable Housing Study Addendum (which can be viewed at [http://growth-management.alachua.fl.us/housing/housing_docs/AC Affordable Housing Addendum.PDF](http://growth-management.alachua.fl.us/housing/housing_docs/AC_Affordable_Housing_Addendum.PDF)). The BoCC accepted the Addendum and directed staff to prepare an ordinance that creates an incentive-based inclusionary housing program. This was implemented through subsequent revisions incorporated in the land development regulations. These changes to the land development regulations are summarized in Section VII of this report. These revisions included things such as: density based residential zoning districts eliminating minimum lot sizes in most cases; mixed housing types in residential zoning districts; provision for accessory dwelling units; and allowance for concurrency reservations for developments with specific percentages of units meeting criteria for affordable housing.

Other process and program-based incentives include expedited permitting for affordable housing projects, an Impact Fee Assistance Program for affordable housing (as of April 2008, 30 homebuyers had been assisted), and the waiver of development review application fees for non-profit organizations developing affordable housing. Staff was later directed to coordinate with the Alachua County Housing Finance Authority to develop incentive-based inclusionary policies for the Multi-Family Mortgage Revenue Bond Program and the Single Family Mortgage Revenue Bond Program.

II. Basic Components of a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Program

- Countywide or specific areas – Designate specific areas, based on certain criteria, where the ordinance would require affordable housing to be built or would require affordable housing to be built Countywide.
 - Specific areas application would locate affordable housing where it is most needed.
 - Countywide ensures that the same requirements apply to all unincorporated areas in the County.
- Development threshold – Establish a minimum residential development size requirement. Any development below that threshold would be exempted from building affordable housing units, and any residential development exceeding that threshold would be required to set-aside a certain percentage of housing units for low and moderate income households. Development thresholds vary from as low as five units to the more common 50 units and up to 100 units.
- Percentage of units to set-aside – Establish a percentage of the total housing units built in a market rate development that must be built to house low to moderate income households.

- Target income levels to receive housing units – Establish criteria for the income levels that are eligible for the set-aside housing units.
- Incentives to compensate developers of affordable housing – Used to compensate developers of affordable housing and to induce the production of affordable housing units. (Used in both mandatory and voluntary programs.)
- Control Period – Establish a period of time that housing units must remain affordable to renter and owner households.
- Comparable design standards - Used to ensure that the affordable housing units' exteriors are compatible with market rate housing units.
- Mitigation options – Establish procedures to allow a developer to forego developing affordable housing units. Procedures may require the developer to pay a fee, donate land, or build affordable housing units at another location in same geographic area as other development.
- Housing Trust Fund - A housing trust fund is the depository for in-lieu payments, and a mechanism for using those dollars to provide affordable housing within the community.
- Administrative Considerations – Any inclusionary program is likely to require additional staff to monitor compliance and manage a housing trust fund if alternative methods of compliance are offered.

Intergovernmental coordination in the establishment of such a program is important as well, as recommended by Anne Ray, the County's consultant, in her June 2001 report. In the report, she recommends the following:

If the County implements a mandatory inclusionary housing policy, it should negotiate with surrounding communities, particularly Gainesville, to create a similar set of regulations for their jurisdictions. Otherwise, mandates will be easily escapable through development elsewhere and annexation.²

III. Socioeconomic Factors

There are some key factors that typically precede a community's decision to adopt a mandatory inclusionary housing policy:

- Rapidly growing population;
- Inability of employers to obtain employees due to housing;

² *Inclusionary Housing: A Discussion of Policy Issues*, Anne Ray, June 2001.

- Rapidly growing house prices; and,
- Dwindling supply of existing affordable housing stock.

“The ideal community for an inclusionary housing policy is one in which developers compete to build and where new housing is assured to sell quickly. If such a community establishes a mandatory inclusionary zoning policy, developers will be more likely to build despite the mandates because the profit potential will remain significant. Incentive programs also are more effective in communities where market-rate units are high-priced and in high demand than in other communities, because incentives such as increased density and expedited permitting will allow developers to build more of these lucrative units more quickly.” (Anne Ray, June 2001)

IV. Buying Power of Extremely Low, Very Low, Low and Moderate Income Households

The table below provides information on the number of homes for sale that are affordable to moderate, low, very low and extremely low-income households. The low percentage of homes available for sale that are affordable to lower-income households indicates a need for more affordable housing. Inclusionary housing programs that are successful in generating affordable housing units for a range of low-income households typically must depend on federal, state and local subsidies. Most mandatory inclusionary housing programs focus on the low to moderate income ranges. There is an existing supply of houses affordable to households in that range.

Homes for Sale: Affordable to Lower-Income Households September 2008				
Percent of Area Median Income (AMI) (Family of Four)	Household Income	Buying Power	Homes Available	% of All Homes for Sale
100 % (Moderate)	\$56,625	\$169,900	333	21%
80% (Low)	\$45,300	\$135,900	163	10%
50% (Very Low)	\$28,300	\$84,900	38	2%
30% (Extremely Low)	\$17,000	\$51,000	9	0.5%

Source: Gainesville-Alachua County Association of Realtors (Sales Figures)

V. Potential Gap for Each Income Category to Purchase Market Housing

An indicator of the need for affordable housing is the gap between buying power and median sales price for an area.³ The buying power for moderate income households in Alachua County in 2008 was \$169,900; the median sales price in Alachua County for that year was \$187,800. The resulting gap

³ Buying power is approximately three times the amount of a family’s income, the amount a private lender will usually allow as a mortgage.

was \$17,925; that gap has been as high as \$54,800 in 2006, up from \$30,350 for 2005.⁴ Households in the extremely low, very low, and low income ranges experience an even greater gap.

VI. Evaluation of the Need & Demand for Inclusionary Housing in Alachua County

Indicators of the need for affordable housing include the number of households spending more than 30% of their income on housing; these households are considered “cost burdened” and households spending more than 50% of their income on housing are considered “severely cost burdened”. The following tables provide data on the extent to which both low-income renters and homeowners were severely cost burdened in Alachua County in 2005.

