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SPEAKER ONE: Where are the jobs?
Where is public transportation?

They've looked at neighborhood health
and safety. They've plotted that out in
terms of high-opportunity areas and
low-opportunity areas. They have mapped that
out and plotted a number of different
demographic maps, including distribution of
where do African-Americans live in the county
and in the City of Pittsburgh in relation to
areas of opportunity. So, you know, one of
the goals of affirmatively furthering fair
housing is to bridge those two gaps, to help
create opportunity in areas that currently
have low opportunity, and to create the
ability for folks who have been excluded from
areas of opportunity to live there. Between
those two sides, I'm more firmly in the
community development camp, what do we need
to do to bring opportunity to low income
particularly African-American neighborhoods.

I'm here to talk about dispersal
remedy. We need to have a both-hand approach. Inclusionary zoning is essentially a dispersal remedy. What it does by linking affordability to market-rate housing it helps provide affordable housing in areas of higher opportunity. Sorry for that long and convoluted introduction.

MR. TAGUE: Just one question.

It seems like, when I was sitting here listening, this is broader than just race, though. One of the things even in the disability community, as an example, or the gay and lesbian community, there are issues there with affordability. I know the incomes in certain communities, such as the gay and lesbian, are higher a lot of times. That's not true in the disability community, for example. Believe me, the race issue is probably the major issue, I understand that.

I just want to make sure we're talking about things in a broader sense.

SPEAKER ONE: Absolutely. The duty to affirmatively furthering fair housing applies
to a lot of protected classes, almost every
protected class that the fair housing
commission deals with.

Income is more closely linked with
race and with disability. A lot of folks
with a disability are on SSI, which has a
very low monthly income level. This does
help with the geographic dispersal, for lack
of a better word. Opportunities to live
in -- opportunities for people with
disability to live in high-opportunity areas
as well, there are other layers, as you well
know, that go into that. It's not just about
affordability. It's also about accessibility
and a number of other -- there are other
interventions that need to be addressed.

MS. LEONARD: Just a point of
clarification.

When we talk about the gay community,
can we maybe refer to it as the LGBT
community. If we don't, we lose a
significant group, especially the trans
people, who are disproportionately
experiencing these disparities more than necessarily the L and the G.

MS. KINTER: If we could, state our name before we speak for the stenographer.


MR. TAGUE: Point well taken.

MR. HARVEY: Just a couple comments. Peter Harvey.

Bob, you talked about tension between dispersal and community development. I always found it helpful -- maybe it's just a semantic thing. What can we do to expand housing choice. So you want the live in your neighborhood that you've grown up in. What are the policies we need to make that choice a viable one, if you want to move to a place of expanding housing choice.

The other is on the opportunity mapping and that whole fiat. It's a great tool. I know when the folks who were putting that together were talking about doing that, one of my concerns was what are the factors
that you're using to determine what makes a neighborhood an opportunity neighborhood. I think that can be sort of politically charged. I think we need to tread very carefully on what things we determine make a neighborhood an opportunity neighborhood. For example, to me, if you're in a mixed-race community, that's a huge opportunity. I'm not sure they look at that. You look at schools. Test scores is one thing. If you're in an integrated school, a racially balanced school, to me, that's an opportunity. Other folks might not consider that an opportunity.

I think we have to be careful when we look at what constitutes an opportunity neighborhood.

SPEAKER ONE: Absolutely. I agree with you 100 percent. This is an imperfect tool. A lot of the tools that we're working with are imperfect.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On the opportunity mapping, there are organizations
that have been doing it that have made
something of a science of it. They may not
be located in Pittsburgh. They certainly do
exist. They certainly do consult.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do we know how
the county is measuring that?

SPEAKER ONE: They are using the
indicators I mentioned. They are using
quality schools based on test scores. They
are using access to employment, where the
jobs are located; access to public
transportation; health and safety, health and
neighborhood safety; so not only crime, but
also environmental conditions, like paint,
air quality, things like that. There's a
whole range of factors.

Do you know what would be great? You
guys might want to have (unintelligible) come
here. They can explain it way better than I
can.

Those are the factors.

MR. WEBER: Some of that is being
driven by HUD. I know they don't have the
new rules on file. They have sort of started
to define what they mean by neighborhood
opportunity.

