

Written Comments Submitted as part of the Needs Assessment for the FY16 – FY20 Consolidated Plan Update for the District of Columbia

Comments were submitted to events.dhcd@dc.gov during advertised public comment periods for four public hearings

August 13th, 2015: DHCD's Housing Resource Center

August 19th, 2015: Martin Luther King Jr. Library

November 4th, 2015: Greater Washington Urban League

May 26th, 2016: DHCD's Housing Resource Center
specifically on the use of the National Housing Trust
Fund Program

Testimony of LaTasha Nicole Gunnels
Resident of Historic Anacostia to the Department of Housing and Community Development
August 8, 2015 Public Needs Assessment Hearings for the FY 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan

I appreciate the opportunity to present this testimony on behalf of the residents of Historic Anacostia. My name is LaTasha Nicole Gunnels and I am a home owner in Historic Anacostia. I believe DHCD has the opportunity to kindle the revitalization of Historic Anacostia through the rehabilitation of the vacant and blighted commercial and residential properties owned by DHCD and DMPED. It is important that the DHCD efforts respect the historic character of the community, and through its policies and implementation ensure that the community has a healthy balance of income levels.

I live next door to a boarded up vacant home owned by DHCD, and the home is infested with birds, rodents, and other wild life. The surrounding of the home is filled with carelessly discarded litter and fragments of the home fall onto my property. The look of most of the unkempt properties owned by DHCD is an eyesore to our community. Every day that DHCD holds on to property in Historic Anacostia it causes loss of much needed tax revenue while inadvertently costing millions of tax dollars to maintain; corrodes the value of nearby homes (suppressing real property tax revenues); presents health and safety risks; and muddles current efforts to revitalize the community. Many crimes are also committed at vacant/blighted DHCD properties.

DHCD can assist in the renewal of Historic Anacostia by presenting a plan of action to the community targeted at refurbishing DHCD properties and placing them on the market. This is important to me because increasing homeownership and commercial retail development can anchor economic recovery of Historic Anacostia while increasing tax revenue. Increased tax revenue can also lead to the upkeep of community infrastructure which would attract businesses, making Historic Anacostia a desirable and viable community to live in. Homeownership in Historic Anacostia can also preserve our relatively small historic district by reducing the number of blighted properties. It goes without saying that placing homeowners in vacant properties will also reduce criminal activities, littering, and the number people with transient life styles roaming the community.

As a community stakeholder I would also like to request that DHCD pull back the RFP for the Big K Project and re- issue a RFP that follows the Mayors OUR RFP process, a process that is meant to be inclusive of the community, developer and government. The community spent countless hours with consultants, researching economic viability of projects for the Big K Site. During the submissions of RFP, a developer presented request for proposal that incorporated the needs and wants of the community of Historic Anacostia which included none profit/retail use. Against the wishes of the community DHCD awarded the Big K project to developer Tim Chapman. Historic Anacostia is not a large historic district; we would like the homes on the Big K lot to remain in place. Any new midrise housing development can be moved further south and not in our historic district. Historic Anacostia is not a large historic district; we would like the homes on the Big K lot to remain in place. Any new midrise housing development can be moved further south and not in our historic district. Again, the Anacostia Historic District is a very small district, and as such, allows for all matter of creative, alternative development around it.

The community would like the existing structures to be stabilized and incorporated into the new development on the Big K Site. The community would also like all DHCD and DMPED owned properties in Historic Anacostia to be stabilized and treated in a manner that will preserve them until they are redeveloped. We also want more community involvement and the plans of the site owned by DHCD at Good Hope Rd and Martin Luther King Jr Avenue. The community is also appalled at the unkempt property owned by DHCD, where the façade fell after a wind storm and its own backyard that has overgrown grass and trees that protrude over the broken fence as you approach the 11th St Bridge.

Thank you for your attention.

Attached is written testimony from John Zottoli for the Consolidated Plan.

Pamela Hillsman Johnson
Sr. Community Outreach Specialist
Department of Housing and Community Development
Government of the District of Columbia
1800 Martin Luther King Jr., Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20020
(202) 442-7251 phone, (202) 645-6727 fax
pamela.hillsman@dc.gov
www.dc.gov

Follow DHCD on our Social Media/Networking Platforms:



@DCDHCD |



<https://www.facebook.com/Dcdhcd> |



dhcdhousecalls.tumblr.com

From: John Zottoli [<mailto:john.zottoli@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2015 10:09 PM
To: DHCD Events (DHCD)
Subject: Written Testimony Concerning Your Five Year Plan

I suggest that DHCD subsidize housing in every part of DC -- even in neighborhoods where land and property values are very high.

Today, far too often, DHCD subsidizes projects in communities where the costs to build or acquire housing is relatively low. This means that DHCD is helps to segregate the District:

The expansion of market rate housing flourishes in the western parts of DC, accommodating wealthier and predominantly white new residents to neighborhoods that already have plenty of wealthier residents and plenty of white residents.

By concentrating its housing subsidies in the eastern parts of DC, DHCD supports placing even more relatively poor Black and Latino residents in neighborhoods that already house disproportionately high percentages of poor people and people of color.

Yes, I understand that DHCD dollars go further in the eastern part of DC. Your admittedly limited dollars can buy more housing there. However, part of the price we pay for those housing investments is further segregation of DC.

Hence, to avoid further segregation, I suggest that DHCD support subsidized housing in EVERY part of DC.

John Zottoli
3025 Ontario Road NW
Washington, DC 20009

**Testimony of Sarah Scruggs, Director of Advocacy & Outreach
Manna, Inc.
Department of Housing and Community Development
Hearing on 2016-2020 Five Year Consolidated Plan for the District of Columbia
August 19, 2015
Martin Luther King Library**

Good evening, Director Donaldson and members of the Department on Housing and Community Development. Thank you for this opportunity to testify. My name is Sarah Scruggs and I am the Director of Advocacy and Outreach at Manna, Inc. - a 33-year old affordable housing developer, homebuyer educator and property manager in Washington, DC. As you know, DHCD is an essential partner for us and your use of federal and local resources help make affordable development happen. Thank you for your partnership and we look forward to more and better work together to continue creating a continuum of housing that supports DC residents and helps them to move up and out of poverty. Below are our recommendations for the 2016-2020 Five Year Consolidated Plan for DC.