Alachua County: Number of Severely Cost-burdened Low Income Renters (Adjusted by eliminating 15-24 year old households that are severely cost-burdened and earning <20% Area Median Income)	
Household Income (As % of AMI)	2005
Less than 30% AMI	4,279 (58%)
30% - 50% AMI	2,562 (35%)
50% - 80% AMI	561 (7%)
Total	7,402 (100%)

Source: Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse

Alachua County: Number of Severely Cost-burdened Low Income Owner Households	
Household Income (As % of AMI)	2005
Less than 30% AMI	2,201 (56%)
30% - 50% AMI	1,210 (31%)
50% - 80% AMI	502 (13%)
Total	3,913 (100%)

Source: Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse

The 2003 Affordable Housing Study estimated an 8% growth in the overall number of cost-burdened (spending more than 30% of their income on housing) households from 2002 to 2010, from 18,602 to 20,109, respectively.⁵

⁴ Data from the Florida Housing Finance Corporation’s 2005 & 2006 Community Workforce Housing Innovation Pilot Program Gap Chart.

⁵ The Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing provided the numbers for the Alachua County Affordable Housing Study.

As noted in the June 2001 consultant report⁶, any inclusionary housing program should be calibrated to the community's demand for the required units as well as the ability of those lower-income households to afford those units. For example, in Alachua County, based on the tables above, the largest portion – approximately 6,500 households – of severely cost-burdened households (spending more than 50% of their income on housing) are in the below poverty income level (less than 30% of Area Median Income; less than \$17,000/year for family of four).⁷ Targeting an inclusionary housing program to that income level would require home prices of less than \$51,000. Given the fact that the cost to produce housing at that price level is not feasible, any inclusionary program targeted at that income level would need to include financial assistance to home-buyers.

VII. Summary of Land Development Regulation Changes Intended to Encourage Affordable Housing

The Unified Land Development Code (ULDC) implemented density based zoning districts that allow for flexible lot sizes and better use of densities allowed within land use categories. The revised ULDC has a provision to allow mixed unit types by right in residential zoning districts, allowing for more density and a greater range of unit prices. This provides opportunities to include affordable housing units in market rate developments. Since the ULDC change has taken effect (2006), density of new development in the Urban Cluster has averaged 2.59 dwelling units per acre, up from 2.31 dwelling units per acre.

The BoCC adopted comprehensive language in the ULDC that removed barriers to the development of affordable housing such as minimum lot size, rigid setback requirements, as well as restrictions on unit types allowed in different residential zoning districts. Changes were made to the residential districts that promote more density by allowing flexible lot sizes and improved utilization of densities, accessory dwelling units, and a greater range of housing types and unit prices.

Accessory dwelling units are now allowed by right in all residential zoning districts. While there is no guarantee that accessory dwelling units will be affordable, this creates an opportunity for affordable rental units to be included within market rate single family developments. Accessory dwellings can be an excellent way to provide affordable homes for family members or caretakers and can also provide opportunities to expand the supply of rental homes while generating income for homeowners.

⁶ *Inclusionary Housing: A Discussion of Policy Issues*, Anne Ray, June 2001.

⁷ For illustration purposes, data sets from two different time periods are utilized in combination.

The revised ULDC has two more provisions that equate to tangible incentives for developers to include affordable housing units in their developments. First, developers are allowed to increase the number of attached units allowed from four to eight units for Affordable Housing Developments⁸. A second provision allows Affordable Housing Developments to reserve long-term traffic concurrency without having to utilize the Planned Development (PD) process. The reservation of traffic concurrency is a critical element of the development approval process as traffic capacity on many major County roads is limited. The incentive of offering long term concurrency reservations with a development plan approval for an affordable housing project allows for long term multi-phase projects without the additional effort, time and costs required to pursue a PD zoning approval.

VIII. Comparison of Incentives

The table below provides a summary of affordable housing incentives already allowed in Alachua County’s land development regulations.

Incentives	Allowed by Right (in Alachua County)	Available through Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Policy
Density Bonus	√	√
Mix of Unit Types	√	√
Expedited Permitting	√	√
Flexible Lot Sizes	√	√
Accessory Dwelling Units	√	√

IX. The Tallahassee Experience – Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Policy

“The Tallahassee City Commission passed an ordinance in 2005, requiring new developments in certain areas of the city with 50 housing units or more, to sell 10% of their units at an affordable price. The sales price range is set by the ordinance. Developers are allowed to pay a fee instead of building the units. The money collected will then be used to build future affordable housing units.

To qualify for inclusionary housing units, your income must fall between 70% and 100% of area median income. This range is determined by the HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) income guidelines for 2008:

⁸ In an affordable housing development, at least 50% of the units meet the definition for affordable housing for low-income households, or at least 20% of the units meet the definition for affordable housing for very low-income households (Chapter 410, Article 3, ULDC).

- 1 person household: annual income between \$30,450 and \$43,500
- 2 person household: annual income between \$34,790 and \$49,700
- 3 person household: annual income between \$39,130 and \$55,900
- 4 person household: annual income between \$43,470 and \$62,100
- 5 person household: annual income between \$46,970 and \$67,100
- 6 person household: annual income between \$50,400 and \$72,000
- 7 person household: annual income between \$53,900 and \$77,000
- 8 person household: annual income between \$57,400 and \$82,000

Households must qualify for a home mortgage loan. A household that makes less annual income than the range above may still qualify for an inclusionary housing unit if they can secure a sufficient home mortgage loan. Inclusionary housing units are subject to re-sale restrictions.”

(Source: www.talgov.com/ecd/housing/programs.cfm)

Based on information from Ellen May (City of Tallahassee Housing Division), no new developments in the City of Tallahassee have met the criteria in the ordinance requiring inclusionary units. There was a legal challenge filed by the Florida Home Builders Association asserting that the City’s ordinance constituted a taking of property on its face. Since the subsequent Circuit Court ruling in favor of the City of Tallahassee in November 2007, there have not been any active eligible developments – largely due to the downturn in the economy and its effect on new housing construction; therefore the policy has not yielded any affordable housing units.

The attached Florida Department of Community Affairs report, *2007 Affordable Housing Report Chapter VIII*, provides information on the four local governments in Florida that have adopted inclusionary zoning ordinances – Coral Springs, Groveland, Monroe County and Tallahassee.

