



Housing Opportunities Commission Minutes  
February 8, 2023 at 5:00 p.m.

---

Members Present: Rogers, Betzig-Lundberg, Chaput, Poser, Werthmann, Moseley, Theisen

Members Absent: Ross, Filipczak, Peterson

Staff Present: Allen, Hufford, Baumgartner, Morman, Vang, Zastoupil, Johnathan

1. Call to Order by Chairperson Moseley at 5:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call – Members and staff were present in Council Chambers.
3. Meeting minutes of January 11, 2023 were approved with the following corrections:

Motion to approve by Commissioner Betzig-Lundberg, seconded by Commissioner Chaput, and passed unanimously.

4. Open Public Comment Period – No one from the public came forward to speak during the Open Public Comment Period.
5. The EDI coordinator, Dr. Ka Vang was introduced to HOC by Ms. Hufford and gave a brief explanation of her background.

Questions/Comments:

- How do you see your first year of work going? Dr. Vang responded that she will be evaluating the existing plan and discussing the future with key staff members.
- Commissioner Moseley stated that, in the context of the ongoing housing study, she wanted to get a better idea on how access to affordable housing affects different groups in the city, who is most affected and how to reach out to them.
- There was a request to have Dr. Vang review documentation for HOC and how it relates to EDI.
- What are your goals? Dr. Vang responded that she is looking to how we can make the city a more diverse place, how can we attract talent and retain diverse talent to the area.

6. Public Discussions

- A. Commissioner Poser gave a presentation on homelessness, the CoC (Continuum of Care) program, local coalitions, the Point-in-Time, the HUD definitions of homelessness, and homelessness prevention and response.

Questions/Comments:

- Why are there more homeless people on the western side of the state, bordering Minnesota? And, why are there people at the shelters in this area in comparison to other parts of the state? Commissioner Poser responded that some may incorrectly argue that they come from Minnesota, however, they are already in the area and staying due to there being some resources available to them.
- Is the third definition of homelessness used to define student homelessness? Commissioner Poser responded that it is used to define student homelessness and a student is considered to be homeless for the entire school year.
- Does the count of homeless students reset each year? Yes.
- Is this tied to the “First-Friday” of the school year? Poser responded that it is.

- Where are the Coordinated Entry signs located? Poser responded that it is at facilities like the Family Promise, Sojourner House, Lutheran Social Services, Bolton, and the Library. She further responded that she is working on Human Services and the school district.
- Are there any connections between Coordinated Entry and emergency rooms? Commissioner Poser responded that that was on her list of things to work on.
- Commissioner Poser was asked if she could clarify the reality of the community, how much funding is available in the community, and what is needed for the community. Poser explained that the Coordinated Entry data, which can be pulled at any time, shows that there is not enough money for housing assistance or available housing to house everyone who is asking for it.
- What is performance and how is it measured? Poser responded that there are 5 different performance measures: First time homeless, defined as having not been in the system in 3 years; exits to permanent housing, or a measure of people moving to a permanent destination; increased earned income; increase in non-earned income, increase in income sources such as child support and social security; and reoccurrence, if someone left a shelter, did they turn up at another one within in the last two years.
- How are the measures of performance used? Poser answered that HUD judges her CoC based on the performance of the state and that this influences funding sources, training, and technical assistance. She further explained that HUD requires them to act against poor performers and those who do not contribute to positive performance.
- Is the data from the presentation being given to the consultant for the housing study? Commissioner Poser responded that she hopes so.
- How does someone who needs more assistance get a social worker? The ADRC has long term options counseling so if you are someone with a disability/low income/etc. you can be connected to long term care programs.
- Are there people on the Coordinated Entry program in these programs? Yes, if they meet specific requirements they are.
- Where do the funding gaps exist and how are communities making it up? Commissioner Poser responded that the funding needs to match the needs of the community, that there is a lack of state and federal funding and that
- Chairperson Moseley reminded the rest of the commission that HOC provides gap funding.

## B. 2023 Work Plan

### i. Funding Affordable Housing

- a. Scoring Criteria Review and Update - Ms. Hufford updated the committee, referencing some scoring structure research that she had done, providing additional links as a resource for them. She then went through the various comments from the last meeting and the following was addressed:

#### Questions, Comments and Revisions:

##### 1. Income Requirement

- Hufford provided the HUD definition for the large family question on the ground floor.
- The question on whether or not the ground floor standard was even needed.
- There was interest in changing the ground floor requirement to instead having the unit be easy to access.
- Hufford asked if they wanted it to be 1 unit or more.
- It was suggested that they reach out to WEDA to ask for clarification on whether the large family access to the ground floor should refer to a specific.