SPEAKER ONE: I'm not that familiar
with HUD's new fair housing, their proposed
affirmatively furthering fair housing regs.
There are other people that can speak to that
way better than I can.

MR. WEBER: I think they are looking
to try to create some definitions that can be
used.

MR. HARVEY: They want to require that
all jurisdictions include that stuff in their
AI. That's a good question. I don't know
what specifically they are looking at in
terms of opportunity.

SPEAKER ONE: Just to finish out sort
of the presentation on inclusionary zoning.
Inclusionary zoning sort of -- the
current Mayor ran on inclusion zoning. He
included that as one of his 100 policies he
was running on. Inclusionary zoning is in
the Mayor's transition team. It's one of the
1,000 policies adopted by the transition team.

Last year it came up in the context of legislation that Councilman Lavelle introduced that would require that whenever a specially planned -- a special zoning designation is conferred, that essentially gives developers flexibility to basically write their own zoning rules for a large development area. Whenever that is granted, it would have required that at least 30 percent of the housing units be affordable. Affordability was not defined in that ordinance. It was something that was considered by the Planning Commission late last year. Folks came together, a coalition of folks called the Southwest Pennsylvania Housing Alliance Inclusive Communities Working Group, I believe. They got to work on a shorter name. They came out and advocated for a specific definition of affordability that I'll get into in a minute.

The Planning Commission remains
devoted to approve that legislation, to
recommend that Council approve that
legislation. Councilman Lavelle has pulled
the legislation in favor of convening an
affordable housing task force along with the
Mayor's office to consider affordable housing
policy citywide, not just in the narrow
context of specially planned districts, but
to look at citywide policy on affordable
housing. One of the things they are going to
consider is inclusionary zoning.

There's a number of components to
inclusionary zoning. One is is it mandatory,
is it voluntary, is it some hybrid mix of the
two. Another is what percentage of units are
set aside as affordable. That ranges from 5
percent to 50 percent around the country. A
more important issue, I would argue, is how
do you define affordability. That around the
country ranges from 30 percent of AMI, area
medium income, to 120 percent of AMI. It's
all over the place. The city's analysis of
impediments to fair housing choice for rental
housing says that the goal should be 50 percent of AMI. That's something that's generally called the housing field very low income, so housing for very low income households.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Haven't most studies shown that the biggest affordability gap or the biggest need is of the extremely low income?

SPEAKER ONE: Yes. I'll start with that.

If you would, look on the reverse page from the maps. This is an affordability gap analysis done by the National Low Income Housing Coalition based on county housing data. What it shows is that the gap, the affordable housing gap, the mismatch between supply and demand of housing happens at housing that's affordable at the extremely low-income level. Essentially, countywide, there are about 30,000 more extremely low-income households than there are affordable and available housing units for
those households. The City of Pittsburgh, I think it's something like 22, 23,000, the city's share of that number. What this means is that extremely low-income households are renting up. So they're paying an unaffordable share of their income for rent. Okay.

If you would, look at the last two columns, cost burden and severe cost burden. Cost burden are households that pay over 30 percent of their income for housing costs. That's rent and utilities or, you know, mortgage and utilities and insurance, things like that. Almost three quarters of all households, of all extremely low-income households are experiencing cost burden. 60 percent of extremely low-income households have severe cost burden. They are paying over half of their income towards housing costs. That makes them extremely vulnerable to disruptions, to loss of their housing. Loss of housing ripples across a lot of systems. It affects the homeless system. It
affects education policy. Relocation and eviction has a really profound effect on children's educational outcomes.

What this also means is that these households are renting housing that would otherwise be available to households in the next income level up, very low-income households, households earning between 30 and 50 percent of AMI. As a result, they are experiencing housing cost burden. 71 percent of them are paying an unaffordable amount of their income for housing. A quarter of them are paying over half of their income for housing. That means they are renting up. They are using housing that would otherwise be available for low-income households, households earning between 50 percent and 80 percent of AMI.

What that means is that the breakdown, the mismatch between supply and demand at the lower end of the scale is having a ripple effect up income levels. It also tells you where we need get to to address this problem.
If we define affordability as 80 percent of AMI, all we are doing is adding units at the upper end of the low-income scale. That doesn't address the problem. That doesn't get to where the mismatch is between supply and demand. On other hand, producing units that are affordable at 30 percent of AMI is expensive. That takes a lot of resources. It's not something that most market-rate housing developers can absorb internally, at least not at any scale.