X. Financial & Staff Resources Required to Manage Program

Additional staff resources will be necessary to develop, implement and monitor a mandatory inclusionary housing program. As stated in a consultant’s report to Alachua County, “the County should ensure that adequate staff resources are devoted to the long-term implementation and monitoring required for a successful inclusionary housing policy. The County can maximize the policy’s chances for success by devoting significant staff time for negotiating inclusionary housing agreements with developers; certifying incomes, rents, and housing prices associated with new affordable units; planning for the use of the housing trust fund generated by fees in lieu of participation; and administering the trust fund and other financial incentives.” (Anne Ray, June 2001)

XI. Summary

- **Land Development Trends**

The land development regulation changes adopted by the BoCC following approval of the Alachua County Affordable Housing Study Addendum (which can be viewed at http://growth-management.alachua.fl.us/housing/housing_docs/AC_Affordable_Housing_Addendum.PDF) were effective in January 2006. Given the short period of time that has passed and the lag time of properties that were already in the process of being approved and developed, it is early to measure the overall changes in land development trends that are a result of these ULDC changes. However, there have been incremental increases in housing densities in the RE-1 zoning category. The extent to which updates to the ULDC have impacted affordable housing will be better understood once more properties have been developed under the new requirements.

- **Impact of Transportation Costs on Affordable Housing**

“There is a growing body of research that suggests housing costs should be looked at in combination with transportation costs. As housing in urban areas becomes less affordable, residents will often locate further from their jobs in outlying communities where the housing is less expensive. However, the tradeoff in this situation is that the commuting homeowner ends up spending far more in transportation costs, particularly as fuel costs continue to rise. A 2006 report by the Center for Housing Policy⁹ states that nationally, for every dollar saved on housing, an additional 77 cents is paid for transportation. The study also found that working families in the 28 metropolitan areas studied spent on average 57% of their income on combined housing and transportation costs, with approximately 28% spent on housing and 27% on transportation. This and other studies suggest it is imperative to consider housing and transportation costs together, and encourage the development of more affordable housing in areas with multiple transportation alternatives and direct access to employment centers.” (These issues are also discussed in more detail in the Evaluation & Appraisal Report issue paper dealing with Land Use and Transportation issues.)

- **Distribution of Affordable Housing in Alachua County**

While the 2003 Alachua County Affordable Housing Study showed that several Census Tracts in the urban cluster west of I-75 contained less than 50% housing units affordable to low-income households, other Census Tracts in and adjacent to that area had percentages of affordable units ranging from 68 to 100%. (See Appendix D, 2003 Alachua County Affordable Housing Study.)

- **Stakeholder Support**

⁹ Lipman, Barbara J., *A Heavy Load: The Combined Housing and Transportation Burdens on Working Families*, Center for Housing Policy, October 2006.

Community support for inclusionary housing is crucial to its success. Without the support of residents and developers, mandatory inclusionary housing will be difficult, at best, to implement. Where it has been adopted and implemented successfully, mandatory inclusionary housing has targeted expensive housing markets where there is interest in providing housing opportunity and economic balance.

XII. References

Alachua County Affordable Housing Study, May 2003.

Alachua County Affordable Housing Study Addendum, November 2003.

Alachua County Department of Growth Management Affordable Housing Update, April 2008.

Florida Department of Community Affairs, *2007 Affordable Housing Report*, December 2007.

Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse, Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, University of Florida.

Gainesville-Alachua County Association of Realtors.

Inclusionary Housing: A Discussion of Policy Issues, Anne Ray, June 2001.

Lipman, Barbara J. *A Heavy Load: The Combined Housing and Transportation Burdens on Working Families*. Center for Housing Policy. October, 2006.

Marshall, J. Michael and Rothenberg, Mark A., "An Analysis of Affordable/Work-Force Housing Initiatives and Their Legality in the State of Florida, Part I", *Florida Bar Journal*, June 2008, Volume 82, No.6.

Id. "An Analysis of Affordable/Work-Force Housing Initiatives and Their Legality in the State of Florida, Part II", *Florida Bar Journal*, July/August 2008, Volume 82, No. 7.

Ross, Jaimie, "Growing Smarter through Affordable Housing", 1000 Friends of Florida, *Foresight*, Fall 2000.

Ross, Jaimie and Outka, Uma, "Inclusionary Housing: A Challenge Worth Taking", *Housing News Network*, Florida Housing Coalition.

www.talgov.com/ecd/housing/programs.cfm



MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Karl Nurse, Chair, and Members of the Housing Services Committee

FROM: Joshua A. Johnson, Director, Housing and Community Development Department

DATE: Meeting of December 15, 2016

SUBJECT: Funding amendment for the Preserves at Clam Bayou Apartments by PAL, Inc.

EXPLANATION: On June 16, 2016 City Council adopted City Council Resolution No. 2016-264, authorizing the Mayor or his designee to negotiate and provide a 0% interest forgiven loan to Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc., a Florida not-for-profit corporation, a subsidiary of Boley Centers, Inc. (PAL, Inc.) in the amount of \$840,790 of HOME Investment Partnership funding for the development and construction of the first 8 units ("Phase 1") of the Preserves at Clam Bayou Apartments to be located at 4110 - 34th Avenue South.

On November 23, 2016, PAL, Inc. submitted a revised development funding request which indicated a need for \$125,000 in additional funding from the City and \$161,666.50 in additional funding from PAL, Inc., due to higher than anticipated bid results. PAL, Inc. has secured additional funding from the Bessie Boley Foundation. The Administration evaluated the funding request and agreed that the requested increase of HOME funding should be forwarded to the Housing Services Committee ("HSC") to request the approval of the HSC to forward the Resolution to the full City Council. If approved, construction could begin in early 2017.

Pinellas County has agreed to fund an additional 8 units and the office and laundry ("Phase 2") so that a total of 16 units may be constructed simultaneously. All of the proposed units will be affordable for households at or below 50% of the area median income. The site plan allows for a Phase 3 consisting of 8 additional units to be constructed, however funding has not yet been secured for Phase 3..

RECOMMENDATION:

Administration recommends that the Housing Services Committee ("HSC") authorize staff to convey the attached resolution amending City Council Resolution No. 2016-264 to increase the amount of the 0% interest forgiven loan authorized therein to Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc., for development and construction of Phase 1 of the Preserves at Clam Bayou Apartments to be located at 4110 34th Avenue South to \$965,790; providing that all other provisions of Resolution No. 2016-264 not amended herein shall remain in full force and effect; authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this transaction; and providing an effective date.