Support of Homeownership Programs and Projects

Manna continues to work with DC residents preparing and searching for homeownership opportunities, a good number of which are moving from another type of affordable housing. We currently have almost 250 people in our Manna Homebuyers Club (HBC), and 7 whom have purchased homes in the last month. The difficulty our HBC members have in finding homes that fit their household needs, incomes and long-term growth needs is real. We would like to see a prioritization of the use of federal funds for both increasing purchase assistance through the Home Purchase Assistance Program and development dollars available for affordable homeownership development.

Thank you for the Department's commitment to improving HPAP, raising the maximum loan amounts to \$80,000, and committing federal dollars to provide any additional funding that may be needed for the program. Juggling the use of local and federal dollars within a particular program can be challenging, especially since the federal income guidelines are lower than the HPAP income table. We suggest close monitoring of HPAP buyer incomes in the NOE pipeline in order to make ensure HPAP continues to be open to a wide variety of incomes and that federal monies are targeted to those with less income and larger loan size needs.

There are affordable homeownership development possibilities on properties and small lots that are stuck within the DC tax system. We would love to partner with the city and others to pull together resources for scattered site homeownership development. Many of those properties exist in areas where homeownership rates are low and poverty is high. Affordable homeownership in those neighborhoods could provide great opportunities for area residents to build assets as well as revitalize the neighborhood.

Finally, we would love to see a large focus on the East of the River Homeownership Initiative, which had a rough start due to funding delays. There are opportunities and needs in Wards 7 and

8 that a robust campaign with strong government and community support and publicity can meet. The time is ripe over the next 5 years to have a strong focus on homeownership where it is needed most and bring together key stakeholders and resources to make it happen. Residents and organizations lobbied for this kind of campaign and time is of the essence when it comes to interest rates and the prices of ownership properties.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Testimony: Needs Assessment Hearing;
“2016 – 2020 Five Year Consolidated Plan for the District of Columbia”
“2016 – 2020 Proposed Citizen Participation Plan

August 19, 2016

My name is Tom Wilson. As a member of the Calvert Street Tenant’s Association, I am a beneficiary of the District’s Affordable Housing agenda. Thanks to the TOPA process and a mortgage from the Housing Production Trust Fund, which allowed us to purchase and renovate our building, my home has been preserved as Affordable Housing for 40 years.

In addition, I am a member of the Resident Leadership Team of CNHED. My insights and recommendations in this testimony are a result of my association with the Housing for All Campaign under Elizabeth Falcon’s leadership, generally, and her testimony at this hearing, specifically. In addition, I have drawn on the testimony of Schyla Pondexter-Moore of Empower DC.

A cursory review of the 2011 – 2015 Five Year Consolidated Plan for the District of Columbia suggests that the concept of Affordable Housing, as embraced by the Bowser Administration, was, at best, an afterthought. Evidence of this is the repurposing of the Housing Production Trust Fund from Affordable Housing to deployment as a contingency fund for unrelated budget shortfalls prior to the 2014 Budget hearings.

Consequently, my first recommendation is that, except for the DHCD Mission Statement, the 2011 – 2015 Five Year Plan be discarded as a template for developing the 2016 -2020 Five Year Plan. During the first three years of the plan, the Fred Trump end of the continuum of housing was largely neglected and ignored while the Donald Trump end was featured and promoted. In contrast, the Affordable Housing concept embraced by the Bowser administration began to emerge during the 2014 budget cycle.

My second recommendation is that the clear and precise definition of Affordable Housing, as it has been embraced in concept by the Bowser administration, be established. As I say, the current Affordable Housing concept began to develop during the 2014 and 2015 budget processes. Therefore, I was surprised to discover in conversation after the Needs Assessment Hearing that there currently IS NOT a working definition for Affordable Housing in DCHD. Therefore, achieving this definition represents the essential first task for the development process, generally.

My third recommendation is that the ideal and intent, if not the language, of the new federal mandate arising from the HUD Rule on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing be adopted as the working template for the 2016 – 2020 Five Year Plan. There are several reasons for this:

- Don’t fight city hall. This is a federal mandate and the District is too dependent upon federal monies to fight the issue. In addition, the anecdotal evidence I have

gathered in the last several years is that HUD actively seeks out appropriate programs and projects in which to move money. Organizing our Five Year Plan around the HUD mandate will help remove whatever barriers which may inhibit this process.

- Increase DHCD – Housing Authority Cooperation. With HUD existing exterior to the processes of the DC government, the independence of the two agencies can be sustained while the HUD mandate will require the boundaries of both agencies to become more permeable and their processes to become more transparent. HUD is in a position to play the role of disinterested referee of intramural turf conflicts.
- Asset and Property Inventory Program. Former DHCD Director Michael Kelly invested several million dollars on a program to identify all the properties and assets in the DC public inventory, an initiative that anticipated the HUD mandate. Consequently, some of the structure is already in place in DHCD to implement the HUD mandate.

My fourth recommendation is to accelerate the creation of a new Acquisition Loan Program and the implementation of the District Opportunity to Purchase Act (DOPA). Up until now, the Affordable Housing agenda has been somewhat ad hoc and market driven. In particular, the TOPA process, as a preservation strategy, is a grassroots, bottom-up demand process which reveals the essential fraud of Supply Side economics that informed the zeitgeist of the emergent 2011 – 2015 Five Year Plan. We want to nurture the grass roots elements of Affordable Housing as it exists while adding the combination of a new Acquisition Loan Program and DOPA into the development mix. These tools represent a systematic, and complementary, top-down element of the Affordable Housing agenda. Among other things, they will allow a greater degree of cooperation between DHCD and the Housing Authority in preservation and creation within the context of the HUD mandate.

