



City of Madison Meeting Minutes - Final

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

INCLUSIONARY ZONING ADVISORY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Friday, October 20, 2006

8:00 AM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

ROLL CALL

Present: Brenda K. Konkel, Lauren Cnare, Curtis V. Brink, Natalie L. Bock, Brian A. Munson, Marianne S. Morton, Marsha A. Rummel and Alex Saloutos

Excused: Nan Fey, Thomas E. Hirsch and Matthew T. Miller

Others present: Carol Schaeffer, Dave Simon, Hickory Hurie

CALL TO ORDER

Morton called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from October 6, October 10 and October 13 were approved.

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE HOUSING MARKET STUDY

04735

SUBSTITUTE - Accepting the Inclusionary Zoning Advisory Oversight Committee recommendation regarding a consultant for the Housing Market Study, authorizing the use of certain City funds to match a private donation for the study, and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into a contract for professional services from the chosen consultant.

Rummel described the subcommittee's work in reviewing the 5 proposals, selecting three groups to interview, and recommending the following:

Division of the study into two, hire The Taurean Group to conduct the quantitative housing market component, and to issue a second RFP for the perception/preference research.

Munson summarized the conclusion of the subcommittee in noting that The Taurean Group appeared to focus on the data, addressed the issue of preconceptions, and indicated a willingness to present their findings on a demographic and geographic arrangements.

The Committee will update the Plan Commission on the issues of content and timing after a subcommittee discussion scheduled for November 3.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Munson, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: Fey, Hirsch and Miller

Aye: Konkel, Cnare, Brink, Bock, Munson, Morton, Rummel and Saloutos

DISCUSSION ON REFINEMENT OF DESIRED OUTCOMES REGARDING THE MARKET STUDY

The Committee then discussed the desired attributes and focus issues for the outcome of the quantitative study: Subcommittee members noted that the major issues arising from the interview questions involved the selection of data sets regarding the housing stock (MLS or Assessor data) and the demographic description of the households beyond the basics of income, size, race, and age group into a more nuanced segmentation that would help the Committee revise the policies and improve the marketing efforts.

** The research on the housing stock should consider the effect of condo fees (on the for-sale side) and utility costs (on the rental side) on "affordability" consistent with the ordinance.*

** The study should help the committee relate a description of housing stock to people, sales activity, and future supply (housing permits).*

** The study should help us understand the pattern of housing stock sales and rentals, in and out of the city, since one of the goals is to provide housing for those younger households that are now moving out of the city due to the unavailability of supply.*

** We need to know how many people income-qualify for the program at different possible (area median income) AMI levels; and need to know this with regard to Madison as distinct from the MSA that includes parts of three counties.*

** A base question is: If a household of particular size and income wants to buy, what are their opportunities within the City? (and in which areas are there opportunities?) What is this mismatch between demand and supply? Are we targeting the right group for the IZ program?*

** While one of the key issues about the 'unmet need' is the role of credit worthiness among the potential buyers/renters, this appears to be a question that may not be within the scope of the study. Hence, it may be helpful to look at the characteristics of the current buyers in the income rangers, and their segmentation by income, size, race, and location of what they are buying.*

** What period of time are we looking at? Some indication that the last year is different, so need to look at longer previous trend patterns, such as 3 and 5 years.*

** We need to know whether the housing product is 'affordable' and 'available.'*

** What are people in these income groups actually buying/renting?*

** School district data may be useful to look at current economic patterns and to relate our discussion back to one of the drivers in the formation of the IZ ordinance, the impact of economically segregated housing on school performance.*

The Committee discussed the extension of the life and charge of the Subcommittee of Munson, Rummel and Konkell to oversee the definition of scope with the recommended consultant group. Others expressed interest and may be present but will not count toward the official quorum.

Bock moved and Munson seconded a motion to charge the original group of 3 members to oversee the definition of scope regarding the market study. The Committee voted unanimously to adopt the motion.

UPDATED REGARDING THE GAP ANALYSIS

Munson updated the committee on his work in calibrating the two alternative gap analysis methods to the same project. The current example appears to move in opposite directions given the same assumptions. He will test the models against other project types and report back to the Committee at the next meeting.

REVIEW OF IZ POLICIES

The Committee reviewed the major changes in the policies document suggested by staff. These include the deletion of the asset test, a change in the down payment assumption from 5% to 0%, and the establishment of building standards for the existing units offered off-site in lieu of on-site units.

The Committee discussed the deletion of the asset test. It currently limits the available pool of buyers, and places some burden for compliance on some developers. Some members expressed a concern about the provision of public support for households that have sufficient private resources, while others suggested that those with assets would be more likely to seek non-IZ units.

Simon moved and Brink seconded a motion to delete the asset test. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Munson moved and Bock seconded a motion to suggest a post occupancy survey that would look at the assets of IZ participants. The motion was then withdrawn by both.

Bock moved and Rummel seconded a motion to suggest that the CD Office review the Committee's preference for asset information on IZ buyers and advise the Committee at a later date on the method of collection. Hurie indicated that this could be part of a broader 'customer satisfaction' survey similar to that currently provided to participants in the American Dream Downpayment Program. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

SCHEDULE AND AGENDA FOR THE NEXT MEETING AND TOPICS FOR FUTURE COMMITTEE WORK

The Committee established three items for its next agenda:

- 1) Continuation of the discussion on IZ policies*
- 2) Update and possible review of the gap analysis methods*
- 3) Discussion on the indicators of success*

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 9:35.

*Respectfully submitted,
Hickory Hurie, recorder*