

City of Madison

Ad Hoc Housing Merger Committee Final Report

Submitted to Mayor Dave Cieslewicz and County Executive Kathleen Falk

September 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee would like to acknowledge all of the members who served including:

Co-Chair Alder Tim Bruer
Co-Chair Judith Wilcox
Carousel Bayrd
Mayor Joe Chase
Nan Cnare
Perry Ecton
Rachel Krinsky
Howard Mandeville
Denise Matyka
Harry Miles
Marianne Morton
Kevin O'Driscoll
Steve Schooler

The Committee would also like to express its appreciation to:

City of Madison Planning and Housing Authority Staff:

Tom Conrad, Lisa Daniels, Brad Murphy, Agustin Olvera

and

Dane County Planning and Housing Authority Staff:

Carolyn Parham, Todd Violante

and

Mayoral staff: Ray Harmon

for their work on this report.

Mayor's Charge to the Group:

- Address the need for additional assisted housing
- Address the dispersion throughout Dane County to:
 - Ensure that residents have increased housing opportunities
 - To alleviate pockets of poverty throughout Dane County
- Consider merger of existing Housing Authorities

Key Activities of the Group:

- Examined merger options
 - Report from City Attorney
 - Review of Fair Share Housing Plans
- Review of Existing Public Housing Units in City and County
- Review of Section 8 program
 - Similarities between city and county
 - Differences
 - Options for merger, improved coordination
- Mapping of existing assisted housing
 - Within City
 - County-wide
 - Mapped different categories
 - Compared with other urban and quasi-urban communities
- Analysis of mapping
 - Existing Dispersion
 - Constraints and opportunities for improved dispersion
- Existing cooperation and collaboration between CDA and DCHA
- Considered opportunities for improved coordination

Conclusions of the Group:

Charge #1: Need for Additional Assisted Housing

- The committee did not do an independent Needs Assessment, but it did review the prior Dane County Affordable Housing Trust Fund Subcommittee who in 2008 did an assessment and affirmed the shortage of assisted housing

Charge #2: Dispersion of Housing

- Dispersion within the City of Madison
 - Assisted housing within Madison has adequate dispersion, especially compared to other urban settings.
 - Review of the map in the final report affirms that dispersion.
- Dispersion County-wide:
 - Dispersion between city and county compares well, especially given the transportation access issues that exist outside of Madison, and based on the job concentration in Madison.
 - The committee did analyze the disbursement among the county communities outside of Madison but makes no recommendations at this time, due to the varying local administrative rules and operating procedures of the various towns and cities within Dane County.
 - Review of data shows dispersion in most categories is representative between City of Madison and the rest of Dane County.
 - Where it is not (ie public housing) the history of funding and decisions was reviewed
 - Data analysis follows (details of this are in the more lengthy report)

Category	Population	Section 8	Section 42 all	Section 42 elderly	CBRF	Public Housing	Other Subsidized	Total:
Madison	46%	58%	47%	41%	48%	79%	67%	57%
Rest of Dane Co.	54%	42%	53%	59%	52%	21%	33%	43%

Charge #3: Merger of Entities:

- Based on the City Attorney opinion, the laws do not provide for a true merger and the joint exercise of powers through one board. Therefore this was not an option for committee consideration.
- The laws do allow one housing authority to designate another as its agent for specific projects and exercise its powers.
 - The transfer of the public housing from City to County would be a major increase in transfer of ownership and one requiring public discussion and consideration.
 - The Section 8 program could be transferred to the broader geographic entity.
 - Advantages:
 - The programs are very similar in most respects
 - Disadvantages:
 - There are different application requirements; the County has no local preference and the City has residency preference
- The city and County could establish a formal agreement to work together and retain separate boards of Directors and further work toward improved coordinated service delivery and seamless collaboration. This is the option being recommended by the committee at this time.
 - The committee reviewed the shared efforts that have increased significantly over the past years, including;
 - Joint training, incl. with landlord associations
 - Joint application for Family Unification Program Funding
 - Joint application to HUD for Family Self Sufficiency Program
 - Joint marketing
 - Parallel administrative plans
 - Joint monitoring of Section 8 programs to use allotted budget authority.
 - The committee further recommends;
 - Developing one application form that can be completed and shared between entities, even if it includes some items that are applicable only to one.
 - The agencies should share that application, as requested by applicant, to avoid duplicative application processes.