My final recommendation is that the elimination of chronic homelessness by 2020 be established as the FIRST PRIORITY of the 2016 – 2020 Five Year Plan. The economic and social benefits of Permanent Supportive Housing has been clearly established everywhere it has been implemented across America. In addition, studies of chronic homelessness in the District reveal the problem to be rather finite. Initiating the 2016 – 2020 Five Year Plan with a clear focus on this particular element of Affordable Housing will allow the various players in the field to explore the possibilities for expanded cooperation to create new capacities and these new capacities will reframe the priorities, challenges and opportunities of the entire landscape of Affordable Housing.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify. My intent in this testimony is as an addendum to Elizabeth Falcon's extensive catalog of recommendations and a reinforcement of Schyla Pondexter-Moore's particular concerns. The theme of this testimony is that Mayor Bowser has embarked on a brand new Affordable Housing agenda and it will profit the process to begin as much as possible with a blank slate.

From: Paul Joice [<mailto:pjoyce@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2015 8:02 AM
To: DHCD Events (DHCD)
Subject: Five Year Consolidated Plan comments

The development of the Consolidated Plan is a great opportunity to lay out a vision for DHCD and the use of HUD funding. DC is fortunate to be in the midst of a strong period of economic growth. I believe that the City's priorities for HUD funding are clear: the City must 1) do more to increase housing affordability and 2) ensure that economic opportunity is shared by all, including low-income and minority individuals.

On housing affordability, the City can and should use its HOME and CDBG funds to produce new housing with income restrictions and affordability requirements. But focusing solely on income restricted units is a mistake. HUD funds can't possibly meet the needs of the hundreds of thousands of low and moderate income individuals living in one of the most expensive cities in America. The housing market is governed by supply and demand. Increasing the supply of housing in high demand neighborhoods is necessary to prevent housing prices from further escalating. DHCD must be an outspoken advocate in support of new housing units, whether they are publicly subsidized or market rate. The City can also take advantage of market forces by leveraging land value to produce more income restricted units. The City (and the DC Housing Authority) own land that has substantial latent value (such as the GreenLeaf complex in Southwest); redeveloping these areas to produce more housing (market rate and subsidized) is essential.

Second, DC must do more to ensure inclusivity in housing and neighborhoods. Redeveloping public housing into mixed income housing (with no loss of units) is one important strategy. Inclusionary zoning is another. DHCD should also work with private developers and non-profits to preserve existing affordable housing in gentrifying neighborhoods. It's also important to recognize that proximity alone does not ensure meaningful interaction: placing public housing units and high-end market rate units side by side may be ineffectual or even counterproductive. Sometimes it's necessary to build social spaces and make deliberate efforts to "build community" among a diverse group of residents.

Thanks for your consideration.
Paul Joice



MEG MAGUIRE
Community Conservation Consultant

631 Maryland Ave., NE Washington, DC 20002
Ph: 202-546-4536 Fax: 202-546-4536
E-mail: megmaguireconsultant@msn.com

**TESTIMONY on DHCD 2016-2020 Five-Year Consolidated Plan for
District of Columbia**

August 20, 2015

I am Meg Maguire, a resident of DC since 1977 and one of many residents of this remarkable city who is deeply concerned with the rapidly developing housing crisis marked by gentrification, displacement of long-time residents, escalating rents and soaring property values. Like so many other well-intentioned people, I want to understand and support the right actions by our city government to maintain a fair and open city with opportunities for all. Most of all, I want to support not just production of more housing but *building and strengthening existing and new communities through housing and community development.*

The *2016-2020 Five-Year Consolidated Plan for DC* could help to overcome several barriers to public understanding and engage new partners in meeting the city's needs. I offer two basic steps:

1. Replace the term “affordable” with more precise terms that describe types of housing and their beneficiaries.

The term “affordable housing” is, in my experience, misleading and virtually useless. Everyone is for it, but the term means different things to different people: To the residents at DC General it may mean transitional shelter and supportive services; to a mid-level government worker it may mean the opportunity to own a home. Worse yet, “affordable housing” has become an umbrella under which people can shelter their random theories of causation and prescribe remedies that may or may not be sound.

Frustrated by trying to understand the housing continuum, I have taken a stab at “unpacking” the various types of less-than-market-rate, or publicly subsidized, housing, from shelters to inclusionary zoning. **Attachment A** is one attempt to understand who is served, income limits, the agencies involved and the nature of the crisis surrounding that particular type of housing. I would welcome DHCD's help in refining this tool and making it useful for the public.

2. A robust research agenda could address important questions, steer potential partners to be more effective advocates and providers, and guide public policy.

There are many questions for which I have been unable to find solid answers or even informed discussion:

- Who is being displaced in DC and why? Where are families going when they are forced out of Sec.8/LIHTC expiring buildings? What are their problems finding housing elsewhere?
- What has been the track record of the city in delivering on its housing promises? What are the specific obstacles to achieving goals set in the past? What new strategies offer a realistic promise of meeting goals? How much money will be required over the next 5-10 years to achieve the goals?
- How much housing is torn down to build IZ housing? Why should developers not be required to replace every unit they tear down without receiving a density bonus (which is a form of public subsidy)?
- To what extent does the DC government have and track data on the results and consequences of affordable housing developments? How accessible and transparent is this data? What is the government doing to improve information and awareness?
- Who benefits from IZ housing by race, age, occupation, income, & education? Are statistics kept on IZ housing recipients?
- Why is the expanded downtown under the new zoning regulations substantially exempt from IZ requirements, especially when the developers are receiving so much from the city, especially in waived parking requirements?
- The public subsidizes developers to build IZ through generous bonus density. What is the impact of this bonus on the surrounding buildings and neighborhood?
- Developers are building almost all 1 & 2 bedroom rental units. These are not adequate for housing families of 5+ people. How can developers be encouraged to build more family housing so that people can live in DC for a lifetime?
- Are we building high quality new communities as massive new housing goes up in DC? As we focus on real estate, are we also planning carefully for community development -- public parks and playgrounds, community centers, churches, schools, stores? Will distinctive neighborhood cultures and histories survive and thrive? What consequences could this have for DC's future and character? What responsibility do the DC government and DC residents have in preserving culture and communities?