ATTACHMENT: Resolution 2016-_____
Original Resolution 2016-264

Resolution No. 2016-_____

A RESOLUTION AMENDING CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2016-264 TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF THE 0% INTEREST FORGIVEN LOAN AUTHORIZED THEREIN TO PINELLAS AFFORDABLE LIVING, INC., FOR DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF PHASE I OF THE PRESERVES AT CLAM BAYOU APARTMENTS TO BE LOCATED AT 4110 34TH AVENUE SOUTH TO \$965,790; PROVIDING THAT ALL OTHER PROVISIONS OF RESOLUTION NO. 2016-264 NOT AMENDED HEREIN SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS TRANSACTION; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City has established the need for additional affordable rental housing units as a priority in its 2016-2021 Consolidated Plan; and

WHEREAS, City Council has previously adopted Resolution No. 2016-264, authorizing the Mayor or his designee to negotiate and provide a 0% interest forgiven loan to Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc., a Florida not for profit corporation, a subsidiary of Boley Centers, Inc. ("PAL, Inc.") in the amount of \$840,790 for the proposed construction of the first 8 units of the Preserves at Clam Bayou Apartments ("Phase 1"), a rental apartment development to be located at 4110 34th Avenue South, subject to conditions set out in that resolution; and

WHEREAS, on November 23, 2016, PAL, Inc. submitted a revised development funding request which indicated a need for \$125,000 in additional funding from the City and \$161,666.50 in additional funding from PAL, Inc., due to higher than anticipated bid results; and

WHEREAS, the Administration evaluated the funding request and agreed that the requested increase of funding for Phase 1 should be forwarded to the Housing Services Committee; and

WHEREAS, the Administration will reduce the program income deposits in the Rehabilitation Loan program (Oracle 81144-14952) by \$125,000 and increase the HOME Investment Partnership ("HOME") Community Housing Development Organization Program Funding (Oracle 81144-14971) by the corresponding amount in order to revise the total PAL, Inc. loan request of \$965,790; and

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2016, the Housing Services Committee reviewed the request to increase the loan and recommended its approval to City Council; and

WHEREAS, all other provisions of Resolution No. 2016-264 not amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that City Council Resolution No. 2016-264 is hereby amended to increase the amount of the 0% interest forgiven loan authorized therein to Pinellas Affordable Housing, Inc., for development and construction of Phase I of the Preserves At Clam Bayou Apartments to be located at 4110 34th Avenue South to \$965,790; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all other provisions of Resolution No. 2016-264 not amended herein shall remain in full force and effect; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is authorized to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this transaction.

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

LEGAL:



City Attorney (Designee)

Legal: 00299699.doc v. 1

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:



Joshua Johnson, Director

NO. 2016-264

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO NEGOTIATE AND PROVIDE A 0% INTEREST FORGIVEN LOAN IN THE COMBINED TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$840,790 FROM THE HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP ("HOME") PROGRAM TO PINELLAS AFFORDABLE LIVING, INC. FOR DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF PHASE I OF THE PRESERVES AT CLAM BAYOU APARTMENTS TO BE LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 4110 34TH AVENUE SOUTH, SUBJECT TO CITY'S APPROVAL OF A HUD ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS RESOLUTION; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City has established the need for the production of additional affordable rental housing units as a priority in its 2011-2016 Consolidated Plan; and

WHEREAS, Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc. ("PAL, Inc.") was awarded \$230,000 in the form of a 0% interest forgiven loan by Resolution number 2015-354 as part of the 2015-2016 Consolidated Annual Action Plan application process; and

WHEREAS, the funding was awarded to assist PAL, Inc. to develop and construct a 25 unit one, two and three bedroom apartment complex which would be restricted as to rent and occupancy for households who are at or below 60% of the Area Median Income, and which would be named the Preserves at Clam Bayou Apartments to be located at approximately 4110 34th Avenue South ("Development"); and

WHEREAS, the Development was anticipated to cost a total of approximately \$4,567,553 and PAL, Inc. applied to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation ("FHFC") in December of 2015 under RFA 2015-109 for \$4,077,553 in SAIL and ELI funding; and

WHEREAS, PAL, Inc. was informed in January of 2016 that it would not be funded by FHFC under RFA 2015-109, since small counties were given priority funding for the submitted applications; and

WHEREAS, in order to commit and expend the 2015 funds in a more timely fashion, PAL, Inc. and Administration have proposed that the first 8 units and the required site infrastructure be constructed on the site for an estimated amount of \$1,175,790 while PAL, Inc. continues to pursue funding for the remaining phases; and

WHEREAS, on May 5, 2016 City Council approved Resolution number 2016-183 which recaptured \$241,701.68 in HOME Investment Partnership ("HOME) Community Housing Development Organization ("CHDO") funding from Homes for Independence, Inc. and awarded it to PAL, Inc. for phase I of the Development; and

WHEREAS, the Administration will provide an additional \$369,088.32 from the HOME Investment Partnership ("HOME)" Affordable Multi-family Rental Program (Oracle 81056-15264 and 81144-14970), and

WHEREAS, the remaining \$335,000 needed for completion of phase I of the Development will be provided using a combination of PAL, Inc. agency funding and the Pinellas County Affordable Housing Land Assembly Program through the Housing Finance Authority of Pinellas County; and

WHEREAS, The City's loan documents will provide that the combined total HOME loan amount of \$840,790 be forgiven at the end of a successful twenty year affordability period; and

WHEREAS, this approval to provide funds to the project is conditioned on the City's determination to proceed with, modify or cancel the project based on the results of a subsequent HUD environmental review.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that the Mayor or his Designee is authorized to negotiate and provide a 0% interest forgiven loan in the combined total amount of \$840,790 from the HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) Program to Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc. for the development and construction of phase I of the Preserves at Clam Bayou Apartments to be located at approximately 4110 34th Avenue South, subject to City's approval of a HUD Environmental Review; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is authorized to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this resolution.

This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Adopted at a regular session of the City Council held on the 16th day of June, 2016.