Market rents in the City of Pittsburgh aren't so high that we could require market-rate housing developers to build a significant number of housing units that are affordable at this lower end, at the extremely low-income end of the affordability scale.

The trick is how do we get down to this number. This is where we need to get to. How do we do it?

There are a couple of subsidies that are on the sidelines right now that can help
us. Between having developers internally subsidize some of this -- we have some subsidies at our disposal that are currently underutilized. That's a whole other conversation. One of those is vouchers project-based vouchers. Another is 4 percent tax credits. We've had this conversation. The 4 percent tax credits aren't an easy fix. It's a potential fix.

I don't know how much time I have. A 4 percent tax credit conversation would eat up probably more than I have available.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think what you are getting to is there should be some -- what I would recommend is there should be some method for determining feasibility. If the city has a will to target resources toward developing affordable units in market-driven developments, then the question, it seems to me, is what is cost feasible for that project. I think that has to do with what are the sources of funding that are available for the city or the county
to put into that project, you know, how much
could the developer absorb and make a
reasonable return for profit and, you know,
what level of affordability are you
targeting, what percentage of the units are
you targeting.

There should be a systematic
methodology probably that could be applied
jurisdictionwide that could be tweaked
project by project to reach that answer.
What is feasible here?

I don't think that exists here now. I
think that there probably are models that can
be adapted, you know. That probably is
something that Lavelle's committee needs to
look at very carefully. Probably we need
some real expert consultation to think that
through in this market.

SPEAKER ONE: I think you are probably
right. Of the two -- right now, if you were
to talk to Tom about -- Tom administers most
of the city's affordable housing funds. He
will tell you that demand already exceeds the
resources they have available.

I think that the analysis you just
talked about, I think what we need to do is
also figure out what other resources are
there available. It may very well be that
it's a matter of priority in some cases.
Some of the URA's resources can be used in a
different way to achieve a different
priority. I don't know. I'm particularly
interested in having a conversation that
looks at what resources are available that we
are not fully using. How do we expand the
pie? How do we make something like this
happen without pulling resources away from,
for instance, community development, which is
my world, kind of where me and my
organization are sort of based?

One of the things that I handed out on
the back of this glossary of terms is what
are affordable rents at different rent
levels, different AMI levels. This is based
on PHFA's formula. It shows what rent levels
really have to hit to get the 30 percent AMI.
That's a pretty low number in a lot of cases. 

One of the resources that's available

to us is housing-choice vouchers. I think

Dave would tell you that folks who receive

vouchers have a hard time finding units where

they can use them. They certainly have a

hard time finding units outside of low-income

areas. So to a certain extent voucher

funding -- they are also a moving to work

agency, which gives them some flexibility.

So they don't have to return this voucher

funding unused to HUD every year, thankfully.

They are able to use this funding for other

things. At the same time, it's a resource

that's kind of sitting there that's not fully

utilized. To utilize that, we have to get

down to this number right here, HACP payment

standards.

MR. WEBER: David Weber from the City

Housing Authority.

The eligibility level for the maximum

income for a Section 8 housing choice voucher

is 50 percent of AMI income level. For
public housing, it's actually the low income, the 80 percent level. Right now, this payment standard for the voucher program that Bob has here, that includes your utility costs. If the landlord is paying all of the utilities, that's the amount.

The developers are saying it's not enough, that it doesn't generate enough revenue to develop new units. That's sort of where we get stuck.

SPEAKER ONE: So we need to find a way to kind of bridge between market rates and what a developer can realistically internally subsidize in a deal, and get down to this payment standard if we want to make units that are available and affordable to extremely low-income households.

MR. WEBER: The other thing is that the payment standard is based off the HUD fair market rent. We are actually at 110 percent of the fair market rent that HUD establishes for each market area. We've started to look at exception payment
standards. Whenever you start doing that, then you're at a tradeoff. You are going to pay more per family, which means you may end up you pay more for each family, but you can have less families.

SPEAKER ONE: There's another option, which is small area FMRs. Housing authorities have the flexibility, they can ask HUD to be able to set up FMRs by ZIP Code. What that does is it reduces the fair market rent in low-income neighborhoods where they might be oversubsidizing rent. They're not supposed to be, but through rent reasonableness -- jurisdictions that have adopted that have saved money in lower-income areas. That has freed up resources for them to provide higher payment standards.