Conclusion:

The planning process for *DHCD 2016-2020 Five-Year Consolidated Plan for the District of Columbia* offers a tremendous opportunity to approach a complex subject in a fresh and truly transparent way and to build an informed constituency for long-term partnerships.

Thank you for this opportunity to present testimony on one of the most critical issues facing our city.

SEE ATTACHMENT A

ATTACHMENT A: Unpacking the DC Less-Than-Market-Rate (“Affordable”) Housing Continuum

The term “affordable housing” is not useful as it obscures who is served. Below is an amateur’s attempt to make sense of the many different types of subsidized housing in DC. The DHCD Plan for 2016-2020 could help educate and engage the public and demystify the problem by developing a similar matrix in greater detail. We need a new language and definitions for this complex topic.

Meg Maguire – 08-20-15

Type of “housing”	Who lives there? Typical occupations? (People with no jobs? Low-wage earners? Teachers and firemen? College-educated people working for non-profits?)	Income Range: 0-\$10,000 \$10,000-\$20,000 \$20,000-\$30,000 \$30,000-\$40,000 \$40,000-\$50,000 \$50,000-\$60,000 \$60,000-\$70,000 \$80,000 +	Who pays? Agencies involved?	Comments Issues Questions
1. The Streets	People who cannot find shelter; people who choose the streets over shelter	Zero	Completely subsidized Department of Human Services (DHS)	CRISIS: Families with children as well as single homeless people are being warehoused in unsafe and unsanitary shelters for long periods of time. Too few options are available for them to move elsewhere. Many end up in motels and shifted from place to place without any stability.
2. Temporary Emergency Shelters Shelters that close during the day and require residents to leave	Emergency or low-barrier shelters. Periodic street pickups during bad winter weather.	??	DHS Community Partnership for Prevention of Homelessness	
Shelters where people stay for indefinite periods	EX: DC General, CCNV, motels	??		
3. Transitional Shelter	People moving out of shelters who are given a subsidy for a fixed period of time, usually less than 2 years.	??	DHS Community Partnership for Prevention of Homelessness	CRISIS: Insufficient supply for overwhelming need
➤ Family Year-Around Temporary Shelter	EX: Coalition for the Homeless, Family Resource Center; Community of Hope	??	DHS Community Partnership for Prevention of Homelessness	
➤ Single Adults – Transitional Shelter/Housing	EX: Calvary Women’s Services, House of Ruth, Sasha Bruce, N St. Village	??	DHS Community Partnership for Prevention of Homelessness	

➤ Family Transitional Housing	EX: New Endeavors by Women, House of Ruth	??		
➤ Transitional Supportive Housing	EX: New Endeavors, Catholic Charities, Access Housing, Gospel Rescue Ministries, House of Ruth	??	DHS Community Partnership for Prevention of Homelessness	
4. Veteran Supportive Housing Program	Homeless veterans	??	DHS US – Veteran’s Affairs Supportive Housing Program (VASH Voucher – U.S. Dept. of Veteran Affairs)	
5. Permanent Supportive Housing (PSHP)	People with a disabling condition who have been homeless for 1+ years or has had at least 4 episodes of homelessness in the past 3 yrs.	??		

PUBLIC HOUSING – DC Housing Authority (DCHA)

The DC public housing portfolio consists of more than 8,000 apartment or townhome units in 56 properties owned and managed by DCHA with close to 20,000 residents. Public housing provides very low-income families, seniors and disabled persons the financial assistance they need to live in safe, well maintained and affordable rental homes.

1. Public Housing	EX: Arthur Capper Senior, Barry Farms, Carroll Apts., Potomac Gardens Family	??	DCHA	CRISIS: Barry Farms had been slated for clearance and renewal. Hundreds of people would be removed from their community. (Where does this stand?)
2. Rental Housing Assistance	10,500 low- and moderate-income families now served EX: Lincoln-Westmoreland, Museum Square	??	<u>Federal funds</u> Families may chose to live in designated HCVP units in single-family homes, townhouses or apartments that have such units	CRISIS: 77 properties financed by Sec. 8 or LIHTC have expired or will expire by 2020! (See LIHTC below)

➤ Local Rent Subsidy Program (LRSP)	700 tenant-based vouchers that must be used within DC	??	DC funded program modeled on federal program	
--	---	----	--	--

SUBSIDIZED “AFFORDABLE” HOUSING - DC Department of Housing and Community Development (DCHCD)

*The mission of the DC Department of Housing and Community Development is to **produce** more affordable housing, **preserve and sustain** affordable housing and **ensure the infrastructure and resources** needed to house future residents. (Operates through partnerships with community organizations, developers, non-profits and residents.)*

<p>1. Rental Housing Assistance</p> <p>➤ Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC)</p>	<p>People whose income qualifies them to live in federal and locally subsidized rental housing 50%-60% or less of AMI.</p> <p>EX: Aspen Court, Douglass Knoll Apt.</p>	??	<p>Private for-profit or non-profit sector owner receives a <u>tax credit</u> for new construction, acquisition or rehab Note: <u>DC</u> will begin a LIHTC program soon</p>	<p>CRISIS: 77 properties with LITC or Sec. 8 will expire or have expired by 2020</p>
<p>2. Rent Control</p>		??	<p>The Act (administered by the Rental Accommodations Division of DHCD) applies to all housing accommodations in the District of Columbia, unless they are specifically exempted by the Act. The most common exemptions are rental units in these categories: *Federally or District-subsidized rental units; Rental units built after 1975; Rental units (including condominium or cooperative units) owned by a natural person who owns no more than four rental units, provided the rental units are registered as exempt; Rental units that were vacant when the Act took effect; Housing accommodations under a building improvement plan and receiving rehabilitation assistance through DCHD.</p>	<p>QUESTION: How could/should rent control be strengthened to keep housing affordable?</p>
<p>3. Tenant Opportunity to Purchase (TOPA)</p>	<p>People displaced when apt. building reverts to market rate (Ex: 77 properties with Sec. 8 & LIHTC expiring by 2020)</p>	??	<p>DHCD provides seed money, acquisition assistance, organizational, legal and development services to tenants</p>	