PURPOSE

In April of 2008, Mayor Dave Cieslewicz proposed exploring the idea of a Merger of the Housing Authorities as a Strategy to develop a Regional Approach to Assisted Housing. The idea was to 1) try and address the need for additional Assisted Housing, defined as low-income and special needs housing, and 2) it's dispersion throughout Dane County. He suggested that a merger of the existing Housing Authorities administered by the Community Development Authority (CDA) and the Dane County Housing Authority (DCHA) might be an appropriate strategy and should be examined. Again, with the intent of ensuring that the residents in Dane County have increased housing opportunities and to alleviate pockets of poverty throughout Dane County.

In November of 2008 Mayor Cieslewicz, County Executive Falk and the Common Council created the Ad Hoc Housing Merger Planning Committee. The Committee was charged with assessing the merger option including short-term and long-term goals for a possibly combined City and County Housing Authority and developing recommendations for a Regional Assisted Housing approach. . The Committee was asked to produce preliminary recommendations by August 2009 if there were any budget implications and a Final Report by December 31, 2009.

The City Attorney has indicated that under the State Statutes (SS 66.1211(9)(g) and 66.0311) “the laws do not provide for a true merger and the joint exercise of powers through one board. The laws do allow one housing authority to designate another as its agent for such projects and to exercise its powers for the benefit of the first agency.”

MERGER OPTIONS

In order to examine the idea of a merger of the Housing Authorities as a strategy toward a Regional Assisted Housing Approach, the Merger Committee raised many questions. The Committee felt that they first needed some baseline information. In particular they wanted to know the inventory of assisted housing and where it was located. City and County housing authority and planning staff were made available to gather the information requested. In beginning the examination of the merger question, the Committee received a memo from the City Attorney's Office which raised concern about a merger option. (See Attachment A Merger memo from City Attorney)

The City of Madison City Attorney, Michael May, issued a memo on the legal issues and options of merging the City and County Housing Authorities. Under Wisconsin State Statutes, the City could authorize the County to work within the boundaries of the City. The County currently has agreements with 5 other Dane County municipalities to operate within their jurisdictions. The City could also do the same but currently does not.

The CDA has 886 Public Housing units while the County has only 86 units, so it would be a very big increase in what they currently manage. The CDA manages their units with approximately 21 City employees. If these positions were lost most might be able to bump into other City positions. A private management company might prove less costly in running Public Housing as city wages and benefits are higher than the private sector. The County contracts the management of its 86 Public Housing units to a property management company and would likely continue this approach. A disadvantage to this is that the private sector is geared more toward simple leasing and property maintenance. The population of the City's Public Housing has many social support needs. The CDA, through its staff has taken an approach to work in support of its residents. It has also established administrative procedures to protect and give “second chance opportunities” to its residents. The Triangle Site

(West Washington and Park St) has 339 units, of which 90%+ are disabled residents, most with mental health issues. Most private sector management companies are not set up to work with this population.

The City could also turn over its Section 8 Program to the County. An advantage would be that there would only be one application to fill out and one Wait List. There is also a small percentage of voucher holders who do transfer between jurisdictions and so transfers would not be necessary. And although the programs are nearly identical there are some differences. An example is that the CDA has a City residency preference so City of Madison residents are prioritized and anyone residing outside of Dane County never gets to the top of the Wait List and so never receive assistance. The County has no local preference and so applicants outside of Dane County do make it to the top of their Wait List and have received assistance. If the County were to run the City's program the City would have less control over these types of policy choices.

The City and the County could also establish a formal agreement to work together however they would still need to retain separate boards of directors. In 1979 the CDA and DCHA have had an agreement to allow up to 35 disabled DCHA Section 8 program participants needing accessible housing units, to reside in the City, yet remain in DCHA's program, eliminating any port requirements. That number was originally 20 but was increased to 35. This agreement remains in place today. Other agreements similar to this could be created as needed for the benefit of program participants.