- It was suggested the private entrance language could be struck to allow it to apply to apartments.
- It was suggested that the ground floor language be struck.
- 2. Location
  - Hufford updated the point totals based off of last meetings discussion
  - Chairperson Moseley asked the commissioners to review the point totals and report back on whether things were weighted wrong for next meeting.
- 3. Financial Leverage
  - No comment
- 4. Inclusive Design
  - Commissioner Betzig-Lundberg went through the changes and clarifications that were made:
    1. Checkboxes should be added for housing types
    2. Key differences in units and compatibility
    3. New construction vs adaptive reuse practices
    4. Ramps vs no ramps
    5. Bathroom turnarounds
    6. Want to encourage adaptive rehab/reuse
    7. Points are still awarded for additional features
      - a. This was simplified.
      - b. Designed for no special population in particular and to keep people in place
      - c. Designed to be compatible with LIHTC
  - What are the differences between line 2 and line 3 under acquisition/rehab necessities two of the criteria. Betzig-Lundberg explained that it was different criteria.
  - There was concern on whether the criteria outlined in this section would exclude potential communal kitchens and shared bathroom spaces.
    1. Ms. Hufford responded that this may be revisited after the zoning update.
    2. Commissioner Chaput clarified that there are shared living spaces in Eau Claire, they are very important, but not well maintained.
  - Acronyms, such as ANSI should be spelled out.
    1. Ms. Hufford volunteered to make an acronym table.
  - Chairperson Moseley said that this discussion should be brought back next month
- 5. Rehab/Neighborhood Stabilization
  - No comment
- 6. Energy Efficiency and Sustainability
  - No comment
- 7. Development Team
  - Hufford noted that development team questions are common to find on applications of this type.
  - It was noted that a recent project, which was successful, didn't score well in this category.
  - It was suggested that this could be a tiebreaker and that the length of this column could be reduced.
  - It was stated that this kind of criteria can be good if you are trying to encourage these things, but there are good projects, such as one in Green Bay, that would not have met it.
  - The general consensus was in alignment with making it a tiebreaker.

**ii. Regional Housing Study Update**

- a. Hufford gave an update on the consultant's work, noting that they are on schedule.
  - 1. Commissioner Rogers asked how firm the end of the study will be and when they can see the results.
    - Hufford responded it would be in April or May

**iii. 2023 Housing Conference**

- a. November 1, 2023
- b. Topics
  - 1. Momentum West - Housing Solutions Forum Update
    - i. Commissioner Rogers briefed them on this conference, noting that it was a collection of topics whereas Eau Claire's conference was more focused on a singular topic.
    - ii. He also noted that both the Realtor's and Builder's Association would be interested in helping with enough lead time.
- c. Location
  - 1. UWEC and the Pablo Center are both being considered as possible venues.

Motion to accept the 2023 Work Plan by Commissioner Poser, second by Commissioner Betzig-Lundberg, and carried unanimously. Ms. Hufford noted that it could come back to them with changes from City Council.

7. Other Business Agenda Items

A. Staff Updates

i. 2022 Housing Development

- a. Ms. Hufford gave a preview of the 2022 Housing Development Report, noting that there was a slight increase in single-family construction, a jump in two-family construction, and a significant increase in the number of units constructed in the last two years. She also shared that the 2022 Housing Development Report detailed that the average cost of a single-family home has increased by 90.5%, but two-family homes are 40% less, leaving them as being more affordable.
  - Are these numbers from the time of permit or the time of occupancy? They are from the time of permit.
  - Is there an update on the affordable housing funds through the ARPA funds? Ms. Hufford responded that more funding needs to be allocated for ARPA in Phase II and that depending on what the community process determines the funding may not go directly to affordable housing fund but instead go to housing in general. She concluded by noting that 2023 and 2024 were listed in the CIP as ARPA, but even though it shows the money there, it is not.
  - Does that include the funds that City Council allocated in the CIP Budget 4 years ago? Hufford responded that it was approved in the CIP but there are two lines that show the affordable housing funds as being ARPA, and although it is shown in the CIP it is not approved until it goes through the Phase II process which depends on the community process and whether it goes to affordable housing fund or somewhere else.
- b. Commissioner Rogers clarified that \$4,000,000 in ARPA money has yet to be committed and that the allocation process hasn't played out yet or been established.