<p>4. EXISTING Housing Ownership Assistance (for existing housing)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Assistance to homeowners to preserve existing housing 	<p>People who are being priced out of the market by high taxes, lack of capital for investment in their properties, etc. are ripe for being bought out and effectively displaced.</p>	<p>??</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Tax abatement * Single Family Residential Rehabilitation Program – (SFRRP) provides loans and grants for home repairs for DC building code violations * Lead Safe Washington Program (LSW)– removal of lead paint hazards 	<p>CRISIS: Many families in Shaw, Trinidad and other rapidly gentrifying neighborhoods are finding that they can no longer pay taxes on their properties or make the long-term repairs needed. Developers are buying up entire blocks in some areas with plans to tear down existing housing and build many small units.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Purchase of existing housing 	<p>People who qualify to purchase a home.</p>	<p>??</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Home Purchase Rehabilitation Programs (HPAP) help first-time homebuyers purchase homes that require limited repairs up to \$40,000 * FHA 203(k) Streamline Rehabilitation loans from \$5,000-\$35,000 * Lead Safe (see above) * Employer Assisted Housing Program (EAHP) and (NEAHP) – for DC Gov employees purchasing 1st home in DC 	
<p>5. NEW Subsidized Affordable Housing for Rent or Purchase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City/Federal direct subsidy 	<p>EX: Lebanon Homes</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Housing Production Trust Fund (est. 1988) (HPTF) – permanent, revolving fund to help create affordable housing and related activities through financial assistance to eligible nonprofit and for-profit developers. 	<p>Could city property be put into a community land trust (see below) in perpetuity so that home ownership is guaranteed?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusionary Zoning 	<p>Households at 50% or 80% AMI (\$107,300)</p> <p>WORKFORCE HOUSING – teachers, fire, police, non-profit workers (See chart below)</p>		<p>Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) - a land use technique for developing diverse mixed-income communities by requiring each new residential development make a percentage of the new units affordable to targeted incomes. It often lets developers build more units through a “density bonus” along with other incentives to help the</p>	<p>SEE BELOW – p.5</p>

			program operate better. NOTE: Policy set by <u>Zoning Commission</u> ; Administration by <u>DHCD</u> (See chart below)	
MARKET RATE HOUSING	Increasingly not “affordable” in DC!			
<i>Other Promising Programs To Ensure Long Term Community Stability</i>	Promotes home ownership that is protected in perpetuity.		Housing preserved in community land trusts .	See articles on Boston experience in Dudley St. Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) Dorchester and Roxbury,. See report of Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

iNCLUSIONARY ZONING:

Maximum Household Income Limits

These income limits are for D.C. Law 16-275; D.C. Official Code § 6-1041.01 et seq.) (“the Act”) and the Inclusionary Zoning Regulations adopted by the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia and codified in Chapter 26 Title 11 of the DCMR.
2013 Washington DC Metropolitan Area Median Income (AMI) = \$107,300

Maximum Household Income Limits (2013)

Household Size	Units at 50% AMI	Units at 80% AMI
1	\$38,306	\$60,839
2	\$43,778	\$69,530
3	\$49,250	\$78,221
4	\$54,722	\$86,912
5	\$60,195	\$95,604
6	\$65,667	\$104,295

The Maximum Household Income Limits are based on the Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area 2013 Area Median Income of \$107,300 for a family of four as published by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development in December of 2012, and are adjusted for household size.

**Testimony of Kurt Runge, Advocacy Director, Miriam's Kitchen
Regarding the Department of Housing and Community Development
Five Year Consolidated Plan**

My name is Kurt Runge and I am the Advocacy Director at Miriam's Kitchen. Our vision is to *end* chronic homelessness in the District. For over 30 years, Miriam's Kitchen has worked to end homelessness by providing healthy meals, case management, and housing. We advocate for proven solutions to homelessness, and we collaborate with city leaders, service providers, and other local partners to improve the homeless services system to ensure that no one is homeless for years. Roughly 75% of the people we serve are chronically homeless – they have been homeless multiple times or for years and have a disabling condition.

Miriam's Kitchen welcomes the opportunity to highlight several recommendations on priorities for the Five Year Consolidated Plan, specifically on how funding is used for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), and the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) to address homelessness in the District for single adults.

Overview of homelessness in D.C.

On a given night in 2015, 7,298 people were homeless in D.C. Of that number, there were 3,814 individuals and 3,477 people in families. Approximately 1,600 individuals and 60 families were chronically homeless. Ending chronic homelessness is urgent – the average age of someone who is chronically homeless is in the 50s and life expectancy is 62. Fortunately, proven cost-effective solutions exist.

In the spring of 2015, the D.C. Interagency Council on Homelessness released *Homeward DC*, a plan to ensure that by 2020, homelessness in the District is rare, brief, and non-recurring. Key benchmarks of the plan include ending veteran homelessness by the end of 2015 and chronic homelessness by the end of 2017. The District is on track to ending veteran homelessness, but more resources will be needed to end chronic homelessness by 2017.

Leveraging Federal resources to end homelessness for single adults

Although some Federal resources, like CDBG, HOME, and ESG funds are being used to address homelessness, more could be done to end homelessness for single adults who are homeless, especially for vulnerable people who have been homeless for years.