A combined City County Housing Authority (similar to the City-County Health Department) with a single board is not allowed under state statutes. The City Attorney has indicated that under the State Statutes (SS 66.1211(9)(g) and 66.0311) "the laws do not provide for a true merger and the joint exercise of powers through one board. The laws do allow one housing authority to designate another as its agent for such projects and to exercise its powers for the benefit of the first agency."

The idea of merging the Housing Authorities has been brought up before. It is one of several departments the City and County have considered combining. The Public Health Departments, were the last departments to merge. Human Resources, Information Technology, and Parks are a few who have been mentioned as possibilities for further discussion. It was noted that mergers do not necessarily produce cost savings. More often improvements in service delivery are being sought or anticipated.

Based on the City Attorney's memo, there was some discussion about trying to change the state statute, or having one housing authority absorb the other. However, since the State Statutes seemed to rule out a merger option, the question quickly turned more towards examining the working relationship of the two authorities and the possibilities for improved service delivery.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF ASSISTED HOUSING

The term Assisted Housing is a term that this report uses that includes Low Rent Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8), private for profit and not for profit low income (elderly and family) and special needs (disabled) housing.

The City Of Madison has the highest number of Assisted Housing Units in the County. There are many reasons for this. Much of the Assisted Housing has been built with the assistance of federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME funds. CDBG funds have been available to the City since the 1970's however they were not available to the County until 1999. HOME Funds too had been available to the City for several years prior to their availability to the County. Nationally, there was an emphasis on funding housing programs

for urban areas. There were some “rural housing development programs” available to counties, that were not available to the cities, as was the case here, but generally at lower funding levels, so not as much rural housing was developed.

The Community Development Authority (CDA) on behalf of the City of Madison pursued funding to construct elderly and family Low Rent Public Housing. It was able to develop almost 900 units of Public Housing before HUD began to pull back from Public Housing in the late 1990’s. The CDA was then successful in getting over 1600 Section 8 Voucher allocations by the early 2000’s.

At the same time that this was going on, disability rights advocates were successfully promoting that persons with disabilities should have housing choices in the general community instead of institutional settings. This was particularly true in Dane County, which was viewed as a national model for its work with disabled persons. Through this approach, many disabled persons chose housing located in the City of Madison. This issue then triggered the government and private sector to respond with a variety of programs including housing. With the need in Madison, and the services and programs in Madison, it was logical that housing for this population to be located in Madison.

Public Housing has also served many persons with disabilities. This influx into Public Housing resulted in an exodus of elderly residents. Many older persons were enticed into new private sector developments. Private Sector developers were building new elderly housing with more space and more amenities than Public Housing was able to provide.

Another influencing factor has been urban flight from the largest urban communities like Chicago, Milwaukee and Minneapolis. Economic and social turmoil in large urban areas created a flight to secondary urban areas like Madison. The availability of jobs, better schools, social services, and connections with family and friends drew many to Madison, again triggering a government and private sector response of programs and housing.

Transportation has also been another crucial factor affecting the concentration of affordable housing alternatives in Madison. There has been limited public transportation to many of Dane County’s communities. This then meant that many people moving to this area were limited in their choice of where to live. Many ended up in Madison in close proximity to bus lines to meet their transportation needs. Those communities without public transportation were not an option for many. People will travel over some length and distance as long as transportation is available but in Dane County this is not always possible unless you have a car. While many persons have originally located in Madison because of jobs, schools or proximity to family and friends, that dynamic is changing. As the transportation systems have improved and as more job centers developed and as people have improved their financial status, there has been some migration out of Madison. A regional public transportation system will aide immensely in furthering the choice people have in housing. This will aid the dispersion of Assisted Housing programs like the Section 8 program where people can move with their voucher. This would also aid developers of Assisted Housing by increasing site selection opportunities.

Transportation has also been another crucial factor affecting the concentration of affordable housing alternatives in Madison.