MR. WEBER: Our initial look at that is that the way our ZIP Codes overlay our neighborhoods doesn't produce a higher payment standard for that ZIP Code.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you have looked at it?
MR. WEBER: We have. We are going to see if there are some other ways that we can address that.

MR. HARVEY: Only by ZIP Code, that's the only way that --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. You can do other geographies.

MR. TAGUE: By communities, like East Liberty separate from Shadyside.

MR. WEBER: We have to look into it. The standard that they have out there is by ZIP Code. We would have to do a lot of work, which we haven't been able to devote the resources to at this point to do that additional research to say, here is how we are going to define it, here are the numbers for those areas, and justify that to HUD, put it in a plan for their review and approval. It takes some process.

MR. HARVEY: Peter Harvey. Has any work been done on what's the impact of using that in low-income neighborhoods where the payment standard is reduced, what impact that
MR. WEBER: We have not looked at that side of it.

MR. HARVEY: No one else also has sort, I mean, of nationally?

MR. WEBER: That I don't know. We have not looked at it. We don't really think there would be much reduction in rent on the lower end. We think the FMRs are too low, frankly.

MR. HARVEY: Even in the low-income neighborhoods?

MR. WEBER: Yeah. The FMR is set for the region. We have to do rent reasonableness on every specific unit. We think the FMR is probably okay for the lower-end neighborhoods, but it's too low for a lot of neighborhoods, partly because the HUD methodology doesn't take into account the quality of the unit. They are including units that won't pass inspection. I think that that pushes down the rent, the fair-market rent level.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You said it's a matter of resources partly to look at this in a really careful and thorough sort of way.

I wonder if there is a funder, you know, who could provide a grant to the housing authority to use a team to extensively, thoroughly, exhaustively look at different ways to construct its local FMR, you know, as permissible under the rules.

MR. WEBER: It's possible. We can talk more about how we can focus and manage the resources to do that research.

SPEAKER ONE: The other methodology, getting back to affirmatively furthering fair housing, the other HUD methodology that is -- the other way it is out of whack is it doesn't look at the cost of accessible units. Accessibility, the higher exception payment standard that can be provided for accessible units --

MR. WEBER: Which we do at 120 percent.

SPEAKER ONE: Right. It's still based
on the pool of all units. Accessible units 
are generally more expensive to produce.
They rent for higher. They have higher 
rents. It's, you know, a mismatch in sort of 
HUD's methodology. That's another thing.

Really quick, just a couple other 
points. Looking at this again, how we define 
affordability is extremely important. One of 
the things that has frustrated me this past 
year about the public discussion of 
affordability in the Lower Hill, for 
instance -- when you read articles in the 
Post-Gazette that talk about affordability, 
it's always about the set asides. The 
community wanted the Penguins to set aside 30 
percent of units as affordable. The Penguins 
only agreed to set aside 20 percent. What's 
more important is how is affordability 
defined. Most of the Penguins units are 
defined at 80 percent of AMI, which means 
$984 a month for a one bedroom apartment. It 
baffles me that the Post-Gazette has not 
called out that issue.
MR. TAGUE: Nobody in the job classification would fit into that.

SPEAKER ONE: That's true.

The other thing, it's important how we define affordability. Whenever we talk about affordable housing, we should be talking about what is the definition of affordability.

MR. TAGUE: It seems variable by jurisdiction. There's no consistency. Or is there?

SPEAKER ONE: Well, it varies. It's generally set as a percentage of area median income. Area median income is based on the metropolitan statistical area. For Pittsburgh, that's an eight county area. It's the median income across the eight county Pittsburgh region.

The other thing that I wanted to mention -- I'm way over my time -- there's this Housing Alliance Inclusive Communities Working Group. If anybody is interested in this issue, please, it's open to everybody.
We would love to have more folks. Please feel free to join.

Pittsburgh -- Peter is a member. Mr. Pittsburgh is a member. You can contact him.

MR. TAGUE: That can be something, the information we can send out to the whole task force.

Bob, if we provide that to Sarah, then we can send that out to the whole task force.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to add another thing while we are talking about affordability.