Amy Foster, Chair-Councilmember
Presiding Officer of the City Council

ATTEST:


Chan Srinivasa, City Clerk

HOMES FOR SALE

October 2016

NEW CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

	Address	Bed Rooms	Baths	Square Ft.	Lot Size	Sales Price	Builder
1	650 27th Avenue S.	4	2	1350	45x127	SOLD -\$79,800	New Millennial Homes
2	868 15th Avenue S. (pending to land trust)	3	2	1298	50x100	\$82,000	American Housing Corp.
3	1721 13th Avenue S.	3	2	1295	49x137	SOLD - \$80,000	American Housing Corp.
4	960 18th Avenue S.	3	2	1295	60x127	SOLD - \$80,000	American Housing Corp.
5	923 20th Avenue S.	3	2	1292	60x127	SOLD-\$81,000	American Housing Corp.
6	2037 12th Street S.	3	2	1292	54x90	SOLD - \$81,000	American Housing Corp.
7	1727 13th Avenue S.	3	2	1521	52x137	SOLD -\$90,000	Griffin Contracting, Inc.
8	1835 13th Avenue S.	3	2	1521	50x137	SOLD - \$90,000	Griffin Contracting, Inc.
9	1801 40th Street S.	3	2	1298	45x125	SOLD - \$82,000	American Housing Corp.
10	3901 12th Avenue S.	4	2	1298	43x120	SOLD - \$86,000	American Housing Corp.
11	1015 40th Street S.	3	2	1308	43x126	SOLD - \$82,000	American Housing Corp.
12	1919 Melrose Ave. S.	3	2	1521	57x136	SOLD -\$90,000	Griffin Contracting, Inc.
13	3482 16th Avenue S.	3	2	1521	50x121	SOLD - \$90,000	Griffin Contracting, Inc.
14	820 15th Avenue S.	3	2	1308	50x100	SOLD - \$82,000	American Housing Corporation
15	4101 14th Avenue S.	3	2	1308	60x125	SOLD - \$82,000	American Housing Corp.
16	840 13th Avenue S.	3	2	1292	50x108	SOLD - \$85,000	American Housing Builders, Inc
17	745 15th Avenue S.	3	2	1292	50x100	SOLD - \$82,000	American Housing Builders, Inc
18	1116 18th Avenue S.	3	2	1292	80x126	SOLD - \$85,000	American Housing Builders, Inc

REMODELED HOMES

	Address	Bed Rooms	Baths	Square Ft.	Lot Size	Sales Price
1	2909 Freemont Terr. S.	3	2	1239	42x90	SOLD - \$45,000
2	4053 18th Avenue S.	3	2	1166	50x127	SOLD - \$85,000
3	810 14th Avenue S.	3	2	1180	50x100	SOLD - \$65,000
4	4026 14th Avenue S.	2	1	1192	45x135	SOLD - \$65,000
5	4035 12th Avenue S.	3	2	1922	96x138	SOLD - \$85,000



HOME BUYER EDUCATION is a condition and a benefit of purchasing a **NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION PROGRAM (NSP)** home. A first-time home buyer is required to attend and receive a certificate of completion from an 8 hour HUD approved home-ownership class that will provide important information necessary to make informed decisions during the process of buying and managing a home. **SELECT ANY OF THE APPROVED TRAINERS LISTED BELOW AND BEGIN THE CLASSES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.**

HUD APPROVED HOUSING COUNSELING AGENCIES

Neighborhood Home Solutions (727) 821-6897 www.nhsfl.org

Tampa Bay Community Development Corporation (727) 442-7075 www.tampabaycdc.org

Catholic Charities (727) 893-1313 www.ccdosp.org

ClearPoint Credit Counseling (800) 750-2227 www.clearpointcreditcounselingsolutions.org

Bright Community Trust (727) 475-1366 www.brightcommunitytrust.org



FAMILY BUDGETING & FINANCIAL PLANNING CLASSES

Guidance, education and support is available to assist with building your credit, developing a spending plan and providing you the tools needed to achieve your goal of home ownership

*** PLEASE CONTACT A HOUSING COUNSELING AGENCY TODAY***

City of St. Petersburg
Housing and Community Development
FY 16/17 Consolidated Plan Budget to Actual
As of 31-Oct-2016