Recommendations regarding Community Development Block Grant

In the District the CDBG provides funding for important programs that meet the needs of individuals at a variety of income levels. For instance, according to the *FY2014 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report* (FY 15 data was unavailable), the District budgeted \$7.8 M for the Home Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP) and the Residential Rehabilitation Programs. In addition, \$7.4 M was invested in Neighborhood investment activities. Although these programs are important to continue to invest in, more funding could be prioritized for vulnerable populations, like people who are chronically homeless, especially considering that a lot of funding was left unspent (\$3.71 M for HPAP and Rehab and \$1.26 M for Neighborhood Investment). Overall, approximately \$12 M budgeted in

FY 14 for CDBG was not spent - money that could be used to fund programs that meet an urgent need and would use all funds budgeted for them.

In a review of communities that excel at ending chronic homelessness, Community Solutions found that the most successful communities had a concrete plan to leverage Federal resources like the Community Development Block Grant Program.¹ We recommend that:

- DHCD outline a plan to leverage CDBG funding for the purposes of ending chronic homelessness, and homelessness for single adults

According to HUD, 15% of CDBG funding can be used for public service activities, including employment services, substance abuse services, and services for people who are homeless.² There are major needs for service dollars for individuals who are homeless to do things like:

- Support people in housing
- Provide employment support, especially to people in rapid re-housing or the new Daytime Services Center
- Homeless outreach working to get people in housing.

However, it does not seem like any of the FY14 CDBG Funding was being used to provide direct services. We recommend:

- A portion of CDBG funding to fund direct services to individuals *and* families who are homeless, and to decrease the CDBG budget in areas that are unable to spend the money that was budgeted.
- We particularly support funding to meet the service needs listed above (services in housing, employment support, homeless outreach).

Recommendations for HOME funding

HOME funding can be used for direct rental assistance to low-income people. However, in the *FY2014 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report*, none of the funding seemed to go for this purpose, and much of the funding was unspent. There is a possibility that some of the funding in FY 15 may have been used for direct rental assistance for families who are homeless. Although we support using the funding to serve families, we recommend that:

- HOME funding be used as direct rental assistance to provide bridge housing for chronically homeless individuals.

Recommendations for ESG

ESG can fund a variety of programs, including street outreach, and rapid re-housing assistance. According to the *FY2014 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report*, in FY 14, ESG funding was exclusively used to serve families who are homeless by providing homelessness prevention, shelter overflow capacity for families, and first month's rent and security deposit for families moving into housing. Although it is important to use some of this funding to serve families who are

¹ Community Solutions. *Being like the best*. http://100khomes.org/sites/default/files/BeingLikeTheBest_0.pdf

² HUD, *Chapter 7: Public Services*, <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Basically-CDBG-Chapter-7-Public-Services.pdf>

homeless, it is equally important to use some funding to meet unmet needs for single adults who are homeless. In addition, if some of the funding is used for prevention, a more targeted use of prevention, similar to New York's *HomeBase* program, would maximize the effectiveness of the program.³ In the past, funds have been given to Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) providers, which up to this point, have not adopted a more targeted approach of homelessness prevention.

The D.C. ICH estimates that approximately 2,600 beds of rapid re-housing are needed for individuals who are homeless. However, currently no ESG funding is being used for this purpose. We recommend that some ESG funding be used for:

- Rapid re-housing for individuals
- To provide additional street outreach in gap areas of the District

We also recommend that:

- Any funding for prevention go to programs that use the *HomeBase* approach

The timing is right. With an Administration in strong support of ending homelessness and an ICH plan that has already outlined what needs to be done, we are in an unprecedented position for our investments to go further than they have before towards ending chronic homelessness by 2017 and all homelessness by 2020.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony.

³ National Alliance to End Homelessness. *Data points: homelessness prevention – to do or not to do.*
<http://www.endhomelessness.org/blog/entry/data-points-homelessness-prevention-to-do-or-not-to-do#.VdeQzvlVhBc>

Written Statement for the Government of the District of Columbia
2016-2020 Five Year Consolidated Plan
Submitted by Carol Dostert, Ward 8 Resident
August 21, 2015

My name is Carol Dostert. I appreciate the opportunity to provide a written statement for consideration by the Government of the District of Columbia (DC), in relation to the development of the Five Year Consolidated Plan and budgets to be submitted to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). My experiences as a former homeless woman and a low-income resident of Ward 8 in DC, in addition to participation on the DC Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) influenced the comments and recommendations within this statement.

I am an educated, prior professional in the education field that became homeless after multiple life challenges. I experienced loss of DC Government employment and health insurance while on medical leave after an auto accident; financial instability; interruption of electricity service; exasperated chronic health conditions; and inconsistent access to quality healthcare. In addition, I suffered emotional trauma from sexual victimization and privacy violations by a landlord employee while inside my home. This victimization triggered post trauma stress relating to childhood abuse. The combination of life challenges interfered with my ability to follow through on legal action and avoid eviction.

I was homeless for one year in a system that does not serve the homeless well. Medical needs interfered with my ability to receive services in shelters and transitional housing due to physical building conditions of poor air circulation/ventilation, chemicals used, bed bugs, mold, roaches and other allergens, stairs and/or carpet. As a victimized woman without physically and emotionally safe shelter, I lived in a constant state of hyper vigilance and fear. It was exhausting and caused further trauma, interfering with my ability to connect effectively with needed services and advocate for my disability and human rights.

While homeless, I slept in a car during the winter. I slept in the woods and on church ground benches. I rode buses to the end of the line and back never actually falling asleep. A few times I even went home with strangers praying the risk did not result in further victimization. I trespassed inside the Washington National Cathedral at night. I never broke in, but I did not leave when nightly prayer hours ended and left before the church opened for the day. I felt safer there and closer to God.