Bob said, and you said there are so many different ways to talk about what is affordable. I think one thing that really should happen is that we should understand, so far as this task force is concerned, affirmatively furthering fair housing, we should understand those groups of people who have this special protection under the law. We should know who they are, what their incomes are, where on the spectrum of
affordability they fall. That should inform
the analysis that the city or the county or
anyone would adopt in coming up with a
standard for determining affordability and
feasibility in this sort of conversation.

MR. TAGUE: The other question is do
we need -- is there an expert piece we need
to bring to the table, meaning in the way of
a consultant or something, if there are other
models that we can be looking at.

You had said there are other
resources.

MR. WEBER: I don't want to
overemphasize that. It's something we are
going to look at during the course of this,
in terms of the exception payment standards
and those things. We want to look more
broadly at what the cost of building a unit
is, what those numbers are. That goes beyond
what the housing committee's sort of mission
and purpose is.

MR. TAGUE: Bob, thank you for your
impromptu presentation. As Chuck said, it
was pretty good.

Would you like to introduce yourself,

Angela.

MS. REYNOLDS: I'm Angela Reynolds.

I'm with the United Way of Allegheny County,
but was instrumental in the research that led
up to this prior to joining the United Way.

MR. TAGE: Angela is a member of our
steering committee also.

Anyways, I thought that was a very
good presentation, a lot of food for thought
in that. What I'm wondering about, are there
models throughout the country that we can
look at that might be something that we are
not doing here that we should be doing.

SPEAKER ONE: For inclusionary zoning,
the trick with inclusionary zoning, there are
500 municipalities around the country. A
dozen or so of those have been studied. Of
the ones that have been studied, almost all
them are in very hot market areas. So that,
you know, there was an article in the
newspaper a few weeks about Boston, which was
a very good article. It said that the housing task force that hasn't been even appointed is something like impressed or influenced by Boston's inclusionary zoning policy. I'm glad that it's on the radar. The problem with just taking an ordinance like Boston's and putting it down in Pittsburgh is the market is very different and the incomes are very different.

One of the things I tried to do in that research paper is look for models in markets, look for ordinances in markets that are similar to the City of Pittsburgh. The only one I was able to find is Chicago. It's a different market in some respects. In terms of incomes, in terms of housing prices, rental housing prices, it's really similar. It's different in that there are a lot of --

MR. TAGUE: I'm wondering if there are peer cities to Pittsburgh, similar size cities. A lot of times you'll hear Cincinnati used as an example. I'm wondering what midsized cities like Pittsburgh do, if
there are other -- Boston is just a
different --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think there
are other cities that have looked at fair
housing, affirmatively furthering fair
housing in their housing community
development policies more thoroughly than
others. I think Baltimore may be a good
example. They have a done number of things
to address fair housing. Chicago is another
good example. New York, I think also has a
number of policies, practices they've studied
and implemented to try to address the fair
housing.

You have to sort of determine what's
analogous to Pittsburgh. I think there are
models to start with and look at and choose
from.

MR. TAGUE: That's something we can
look at, is what other models might be there
that we can compare to Pittsburgh and
Allegheny County. That's part of the purpose
of this, is to come up with some solutions.
Obviously, I think there would be -- I'm very much interested, for example, in the area of East Liberty, what's going on out in East Liberty. One of the things -- and in Hazelwood with the Almono Project, what's happening to property values, gentrification, what do we do about that. That's also another issue. You live in a neighborhood your whole life, and then you can't afford to live there anymore because property values have gone up. That also affects fair housing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the general assembly has authorized taxing communities to give an exemption, sort of a homestead for gentrification. I don't think they've done it here. They should.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It has to be approved by the county first and the city.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is an intergovernmental task force. It sounds like they have access to the county and the city.

MR. TAGUE: Did you say "it sounds
like?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I look at
Sarah.

MR. TAGUE: That's right. In other
words, for example, we are not just looking
at the city. We have to look at Allegheny
County in general, other communities in
Allegheny County. Very good.

Any additional questions or thoughts?

This actually led into a forum, a
discussion about things. Obviously,
exclusionary zoning has an adverse effect on
affordable housing, I'm sure. Thank you
again.