Funding Sources

Line No.	Approved Projects	Program Goals H-Housing P-Program L-Lease	Fiscal Year-01/16-02/16 Accomplishments	Total Budget	CDDB	HOME	ESG	SHIP	NSP1 med 3	CHTF	HCP	GEN FUND	Total Expended	Amount Remaining	Commitments/Order Contract	Total Funds Available to Commit
	Housing Programs															
1	1 Rehabilitation Assistance Program. SF_OO <120% MFI	4H-H		1,530,788.72		0.00		36,032.00					36,032.00	1,494,756.72	622,821.41	831,907.71
2	2 Emergency Repair Program. SF_OO <120% MFI (Sunstaring at category)			107,509.98				47,258.08					47,258.08	60,250.28	42,977.62	17,252.66
3	3B Senior Free Program/Special Needs Program. SF_OO <120% MFI	3H-H		225,998.98				12,107.20					12,107.20	213,891.78	59,193.96	154,695.83
4	4 Purchase Assistance (with or without minor repairs). SF_HH <120% MFI	4H-H		830,128.10		13,100.00		10,000.00					23,100.00	807,028.10	72,808.97	734,218.23
5	5 Rental Rehabilitation Program. MF <80% MFI			368,103.56	0.00			0.00					0.00	368,103.56	0.00	368,103.56
6	6 Rental Assistance <80% MFI/HH facing eviction. <50% MFI/HH with at least 1 adult who is a person with special needs or homeless HH	10-H		100,000.00				0.00					0.00	100,000.00	0.00	100,000.00
7	7 Multi-Family Housing Development Program			889,100.00		30.02		0.00					30.02	889,069.98	553,853.30	335,811.68
8	8 Single-Family New Construction to Assist Developers/Sponsors with Matching Funds	5-L		50,000.00				0.00					0.00	50,000.00	0.00	50,000.00
9	9 Single-Family Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation Assistance Loan to Single-Family Homeowners	5-H		50,000.00				0.00					0.00	50,000.00	0.00	50,000.00
10	10 Investment in the Improvement in Housing in the Southeast CRA			110,242.00				0.00			2,733.18		2,733.18	107,508.81	0.00	107,508.81
11	11 Construction Warranty Program. SF_OO <80% MFI			48,127.73				0.00			450.00		450.00	47,677.73	0.00	47,677.73
12	12 Homeownership Counseling/Foreclosure Prevention Counseling			338,200.00				0.00					0.00	338,200.00	0.00	338,200.00
13	13 Community Development Housing Organization (CHOD)/Bright Community Trust			471,701.68				0.00					0.00	471,701.68	471,701.68	0.00
14	14 Community Development Housing Organization (CHOD)/PAL			16,941.00				0.00					0.00	16,941.00	0.00	16,941.00
15	15 Lead Paint Abatement			29,338.38				0.00					0.00	29,338.38	0.00	29,338.38
16	16 Developer Recycling			15,184.08	0.00			0.00					0.00	15,184.08	0.00	15,184.08
17	17 Habitat for Humanity-Homeowner repair program (CDDB) and Acquisition of Property (HOME)	7H-CDBG 3H-HOME		1,518,078.33				0.00	871.58				871.58	1,517,206.75	181,328.87	1,335,708.38
18	18 NSP Program-Building, Reconstructing, Selling and Maintaining Low-Bank Properties												0.00			
19	19 Total Housing Programs			6,939,429.53	8.86	13,138.82	8.86	185,408.48	871.58	0.00	3,633.19	0.00	123,198.27	6,816,230.26	2,181,661.83	4,734,568.43
	Subsidiary Projects															
20	20 211 Tampa Bay Care - Referral Service	500-P		4,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	4,000.00	0.00	4,000.00
21	21 211 Tampa Bay Care - TBN			20,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
22	22 Safety Centers - Safe Haven	25-P		60,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	60,000.00	0.00	60,000.00
23	23 Safety Centers - TBRA	25-P		330,764.04	0.00			0.00					0.00	330,764.04	139,068.91	191,695.13
24	24 Brotherhood	123-P		45,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	45,000.00	0.00	45,000.00
25	25 Catholic Charities - Prudex HOPE	650-P		25,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	25,000.00	0.00	25,000.00
26	26 Catholic Charities - Rental Assistance	40-H		80,027.69				0.00					0.00	80,027.69	0.00	80,027.69
27	27 Community Action Steps Abuse (CASA)-Rehab	1500-P		113,801.10	21,211.88			0.00					21,211.88	92,589.22	92,589.22	0.00
28	28 Community Action Steps Abuse (CASA)-Operating	500-P		19,384.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	19,384.00	0.00	19,384.00
29	29 James B. Sabinien Family Services Center	204-P		50,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	50,000.00	0.00	50,000.00
30	30 Lucius Graham Regeneration Center	67-P		13,640.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	13,640.00	0.00	13,640.00
31	31 Gulfcoast Legal Services	48-H		33,946.90	0.00			0.00					0.00	33,946.90	33,946.90	0.00
32	32 Neighborhood Home Solutions (Counseling)	35-H		7,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	7,000.00	0.00	7,000.00
33	33 Neighborhood Home Solutions (HVAC)			12,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	12,000.00	0.00	12,000.00
34	34 New Frontiers	174-P		10,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00
35	35 Prudex Opportunity Council	14-H		10,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00
36	36 Prudex E.O. Offender Reentry Coalition (1)	150-P		151,400.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	151,400.00	151,400.00	0.00
37	37 Police Athletic League - 820 20th Street South (1)	40-P		90,000.00	0.00			0.00					0.00	90,000.00	90,000.00	0.00

Funding Sources

Line No.	Approved Projects	Program Goals & Performance Measures	Program Goals & Performance Measures	Special Year-to-Date Accomplishments	Total Budget	CRBG	HOME	ESG	HRP	NSP 1 and 3	CHTF	HRIP	GEN FUND	Total Expended	Amount Remaining	Commitment/Unltd Cash Bal	Total Funds Available to General
38	38 01 Vincent DePaul Shelter	728 P			87,000.00	0.00		0.00						0.00	87,000.00	0.00	87,000.00
39	39 01 Vincent DePaul Rental Assistance	9 H			28,380.00	0.00		0.00						0.00	28,380.00	0.00	28,380.00
40	40 01 Veterans - Transitional Housing	200 P			91,047.00	0.00		0.00						0.00	91,047.00	0.00	91,047.00
41	41 01 Veterans - Training Point	253 P			20,000.00	0.00		0.00						0.00	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
42	42 01 WPCA	20 H			20,000.00	0.00		0.00						0.00	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
43	43 01 FTSP Youth GSA Council (1)	370 P			250,000.00	0.00		0.00						0.00	250,000.00	0.00	250,000.00
44	44 01 Total Subtotal				1,552,409.73	21,211.88	8,800	0.00	0.00	0.00		8,800	8,800	21,211.88	1,531,197.85	777,153.82	777,153.82
45	45 01 Public Facility Improvement				40,000.00	0.00								0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
46	46 01 Total Public Facility Improvement				40,000.00	0.00								0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
47	47 01 Support Services				18,580.00	0.00								0.00	18,580.00	0.00	18,580.00
48	48 01 Administration				1,116,412.57	41,022.70	620.15	448.97	425.43	1,131.99		3,289.31	27,548.04	71,267.28	1,045,145.29	21,803.69	73,288.10
49	49 01 Legal Administration				88,551.14									0.00	88,551.14	0.00	88,551.14
50	50 01 TRBA Vendor Program Administration				25,200.00									0.00	25,200.00	0.00	25,200.00
51	51 01 Program Delivery Costs				397,540.50	201,837.81	1,540.59							22,378.40	345,162.10	345,162.10	345,162.10
52	52 01 Section 108 Loan Requirement				303,468.00	0.00								0.00	303,468.00	303,468.00	303,468.00
53	53 01 Total Support Services				1,829,769.28	61,939.51	2,160.74	448.97	425.43	1,131.99	0.00	3,289.31	27,548.04	96,645.68	1,832,123.60	1,706,977.17	195,146.43
54	54 01 Total All Approved Projects				10,481,877.52	83,142.36	15,298.78	448.97	195,298.91	2,103.57	0.00	8,972.59	27,548.04	241,327.14	10,240,550.38	4,539,234.03	5,611,316.35
55	55 01 Funding to be Reprogrammed																
56	56 01 Funding to be Reprogrammed				552,590.47	347,532.13			88,114.12		1,111,672.78	24,271.46		40,000.00	552,590.47		552,590.47
57	57 01 HUD (Program Ended) Funding at City				40,000.00	20,900.08								0.00	40,000.00	0.00	40,000.00
58	58 01 Total Funding to be Reprogrammed				619,498.55	374,432.21	0.00	0.00	88,114.12	0.00	1,111,672.78	64,271.46	0.00	0.00	619,498.55	0.00	619,498.55
59	59 01 Sources																
60	60 01 FY Grants / City Funds				2,862,513.90	1,000,833.00	675,395.00	142,779.00	1,822,035.00		25,000.00	412,518.00					
61	61 01 Carry Forward Funds from Previous FY				6,404,245.98	1,989,741.01	1,086,207.12	31,520.85	1,543,342.88	1,487,985.98	111,569.75	339,783.33					
62	62 01 Fiscal Year Program Income-Housing				184,867.81	31,308.40	14,074.59		55,007.65	81,859.12	73.01	1,864.24					
63	63 01 Fee HUD-Admin be used for Low Mod Housing				28,900.08	28,900.08											
64	64 01 Total Sources				11,481,488.87	2,833,648.55	2,375,782.71	174,299.85	3,228,888.53	1,579,844.10	111,672.78	346,872.57	412,518.00				
65	65 01 Total Funding by Approved Source Reallocating				0.00	27,776,718	2,299,475.81	173,450.88	3,121,052.93	1,577,747.63	111,672.78	346,872.57	384,967.86				