LOCAL EXPERIENCE IN THE DISPERSION OF ASSISTED HOUSING

The Committee has verified that the City of Madison has -wide_ dispersion of Assisted Housing within the City.

The City's Planning staff has for several years compiled data on Assisted Housing to monitor the effects of the Fair Share Housing Plan. This Plan was developed in 1981 to encourage the reduction of concentrations of Assisted Housing that had developed in some neighborhoods on Madison's south and east sides.

The City map (see attachment B Map 1 Distribution of All 2008 Assisted Housing in City of Madison) show a good geographic dispersion of Assisted Housing, throughout the City. It must be noted that much of the Assisted Housing are rental units and therefore must be located in areas where zoning requirements allow for rental properties. In examining maps or charts the reader may note areas, census tracts, or aldermanic districts with low numbers or percentages of Assisted Housing. One of the reasons for this are the fact that the properties in these areas may not be zoned for rental housing, or have small percentages of rental units available or that high property values do not make these areas affordable for the development of this type of housing. The City of Madison maps presented to the Committee were plotted on transparent overlays. When presented in this fashion it was very clear to see that within the City of Madison there was a good distribution of Assisted Housing.

The Dane County Planning staff presented a map to the committee pinpointing the locations of affordable/assisted housing units dispersed throughout Dane County. A comprehensive table was prepared listing the municipalities, affordable housing types (public housing, other subsidized, Section 8, etc), and number of units in each community. See Attachment C.

It shows the distribution in each community by program area. This Chart contains some categories of assistance not classified as Assisted Housing. Residential Care, Group Homes Adult Family Homes were not classified as Assisted Housing for purposes of comparison in the Summary Comparison of Assisted Housing (See Attachment D Summary of Assisted Housing)

It should be acknowledged that "a good distribution" is a subjective measurement. In 1981 the Fair Share Plan proposed to have a numerically equal distribution of Assisted Housing in 18 "districts" in the City. In this report it was reported that the City had 1,194 Assisted Housing units with Plans for another 913 to be added.

In the 1993 Fair Share Plan Update Report the notion of numerically equal distribution was revised to a proportional distribution. At that time Assisted Housing was 2.8% of the total housing in Madison. It was then recommended that 2.8% be the goal for equal distribution in the 18 Planning districts. By then the number of Assisted units nearly doubled to 2231, an increase of 1037 units. Based on 2000 Census tract information there were 92,394 housing units with 5,782 (a 2008 figure) Assisted Housing units or 6.3% as a percent of total housing (See Attachment E Table 5 Total Housing Units and Subsidized/Assisted Housing Units by 2000 Census Tract, revised in 2008). Currently the U.S. Census Bureau estimates Madison's total households at 95,296. Planning staff currently estimate an Assisted Housing count of approximately 6,743 or 7%.

The City was able to use its Fair Share Housing Plan in influencing the siting of some Assisted Housing developments. The CDA developed a number of Public Housing units on Madison's far west side as a direct result of the Fair Share Plan and Housing Diversity Strategies (See Attachment F City of Madison Fair Share Housing Plan 1981 and Attachment G Statement of Housing Diversity 1990). There were, however, several factors beyond the control of the City that also influenced Assisted Housing locations. As outlined earlier, HUD, put more funding into the Section 8 voucher program which gave more people choice and did not allow for putting people into specific geographic locations. Also market forces limited the feasibility of building in

some “underrepresented” areas. While the City and County do not have perfect numerical or proportional distribution, the Committee felt the City and County do have overall a “good distribution”. (See Attachment H 2008 Section 8 Housing Vouchers Dane County and Attachment I Map 3 Distribution of 2008 Section 8 Tenant Based Voucher Sites in the City of Madison).

The Committee felt that the County had some distribution of its Assisted Housing but that it was concentrated in a small number of communities, and that more communities in the County needed to develop Assisted Housing. This idea was outlined in the 1981 Fair Share Plan and then again in the 1993 Update which stated “Ideally, fair share housing plans should be prepared on a regional basis.” Future fair-share analyses should include an analysis of location patterns of assisted and non assisted housing both in the City of Madison and throughout developing and rural areas of the County.”

COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE HOUSING AUTHORITIES

Both Housing Authorities had cordial working relationships but generally operated independently of each other. In the period 2000 to 2003 things changed as personnel changed, and as both Housing Authorities experienced difficulties in getting Section 8 Vouchers out into use in their respective communities. A Section 8 Advisory Committee was formed and engaged both agencies in working with Landlords, the Apartment Association of South Central Wisconsin and various social service agencies working in housing, to address issues related to the underutilization of Section 8 vouchers. This issue through this Committee brought the two Housing Authorities together to work on a common problem. Over approximately a year’s time, the issue was addressed and proved valuable in bringing the two Housing Authorities together to work more cooperatively and in coordination.

In April 2002, Mayor Sue Bauman sent a memo to the CDA on the subject of a CDA/DCHA Consolidated Discussion Work Group. The memo outlines a request for the two agencies to look at ways in which they might work together, in the hopes of improving both housing authorities’ service delivery. In response CDA and DCHA staff met, to discuss and then implement activities to improve service delivery and foster more cooperative efforts between the two agencies. The Merger Committee reviewed these efforts, going back to 2000 and up to 2009. It was very satisfied with the level of cooperation that has developed and the joint activities between the two Housing Authorities. This cooperation and coordination has led to the sharing of resources and an increase in the number of vouchers (100) and HUD dollars (\$660,000) coming to the City and Dane County in 2009.

The Merger Committee reviewed these efforts, going back to 2000 up to 2009, and was very satisfied with the level of cooperation that has developed and the joint activities between the two Housing Authorities.

Below is a summary of some efforts carried out by CDA and DCHA. The information below are excerpts from the report to then Mayor Bauman.

A. Adopting common policies concerning eligibility, housing preferences, mobility, payment plans and landlord relations

1) Eligibility and Preferences

HUD’s eligibility requirements are adhered to by both agencies, however CDA has a local preference while DCHA does not.

2) Mobility

CDA and DCHA — Both agencies follow HUD procedures for portability between jurisdictions.

3) Payment Plans

CDA and DCHA — Both agencies offer a repayment agreement in lieu of termination..

4) Landlord Relations

CDA and DCHA — Both participate and financially sponsor landlord training conducted by the Apartment Association of South-Central Wisconsin. Both agencies maintain vacancy listings to help voucher holders find participating landlords. Both agencies provide HAP payment by direct deposit and both agencies provide substantial information for landlords on their websites. The CDA also has one half-time staff person dedicated to Landlord Marketing and Outreach and serve as an “ombudsman” to address landlord/tenant issues. The CDA was able to increase its landlord participation by over 100 landlords in 2003. Today over 500 landlords continue their participation in the program.

In 2002 both agencies saw up to 25% of voucher recipients return their vouchers unused. Usually it was because they could not find a landlord who would rent to them. Currently it is very uncommon, at both agencies, for a voucher not to be used.

B. Combining waiting lists for Low Rent Public Housing and Section 8

It is a requirement that separate wait lists for Low Rent Public Housing, Section 8, Section 8 New Construction (Parkside and Karabis Apts), and Project Based Vouchers be maintained. Applicants can apply to all, but separate wait lists must be maintained. Section 8 income eligibility is lower (no more than 50% of median income) than Public Housing (no more than 80% of median income) and some Public Housing is restricted to a certain demographic such as elderly or disabled. Some Project Based vouchers allocated to agencies partnering with the CDA are also restricted to serve the special needs clients of those agencies (Porchlight, Independent Living and Housing Initiatives). For these reasons a single combined wait list is not possible. The CDA Public Housing Wait List has never been closed. DCHA Contracts out the management of its Public Housing Program including its Wait List. Currently the DCHA Public Housing waiting lists for family units is closed.