On several occasions while homeless, I required medical respite to heal after exasperated asthma symptoms and chest pain so severe it significantly impacted my mobility. I was not considered ill enough for inpatient hospital care after ER treatment and was denied acceptance for medical respite at Christ House. At that time, the remaining medical respite beds were limited to those recovering from surgery. As an unsheltered physically disabled woman, it was challenging to travel streets with my belongings. Exasperated chronic health conditions requiring emergency treatment placed me at an even higher risk of targeted victimization upon ER release, increasing an already high level of anxiety and fear.

The flexible, permanent, housing pathways model with an emphasis on *Housing First* and individualized needs developed by the DC ICH in 2015 did not exist for me while homeless. The path to permanent housing for me required acceptance into and completion of transitional housing programming which I did not need in order to maintain a home of my own. I needed an income or rental assistance to secure a new home. There were long waiting lists for most programs, with some posing barriers to entry (i.e., my lack of pregnancy and no incarceration or substance abuse histories). The few offered did not meet physical disability or chronic health needs. In addition, the wait time for assistance through the DC Housing Authority was reported to be a decade long. There was no evident path to stable and safe permanent housing for me, causing harm to me physically and emotionally.

I became a recipient of Social Security Disability Insurance, which provided a needed income for a new home. I required a healthy home of my own where I could simply breathe physically and, in a sense, emotionally to stabilize and heal. I also needed limited to no stair requirements, due to a permanent

Carol Dostert 2016-2020 Five Year Consolidated Plan Testimony
August 21, 2015

disability with varying degrees of chronic pain. Unfortunately, I could not afford to pay rent in a LEED certified building offering the physical structure, ventilation/air quality, and lack of allergen exposure I needed (i.e., asthma/chemical sensitivity triggers, including roach/rodent infestations). I ended up in a Ward 8 apartment with limited community access to grocery stores offering fresh produce and other health related dietary needs at reasonable prices. More significantly, my new landlord was not only negligent in responding to multiple housing code violations, but engaged in unethical and illegal efforts to silence me during the sale of the property-behavior that traumatized me further. Unethical and illegal DC DCRA ProA inspection practices reinforced a feeling that I could not turn to my government for assistance.

After experiencing additional trauma in my new apartment building, I disengaged further from everyone around me and kept to myself. I now exhibit trust issues and cannot yet tolerate interacting or simply being in the presence of people 24 hours a day, making reduced housing costs via roommates not an option. After years of exposure to trauma inside and on the property grounds of more than one home, I may never feel completely at ease and safe in any home. It is important for me to know my willingness to share very personal information about my struggles will result in US and DC Government budget realignment, as well as the necessary policy and practice development to reduce harm to others facing similar challenges now and in the future.

There is a homeless and affordable housing crisis in our country and city, presenting with human rights violations. In theory we value the rights of all humans. In practice, we do not honor the human right of access to an adequate standard of living for everyone. Habitable, safe, healthy, and accessible emergency shelter and affordable housing for all residents is a vital component of that standard.

Our city's affordable housing and homelessness crisis did not evolve overnight. I recognize a fiscally responsible and compassionate response to this human rights crisis will also not occur overnight. That said, I am uncomfortable valuing one homeless sub-group over another by choosing which folks receive assistance sooner. I do agree with the Federal and local focus to end Veteran homelessness, as well as secure stable living environments for families with children, unaccompanied youth, and those with chronic health conditions as soon as possible. However, when you do not also prioritize the needs of seemingly more capable homeless women and men, many will eventually present as the more difficult to treat chronically homeless do now. When resources are allocated for 24 hour year round access to shelter and affordable housing for all residents in a manner that ensures human rights adherence, there is a positive long-term impact not just to government fiscal planning, but to actual human lives.

If, as a country and city, we continue increased funding to certain homeless sub-groups, then I contend that women need to be included as a vulnerable group. Women living on the streets and in shelters operating without 24 hour access are at an extremely high risk for sexual victimization. In addition, the lack of privacy on the streets and in shelters can feel extremely violating to women with sexual assault and child abuse histories in ways that trigger post trauma stress. There are female victims of sexual abuse that report incidents to authorities, but will never speak publicly to bring voice to the often inadequate safeguards necessary for feeling safe, protected, and living a life without shame-a life that not only is valued by others, but the woman herself. There are also women that will not only refrain from reporting abuse to law enforcement, but will never tell those closest to them. It is vital that we instill as many societal safeguards as possible into the fabric of community housing design and service delivery to protect a vulnerable population, many of whom you may never know you encounter. I hope for a positive shift not only in how we address an affordable housing and homelessness crisis, but how we value all human life. In doing that we honor the rights of both vocal and silent human needs-the value of which is the same.

A five year response to end long-term homelessness is too long. I was only homeless for one year. However, I presented with post trauma stress with coping through disengagement posing challenges to service access and successful society reintegration. I exhibited symptoms described by some military personnel returning from active war duty. I did not survive a war, but the emotional toll of what I endured

Carol Dostert 2016-2020 Five Year Consolidated Plan Testimony
August 21, 2015

caused internal battle scars. I needed to relearn how to be in and of a world I no longer could relate to or feel at ease in. It was vital to my reintegration efforts that I secured housing that met my physical and emotional needs to ease my transition to living inside, increasing positive social interaction, and performing daily activities I still felt disconnected from or increased anxiety performing. That did not happen. My relearning continues today.

I was one of yours as a special educator of DC Public Schools most vulnerable students. I was one of yours when I became a vulnerable DC resident myself after job and health insurance loss following an auto accident. I was one of yours when the DC Government failed to offer disability accommodations during an attempted return to work. I was one of yours as a victimized woman without sufficient police and legal assistance. I was one of yours when US Marshals and my landlord escorted me out of my home without the opportunity to complete the DC Administrative Hearing process prior to eviction. I was one of yours as a traumatized homeless woman without healthy emergency shelter. I remain one of yours as a low-income Ward 8 resident without affordable housing that meets my disability/medical needs. I am one of yours.