One of the things on Section 4 --
unless there is additional discussion on
this -- we had discussed, as I mentioned
early on, about land banking. Obviously, we
know that the City of Pittsburgh has passed
legislation and are in the process of
implementing it. What we want to do is
figure out how we could -- obviously, a lot
of the policies and stuff have not been
developed yet. We want to try to be able to inform that discussion. Plus, as I said, the other communities that would be following along with land banking, I think cities like the City of McKeesport, stuff like that, which has a fair amount of vacant housing, I thought it was important that we be engaged in that. What we did want to have is what I said earlier, Councilwoman Gross come and talk about the legislation. Again, that legislation was adjusted based on, obviously, other council members' input into it.

We want to have a discussion a little bit about land banking, how we feel the policies that are developed play into that. It's something we need to, as a task force, look at.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: From my knowledge of that, there's a copy of an article in the Post-Gazette this morning on land banking. I think a lot of areas, a lot of communities where there are pending a lot of development, you have a lot of housing
that's there. It's either people have died, moved away, families no longer want to maintain them, they've been lost in foreclosure, they've been lost for taxes. There's vacant lots, as opposed to single family homes that are there. They tend to be impediments to development, in terms of the houses there. It could be, I call it recycling of properties for another generation of families to come in and to reside there.

In particular, the area I'm most familiar with is an area like Homewood. It's pending. It's not -- I could say pending. There's development going on. They are in the middle of it, some of the highrises that you see off of the busway. The Animal Rescue League is coming in and doing a new facility. The velodrome, that's there. There's a dance venue down the street. It's steadily creeping down from Bakery Square, from East Liberty, and starting to move further east into that area. You have a number of
families who have been there long-term who are now in the midst of a decision, should I consider moving, should I consider staying here and taking advantage of the wave of development that's getting ready to come through.

One thing that Homewood has a problem with is a decline in population. A lot of that, what that has done is left a lot of otherwise structurally sound, vacant properties available for other families to come in, to be able to rehabilitate and to live there, increase the tax base, stabilize neighborhoods, create more of a demand for goods and services to support those families coming in.

The city has a program where you can come in, available properties on the city list, city-owned properties, to be able to acquire those properties. You go through a process. They clear the title. You're able to essentially bid on that property and acquire that property and rehabilitate the
property. There is no requirement in terms of you have to live there for five years, one year, whatever to be able to do this. Once it clears, once you're able to gain title to the property, you are able to do pretty much whatever you want to with it.

The big problem is the way that the system is set up, it can take you anywhere from 18 to 24 months before you finally gain title to that property. That property is still in the possession of the city. It's still deteriorating. Midnight plumbers may come through. It may make it untenable, in terms of you actually developing that property.

These properties are very, very affordable otherwise. You are talking maybe a rehabilitation cost of $50,000 for some of these properties. They're infinitely more affordable than going out and purchasing on the open market, particularly in an area that has a lot of advantages in terms of location, in terms of topography for Pittsburgh, in
terms of the thrust of development that's
going to naturally come through there, and
the increased population once that housing
stock is there.

I think that Pittsburgh probably -- if
you believe the news this morning -- has the
most affordable housing costs in the nation.
As I stumbled out of the shower, I heard that
this morning. I'm not sure how true that is.
That's what they're saying, anyway. You have
an area that's prime for development. It's
ready pretty much to go it's ready for almost
a new influx of population if you're going to
take advantage of some of these properties.

I'm talking properties that have, some
of these, fireplaces, hardwood floors,
stained glass. Beautiful properties that
were built -- I think the term was
supervisor, manager-class housing, as opposed
to worker-class housing. I'm talking about
stone, brick types of housing, slate roofs,
really beautiful properties that were meant
to last, as opposed maybe some of the
properties that were built for a lot of people who worked light industrial. There is a lot of light industrial zoning in that area that have lasted over 100 years. It's still there, still viable, still providing affordable housing for a lot of families.

Again, those neighborhoods could really benefit from the stability that it would gain. Land banking is a real big issue there, and where that property is going to, who is holding the property with that development going on. Properties that are otherwise blighted properties that probably, if a building inspector would go through, some would be cited for that are causing some of the issues within the community, as far as security in the community, in terms of crime in the community. It's a real big, burgeoning issue there. I think it's something we definitely need to look at.

Again, if you're talking about affordable housing in neighborhoods, this is a huge issue. A lot of people are really
attuned to this. It's definitely something we should be dealing with.