CDA and DCHA — The Section 8 Wait Lists of both are currently closed. DCHA took applications for a 2-month period from September to October of 2007 and CDA for the month of November 2007. Each received interest from over 2,000 households. The CDA conducted a pre-application process and then drew names in a lottery system. It is estimated that the current listing is good for several years for both CDA and DCHA

C. Establishing a centrally located service center to allow, “one-stop shopping” for prospective clients of CDA and DCHA

The CDA and DCHA offices are centrally located and readily accessible to City and County residents by public transportation. Public Housing applications are available by mail and can also be downloaded from the CDA and DCHA websites. Public Housing applications are also at the Housing Help Desk at the Job Center on Aberg Ave, each of the CDA and DCHA Site Offices and many Social Services agencies. The CDA and DCHA’s outreach efforts have made it very easy to find out about and apply for assistance from many locations. The CDA and DCHA also frequently refer applicants to each other.

D. Purchasing goods such as information services and capital improvements for public housing

CDA and DCHA — Each agency benefits from the purchasing power of their associated governmental bodies (city, state and federal contracts). Both agencies use Dane County Printing and Services. The CDA, because of its much larger Public Housing program, does more purchasing and contracting than DCHA so there is not much chance for cooperative purchasing for the Public Housing programs. CDA and DCHA have purchased services cooperatively under their Section 8 Programs. Consultant costs were shared for a grant application in which both were awarded funding. Both are looking at a new Self Sufficiency Program initiative where costs and workload which involve not only the CDA and DCHA, but also two other community agencies. The CDA and DCHA have a good track record of cooperating and costs sharing and anticipate a continuation of this effort.

E. Collaborating on internal staff services such as sharing HQS inspectors, housing counseling and joint training of internal staff

HUD increasingly relies on Webcasts to provide training via the Internet. Agency staff can view and participate in training remotely. CDA and DCHA have shared the costs of such web training, with staff going to the others offices for these trainings. The program administration and the workload levels of each authority are very similar. The sharing of staff like HQS inspectors would not gain any efficiencies in that the workloads/caseloads are large enough that reductions in staff levels are not practical. Both staffs have worked closely together and share information and advise each other on program questions and concerns. They also communicate very well when participants transfer (known as porting) from one jurisdiction to another. Each has agency has a designated “port” staff who work closely with each other to coordinate efforts and minimize any problems in this transfer.

F. Collaborating in housing development, including joint applications to HUD and investigating whether the creation of a non-profit for developing affordable housing would further each agency’s long-term goals

CDA and DCHA did collaborate and hired a consultant to prepare a Family Unification Program (FUP) grant application that could be used for both agencies. Staff met jointly with Dane County Human Services in preparing our application. We were both awarded 50 new vouchers (100 total) valued at approximately \$630,000. CDA and DCHA were one of only 17 communities in the nation to receive this grant and the only ones in Wisconsin. The FUP program is a special grant program available to Housing Authorities that allocates vouchers specifically to families involved in Foster Care. The Housing Authorities are required to partner with their local Human Services Department running the Foster Care program.

In recent years the CDA has undertaken significant development projects within the City of Madison (Monona Shores Apartments, Villager Mall, Allied Drive Apartments, Monona Shores Condominiums). The CDA is also in the beginning stages of the Redevelopment of the Truax Park Apartments Public Housing site. There is also a proposal to develop Senior Housing in the Burr Oaks neighborhood on Madison’s south side.

DCHA has been instrumental in helping to preserve and provide affordable housing throughout the County by using its bond authority. Developer’s use of tax-exempt bonds issued by DCHA has resulted in the preservation and/or creation of over 300 units of affordable housing. The units are located in Middleton, Sun Prairie, McFarland, and Madison. DCHA created the Dane County Development Group, a not for profit corporation designed to undertake development projects in Dane County.

Additionally, DCHA has been instrumental in the development of affordable housing by giving a grant and issuing project-based vouchers to the Uplands development in Sun Prairie. DCHA also provided a short-term

loan to Habitat for Humanity to assist in the development of their condominium project in the Fiedler Lane-Eric Circle area of South Madison. Currently DCHA is involved in the acquisition of three (3) properties located in Stoughton, Verona, and DeForest. The successful purchase of these properties (55 units) will increase DCHA owned properties to 158 units.