Based on my experiences prior to and while homeless, as well as my difficulty securing healthy, affordable housing I recommend the following for your consideration:

- Adoption and implementation of housing and service delivery whereby 24 hour year round access to habitable, healthy, safe, ADA compliant shelter and affordable housing promoting independence, inclusion, dignity, and respect for all residents is a human right;
- Support for a *Housing First* philosophy adoption for all District residents currently homeless, not just for those with diagnosed mental illness;
- Include women as a vulnerable sub-group with high priority for housing, including homeless prevention efforts and an expedited path to safe, private housing;
- Development of small, healthy, and well maintained therapeutic homeless shelters, with stays lasting no more than 60 days, for both families and singles with easy accessibility to services, education/training opportunities, work, community involvement and recreation;
- Immediate current shelter conditions improvement in physical structures and service implementation;
- Increase homeless medical respite beds and broaden admission criteria beyond surgical recovery to include individuals released from ER treatment with residual health symptoms posing increased risk of victimization;
- Increase and maintain available affordable rental housing stock, including larger, multi-bedroom units for families;
- Increase healthy, accessible, safe, and affordable housing options for residents at the 0-30% AMI threshold;
- Adequate affordable, LEED certified housing development of well maintained properties for residents of all AMI levels w/developers and landlords that provide for disability and human rights needs;
- Adequately trained and supervised government personnel conducting timely, ethical, and legal inspections/investigations promoting healthy living environments and landlord accountability (including during DCRA ProA division inspections with housing code violations that may interfere with the sale of a property);
- Increase opportunities for low-income resident home ownership;
- Property developer, investor, philanthropic and community at-large involvement for the support, design, and funding contribution for city infrastructure and neighborhoods that are inclusive to all residents, including our homeless neighbors and those with chronic health impairments caused by or exasperated by housing and/or community conditions; and
- End long-term homelessness prior to 2020 without compromising quality and sustainability.

Thank you for your service and the consideration of my comments and recommendations.



**Anacostia
Economic
Development
Corporation** 1800 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue, SE Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20020
(202) 889-5100
FAX (202) 889-9508

"Serving the Community Since 1969"

**TESTIMONY
of the
ANACOSTIA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
for the
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
FY-2016
Citizen Participation Plan
District of Columbia Consolidated Plan
HUD Federal Entitlement Grants
Plan Amendment and Performance Reports**

Submitted By

**Stanley Jackson
President & CEO**

August 13, 2015

Good Evening. My name is Stanley Jackson, and I am the President and CEO of the Anacostia Economic Development Corporation (AEDC). As you know AEDC is a Community Development Corporation (CDC) that has served the District of Columbia, specifically the far southeast communities, continuously for over forty-five (45) years. During this period AEDC, in concert with the District of Columbia government, has undertaken, and completed numerous affordable housing, commercial, office space, storefront facade improvement and neighborhood improvement projects and programs to revitalize neighborhoods, promote community development and provide economic opportunities. The vast majority of these efforts utilized Federal Entitlement Grants, in part, as a source of funding.

The federal requirement for the District's allocation and use of such federal funds involves the development and submission of a Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) and Annual Action Plan for each year's proposed activities. Additionally, the DC Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is required to conduct a Public Hearing to solicit input from the public as to a "Needs Assessment" for the various activities funded by the program. It is this assessment process to which I would like to direct my comments. AEDC, for the past several years, has implemented two (2) very important program efforts funded by Federal Entitlement Grants within our service area.

The first is the DHCD funded Small Business Assistance Program (SBAP). This effort is administered and implemented by AEDC's Business Development Center (BDC) staff, which provides technical assistance, training and one-on-one business

counseling to District residents who either currently operate a small business, or wish to launch a small business in our neighborhoods and communities.

AEDC's understanding of the diverse and transitional nature of our neighborhoods, the significance of new investments and reinvestments in our neighborhoods and commercial corridors, the influxes in population and increases in the costs of housing accommodations and commercial properties, has led AEDC to direct services to businesses that support community and economic development and provide employment opportunities for District residents.

Each year with the support of DHCD's SBAP effort, our Business Development Center (BDC) staff provide assistance and counseling to over one hundred (100) District residents and businesses, conduct 12 -14 training/ workshop events and assist 8-10 businesses receive District or federal small business certifications. AEDC's BDC efforts also support the creation and retention of jobs within the District, and has facilitated in the infusion of investment capital into the District's small business community, resulting in a positive impact upon the District's tax revenues.

The second AEDC program that is supported by DHCD with Federal Entitlement Grants is our participation in the Storefront Facade Improvement Program (SFIP). Over the past several years AEDC has participated in DHCD's Façade Improvement Program. This program makes funds available to the owners of properties located within neighborhood commercial corridors to make improvements in their respective properties by enhancing the appearance of these properties and improving the environment for the delivery of quality goods and services to the

residents and clients serviced by these economically challenged neighborhoods. The focus of the program effort has been on corner commercial units and “commercial nodes” within neighborhood corridors which result in the highest programmatic impact, and best use of the funding resource.

Under the SFIP, AEDC has completed an average of 10-13 facades per year and has generated a matching investment of twenty-five (25%) percent of the federal expenditure from the property and/or business owners. This program has significantly enhanced the physical appearance of our storefronts and has had a positive impact with regards to the commerce of our neighborhood commercial corridors.

As the transition of our East-Of-The River neighborhoods and communities increase in momentum, brought about by increased new investments, reinvestments and changing demographics; it will be of critical importance that DHCD maintain such programs and increase their levels of funding availability to allow existing residents and small and local businesses to participate in this economic resurgence. In the acknowledgement of the importance of DHCD sponsored federal entitlement grant funded programs; AEDC is of the firm belief that in order for DHCD to successfully address its mission to create a more inclusive city; to ensure that economic opportunities are experienced by all our residents and to improve the quality of life for current and future residents of the District of Columbia; the federal entitlement grants must be maintained, and citizen participation and involvement in their planning must be prioritized.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on such an important aspect of DHCD's mission.