MR. TAGUE: John Tague. One of the concerns is tearing down perfectly good property. One of the interesting things as you were talking about, I was thinking about a lot of the housing that's developed to be energy efficient, which is a cost-saving thing also. You sometimes wonder, to maintain a property, one of those properties that a friend of mine would have called robber baron homes from the old days -- anyways, that's something that we have to take a look at also.

In other words, I don't want to see us tear down perfectly good property. Maybe there needs to be some process that simplifies the change of homeownership. That's a legal thing. I'm not sure how that would all evolve.

MR. FENTON: Pat Fenton. I think, if the property has been sitting for any period of time, if it's a year or two years, you've
got a real situation. I think $50,000 is a pretty light number. That's minimal, you know. If you want to put the home back in shape again, you're doubling that, if not more, you know, to really get a product that is marketable and that will attract new owners.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's more amenable in terms of sweat equity, in terms of what that party can afford to come in, actually do some of that work themselves. Obviously, some mechanical things that need to be done are going to cost a lot more. In terms of actual things that people can and do have the skills to do, it's readily affordable.

I know people who have done that. I've done that, gone in with minimal experience in terms of home rehabilitation, and with inspection of the roof, had the roof repaired, inspection of furnaces, inspection of wiring and plumbing that otherwise is sound and relatively up to code. It's a
long-term process, a commitment. I think that once you have that family with that commitment, knowing that, I'm just not going to walk into a property that's going to be living ready, I might have to come in, and I might have to live with drywall that has to be pulled out and put in, I might have to live with electricians coming in and upgrading the electrical systems, putting breakers in or doing plumbing work -- most people I know have a system to be able to barter with people they know that can do that kind of work, that they can do relatively affordably over a long period of time and have a property that's eminently affordable in the long haul. It's going to be an actual asset to them once they do get it on the market.

You're absolutely right. That's a bare minimum. That's a pretty good property that's been secured. The longer those properties sit on that list, the more susceptible to being vandalized and letting
nature taking its course and deteriorating
those properties. A lot of those properties
have been abandoned and vacant for a number
of years. Rather than coming in and
bulldozing them and having another vacant
lot, and really no tax incentive or advantage
for that property put back into the
neighborhood itself, the system needs to be
streamlined. It's ridiculous. A lot of
places, you can go in and acquire that
property one you determine there is no proper
owner, that there is no interest from that
owner. The party is deceased. You made the
effort to try to find any successors, any
kind of heir to that property. It's not
there.

Generally, it's not a real involved
procedure to be able to determine. Then
you're able to put that property back on the
market, even if you auction that property. I
know, in Northside, they've had a number of
businesses where they've been able go in and
have an auction of properties that are
available, and open it up to the general public to come and bid on.

I know that's real simplistic. It's a lot more complicated than that. There are people who I know are looking for properties, some of these families, families with children, growing families that find that they are priced out of most markets who would want to stay in a community and be able to grow that community in terms of living there, participation in the affairs of the community, that are kind of excluded, priced out of a really burgeoning market that's readily available and can be utilized to stabilize that area and afford that family affordable housing.

MS. REYNOLDS: Angela Reynolds.

I know when we were talking about this in subcommittee, there were those of us who said, in terms of land banking, we see the connections for affordable housing, but thought it would be useful to bring somebody in who could help us understand what are the
implications as it relates to fair housing.
I think, on this task force, sometimes we go
down the affordable housing road without
remembering that we are also furthering fair
housing.
I think it would be useful to have
someone come in and say, what are some of the
potential opportunities, do we have an
opportunity to influence that panel that will
be making those decisions, who might be
appointed to it. I don't know if that's even
a possibility. At least let's talk about it.

MR. TAGUE: John Tague. Is there an
issue the task force needs to address? Is it
something that we need to spend energy and
time on? Do we need to create a subcommittee
to work on this issue?

You're absolutely right, we want to
keep the focus on furthering fair housing.
Is it that something we need to work on?
I think you had a question, Fred.

MR. BROWN: Fred Brown. I just want
to back up.
There's a couple things that have been said that I think we need to be considerate of. For example, in Larimer and Homewood, there's 700 vacant lots and buildings. There's 7,000 in Homewood. The community is currently doing a cluster planning process that's being headed up by OBB, Operation Better Block. OBB is currently doing rehab houses and trying to create a middle market. I think it would behoove us to consider talking to organizations and institutions that are currently doing this work and potentially adding muscle to their capacity to meet some of the metrics that we are talking about.