G. Developing a joint or single Section 8 Homeownership Program for Madison and Dane County

The CDA and DCHA jointly developed administrative plans, policies and procedures to implement their Section 8 Homeownership programs. They are for the most part, identical. DCHA provides the first-time homebuyer education required by HUD for both agencies. To date, CDA has subsidized homeownership for 17 families and DCHA has provided 159 First Time Home Buyer Down Payment Assistance loans and have eight (8) Section 8 Homeownership participants.

H. Additional Efforts

Section 8 Utilization – The CDA and DCHA have to closely monitor their Section 8 programs in order to utilize their allotted budget authority. It is hard to project accurately what the actual expenses will be as housing assistance to households can change as their incomes change and rents change. The attrition rate (people coming off the program) can also vary. Both agencies need to try maximize use of their budget authority as HUD may reduce it if not used. They also need to be careful not to overspend. The CDA and DCHA have for several years worked closely with each other to assist each other in monitoring their budgets and maximizing their utilization. They have worked closely managing their porting (transfer) process which can help to make quick adjustments and help to keep each other in balance.

Administrative Plans for Section 8 —In 2007 DCHA updated its Housing Choice Voucher Program (Section 8) Administrative Plan because CDA and DCHA are using the same format, the Administrative Plans are nearly identical in content, very similarly organized and easy to read and compare. The Boards of each would need to meet to reconcile some of the minor policy differences. (e.g. The CDA has a City of Madison residency preference. DCHA does not have a similar Dane County residency preference.)

Marketing/Public Relations — CDA and DCHA — Both agencies had problems with landlords not wanting to participate in the Section 8 program. In 2002, twenty five percent (25%) of those households receiving vouchers could not find landlords who would rent to them. Many landlords simply did not want to participate in the program. Also the rental market was very tight. The CDA and DCHA worked closely with the Apartment Association of South Central Wisconsin to market the program to landlords. This had a dramatic affect and increased the numbers of landlords who would accept vouchers in 2003. In addition, since then, the City and County passed ordinances protecting vouchers holders and the rental market has loosened up. The incidents of voucher holders not being able to find someone to rent to them are very small, less than one percent (1 %).

Both agencies conduct joint, ongoing marketing with/through the Apartment Association. They have sponsored an appreciation brunch for Section 8 landlords, coordinated by the Apartment Association. Both have participated in ongoing training seminars sponsored by the Apartment Association, in which they inform landlords about the Section 8 program, how it works, and advantages to the landlord, in participating.

**Ad Hoc Housing Merger Committee
Final Report Recommendations**

Dispersion of Assisted Housing

- 1) Continue policies and approach to maintain dispersion and work to develop more low-income housing not as standalone but in mixed income projects.
- 2) Continue to support existing housing programs in the City. Additional funding should be sought for those programs to ensure their successful integration into the surrounding neighborhoods.
- 3) This report should be forwarded to Common Council Leadership and Dane County Board of Supervisors Leadership to make the community aware of the success of the dispersion/integration of Assisted Housing in Madison and County wide.
- 4) Continue to have planning staffs monitor and maintain the data on the dispersion of Assisted Housing

Cooperation between the Housing Authorities

- 1) Continue ongoing efforts initiated cooperatively both Housing Authorities. They may want to formalize the efforts through a Memorandum of Understanding.
- 2) Conduct a joint meeting of the two Boards of Directors periodically to assess the level of cooperation and determine if additional efforts are warranted.
- 3) Review the differences in policies to determine if changes are warranted.
- 4) Review the potential for working together on the development of new Assisted Housing in areas in the City and County currently not served. Include discussions on collaborations with for profit and not for profit housing providers.

Regional Housing Approach

- 1) Support ongoing efforts for Regional Transportation approach/authority and in particular the promotion of intercommunity bus service.
- 2) Encourage the County to provide Education and Outreach, and Technical Support to Surrounding communities regarding the benefits of Assisted Housing
- 3) The City of Madison neighborhoods overcame many of the fears surrounding Assisted Housing. The Committee feels that many of the Dane County communities that do not have Assisted Housing could do likewise and so it is recommended that outreach and education regarding the value of Assisted Housing programs in Dane County be conducted.