Note:
(1) Council Amendment 2015-102 and 2015-183 dated 7 May 2015
(2) Council Amendment 2016-279 dated 16-Jun-2016

AWARDS, EXPENDITURES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OVER A THREE YEAR PERIOD

Title/Strategy	Description	FY 2017			FY 2016			FY 2015			GRAND TOTAL				
		Approved Budget	Expended as of November 30, 2016	Accomplishments as of November 30, 2016	Approved Budget	Expended	Goals	Approved Budget	Expended	Goals	Approved Budget	Expended	Goals	Total Awarded	Total Expended
NSP Rehab/New Construction	Rehabilitation to existing houses and construction of new homes	0	0	0	884,574	360,080	6	1,334,574	325,244	8	2,219,148	685,324	0	0	3
Nonprofit Acquisition and Rehab	NSP assisted Homes for Independence ReHabs (4) and Boley with new construction (6)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Habitat for Humanity	Habitat for Humanity	75,000	0	0	75,000	50,993	7	50,000	0	7	200,000	50,993	2	2	4
Habitat for Humanity	City assisted Habitat to purchase lots for housing	45,000	0	0	45,000	45,159	3	45,000	30,000	3	135,000	75,159	2	2	4
Housing Counseling - Multiple Agencies	Homebuyer education and foreclosure prevention	100,000	0	0	53,088	42,000		34,000	26,760		187,088	68,760	194		257
NHS Housing Counseling	Homebuyer education and foreclosure prevention	7,000	0	0	7,000	9,800	50	7,500	7,500	38	21,500	17,300	38		81
Gulfcoast Legal Services	Legal assistance with foreclosure prevention	0	1,542	3	36,341	2,394	48	0	0	0	36,341	3,936	0	0	9
Purchase Assistance	Down payment and closing cost assistance	423,643	42,100	3	726,884	366,081	63	638,729	220,147	40	1,785,256	628,328	23		56
Barrier Free	Disabled Retrofit	150,000	0	0	58,500	128,417	11	29,000	88,337	5	237,500	216,754	3		6
Rehabilitation Assistance	Repair Code citable items	905,833	0	7	1,040,192	836,386	34	1,016,675	990,731	38	2,962,700	1,827,117	46		98
Rental Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation to multi-family developments (maximum \$60,000/development)	185,001	0	0	152,932	0	2	60,000	0	1	397,933	0	0	0	0
Multi-Family Community Housing Development Organization - PAL	New Construction/Preservation	240,000	0	0	420,000	890,214		450,000	302,659		1,110,000	1,192,873	6		59
Community Housing Development Organization -Bright Community Trust	Acquisition of property for construction of 26 units of affordable rental housing	0	0	0	230,000	0	26	0	0	0	230,000	0	0	0	0
Boley Centers	Develop homes on MSP lots and other vacant land to be sold to first-time homebuyers at or below 80% mfi	338,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338,200	0	0	0	0
Rental Assistance Program	Rental vouchers for homeless persons	230,480	0	0	230,480	213,774	25	230,480	204,581	25	691,440	418,355	29		54
Catholic Charities	Provide up to 3 months assistance to prevent homelessness and up to 6 months to rapidly re-house the homeless	100,000	0	0	50,000	45,729	14	60,000	17,150	10	210,000	62,879	10		32
St. Vincent dePaul	Rental assistance to households at-risk of becoming homeless and help re-house the homeless	60,000	0	0	28,360	35,148	16	30,676	33,612	14	119,036	68,760	45		65
	Rental assistance to households at-risk of becoming homeless and help re-house the homeless	0	0	0	28,360	0	9	0	0	0	28,360	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL HOUSING	2,460,157	43,642	33	4,066,711	3,026,175	314	3,986,634	2,246,721	189	10,913,502	5,316,537	398	0	728

NOTE: FY 16/17 Agreements have not been executed by subrecipients as of November 30, 2016. HUD Agreements received on November 14, 2016. Agreements forwarded to subrecipients for execution.

**CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AWARDS, EXPENDITURES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OVER A THREE YEAR PERIOD**

Title/Strategy	Description	FY 2017			FY 2016			FY 2015			GRAND TOTAL			
		Approved Budget	Expended as of November 30, 2016	Accomplishments as of November 30, 2016	Approved Budget	Expended	Goals	Approved Budget	Expended	Goals	Accomplishments	Total Awarded	Total Expended	Total Accomplishments
PUBLIC SERVICE														
211 Tampa Bay Cares	Referral service to homeless persons	4,000	0	0	5,000	5,000	625	5,000	5,000	625	14,000	10,000	12,524	
211 Tampa Bay Cares	Operating support for TBIN Information Network	20,000	0	0	28,091	28,091		27,750	27,750		75,841	55,841	139,243	
Boley Centers	Operating support for safe haven - 555 31st Street South	60,000	0	0	53,091	53,091	21	53,000	53,000	25	166,091	106,091	53	
Catholic Charities	Operating support for Pinellas HOPE	25,000	0	0	18,091	18,091	950	25,000	25,000	483	68,091	43,091	2,223	
CASA	Operating support for emergency shelter	4,384	0	0	0	0	0	44,867	44,867	253	49,251	44,867	366	
New Frontiers	Operating support for 12 step program for recovering alcoholics and substance abuse	10,000	0	0	11,091	11,090	133	8,000	7,999	114	29,091	19,089	400	
Pinellas Opportunity Council	Assist the elderly with house cleaning and yard work	10,000	0	0	23,091	23,091	28	20,000	20,000	29	53,091	43,091	357	
St. Vincent dePaul	Provide funding for purchase of food/supplies (FY 2014); provide funding to pay night shelter staff salary and benefits (FY 2015/2016)	87,000	0	0	80,000	79,619	1,380	75,000	75,000	2,300	242,000	154,619	4,990	
Westcare	Operating support for transitional housing (Mustard Seed)-FY 2014; operating support and replacement of flooring FY 2016	24,142	0	0	27,907	27,907	200	0	0	0	52,049	27,907	134	
Westcare	Operating support for inebriate receiving center (Turning Point)	20,000	0	0	27,904	27,904	396	0	0	0	47,904	27,904	1,503	
YMCA	Operating support for educational programs after school and summer in tutorial to youth	20,000	0	0	28,091	26,831	28	33,000	33,000	37	81,091	59,831	169	
YWCA	Operating support for shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	43,463	41,505	121	43,463	41,505	206	
	TOTAL PUBLIC SERVICE	284,526	0	0	\$302,357	\$300,716	3,761	\$335,080	\$333,121	3,987	\$21,963	\$33,837	162,168	

NOTE: FY 16/17 Agreements have not been executed by subrecipients as of November 30, 2016. HUD Agreements received on November 14, 2016. Agreements forwarded to subrecipients for execution.

**CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AWARDS, EXPENDITURES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OVER A THREE YEAR PERIOD**

Title/Strategy	Description	FY 2017			FY 2016			FY 2015			GRAND TOTAL			
		Approved Budget	Expended as of November 30, 2016	Accomplishments as of November 30, 2016	Approved Budget	Expended	Goals	Approved Budget	Expended	Goals	Accomplishments	Total Awarded	Total Expended	Total Accomplishments
CAPITAL PROJECTS														
Brookwood Florida	Replace security lighting (FY 2015); and painting of exterior of buildings (FY 2016)	45,000	0	123	50,000	50,000	110	37,910	37,910	100	127	132,910	87,910	259
CASA	Rehabilitation of administration building at 1011 1st Avenue North	0	0	0	114,332	531	1,500	0	0	0	0	114,332	531	1,842
Family Resources	Replacement of flooring at 3761 5th Avenue North	0	0	0	16,924	16,924	200	0	0	0	0	16,924	16,924	196
First Tee	Construction of a mentoring center at Twin Brooks Golf Course	0	0	370	0	0	370	250,000	0	370	0	250,000	0	0
Sanderlin Center	Rehabilitation of facility at 2335 22nd Avenue South	50,000	0	204	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	0	0
Louise Graham	Rehabilitate facility at 2301 3rd Avenue South	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,196	13,196	40	67	13,196	13,196	67
Regeneration Center	Pinellas Ex Offender Reentry Coalition	0	0	150	0	0	0	151,400	0	150	0	151,400	0	0
Police Athletic League	Funding for replacement of windows, installation HVAC and insulation	0	0	0	0	215,460	0	55,273	27,289	87	0	55,273	242,749	146
Police Athletic League	Rehabilitation of facility at 820 20th Street South	0	0	40	0	0	0	90,000	0	40	0	90,000	0	0
R Club Child Care	Rehabilitate facility at 2355 28th Street South	0	0	0	11,107	9,015	49	23,030	18,306	49	92	34,137	27,321	158
Westcare	Replacement of flooring (FY 16) and replacement of terminal A/C units (FY 17) at 1735 Dr. ML King Street South	73,976	0	200	42,250	35,876	200	0	0	0	0	116,226	35,876	0
Westcare	Fund construction of free standing building to house washers/driers	0	0	0	0	27,334	0	27,500	166	363	1,380	27,500	27,500	0
GRAND TOTAL OF CAPITAL PROJECTS		168,976	0	1,087	234,613	355,140	2,429	648,309	96,867	1,299	1,666	1,051,898	452,007	2,668
GRAND TOTAL OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND CAPITAL PROJECTS		453,502	0	4,511	536,970	655,856	6,190	983,389	429,988	5,186	79,725	1,973,861	1,085,443	164,836

NOTE: FY 16/17 Agreements have not been executed by subrecipients as of November 30, 2016. HUD Agreements received on November 14, 2016. Agreements forwarded to subrecipients for execution.

2012- 2016 Vacant & Boarded Report Comparison

Month	Citywide					Midtown					Childs Park				
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
JAN	767	861	830	741	440	365	379	358	347	230	231	188	112	64	
FEB	796	888	821	750	424	373	375	356	349	226	233	187	108	61	
MAR	786	890	814	735	426	365	377	353	340	226	226	182	103	61	
APR	782	899	803	617	406	362	385	368	268	211	229	176	94	61	
MAY	770	894	781	577	418	358	382	356	264	212	218	176	94	61	
JUNE	835	890	784	559	407	382	379	368	263	203	228	118	88	59	
JULY	833	910	813	537	379	381	389	378	256	186	223	120	84	57	
AUG	821	892	795	520	357	377	379	373	248	171	224	114	80	55	
SEPT	803	866	807	504	351	369	369	386	245	161	220	115	75	54	
OCT	797	849	787	489	340	371	360	376	243	152	214	109	71	53	
NOV	784	844	760	473	326	366	363	362	240	147	214	108	67	50	
DEC	845	827	768	448	321	388	354	363	234	145	222	112	64	49	