The other thing that's concerning is we need to be conscious of the communities, really to look at developing mixed community income. The other thing the community is very concerned about is concentrated poverty. When we start talking about these types of housing constructs, for example the Larimer Consensus Group -- in Larimer in 1940, there
was 13,350 homes, something like that. Today
there is a little under 15, 1,600.

This new evolution, this new
ecological footprint that Larimer is seeking
to create, there's around 6,500 homes. When
you look at the tax credit projects going on,
the current homeownership, they are already
almost saturated at the low-income side of
the affordable housing side. We are
currently working with the PHFA and the URA
to do five passive houses, as a way to start
to shift the way that we bring in
mixed-income homeownership, to kind of level
off the playing field, so that we don't have
concentrated poverty along the main vein of
Larimer and Meadow, which is currently being
kind of considered when you look at KBK's
project, which is 40 affordable units, and
then NBS's project, which is 86 units. So
when we look at the gateways coming into some
of these communities, we have to take that
into consideration.

The third thing of concern is when you
look at the donut hole that's represented by Homewood and Larimer in particular in the east end, and you look at Shadyside, Point Breeze, Highland Park and Penn Hills, those communities, for example, the housing market and rental properties went up 100 and 300 percent in the last two years.

So there's real dynamic tension occurring at these community levels when we start talking about integrating different home constructs and people who are trying to look into those opportunities. Since Google came, houses were selling for $50,000 on Stanton Avenue before they came. Those same houses are selling for 250.

We have a market-driven response that is driving the community. Some communities are trying to fight back and have their own plan. The real issue for them is they have no skin in the game. They can have a great plan. LCG has a great vision plan. They don't own property. The URA and the city have been very supportive of their plan, for
the most part. But they don't get to pick
the developer. They don't get to negotiate
those things. If they were able to pick the
kind of developers and contractors that would
support their long-term vision, you would see
an exponential growth in sustainable career
pathways. A lot of the people that we have
interviewed and talked with are not just
looking at bricks and sticks, but they are
also looking at the issue of affordability,
also creating sustainable, liveable wages.

When you look at the Mt. Auburn
report, there's 41 Tier One and Tier Two
communities with 80,000 vulnerable people.
Most of those communities are represented by
people of color. What's not in the report is
45,000 of those people are on probation or
parole. Nobody is talking about how those
people are getting employed. I'm talking to
people every day who can't find housing
because they have a record. This is a
multidimensional issue that I just really
want us to all be sensitive to when we start
talking about this approach.

I think there's a real need to create a couple committees as we look at the complexity of this. If there are organizations out there that are already doing this work -- we've worked with RTP for the past 6 years, Rebuilding Together Pittsburgh. We stabilized 60 houses in Homewood and Larimer as a work development program for low-income people in the community to increase their green IQs and capacity to work in the construction trades. We didn't get support from the SPP this year, so that project got put on the shelf.

What we've attempted to do is engage local community residents both in their needs for housing and employment and create a bridge that they can increase their sustainability through sustainable career pathways; and then offer homes to them that we are working on or considering to work on, either through partnerships with Operation Better Block or RTP.
For the most part, in closing, a lot of these homes -- I think Pat mentioned, when we went into the homes, our first plan five years ago was based upon weatherization. We trained 15 community residents to be BPI certified as energy auditors. We worked with Pitt and such. When we got in the houses and started doing blower door checks, the roofs were leaking, doors were missing, floors were sagging. So we had to retrain our workforce to come in and do home stabilization, do flooring, concrete work, drywall work. For the past three years we've been doing that work on a very microscale, as I said, 60 units. It's been more of an intensive labor process to grow the communities' ability to do that work on their own. When they come in, they see people from their community doing work. We are trying to raise the capacity of the path for homeownership, or at least stay in the community as well.

I just wanted to throw that out there. That's some critical stuff that's not really
being be tabulated in this analysis.

MR. TAGUE: You mentioned something about previously incarcerated. The Commission on Human Relations report on barriers is something that's important. You had also said something about, this is much more than just about housing, this is about jobs, about income and others. You'll remain low-income if you're working at McDonald's, that's the only job you can find coming out of prison. That's something we have to address.

I think it's clear that it's pretty complicated stuff. It's not all that easy. You're still fighting things like racism. You're still fighting with these things. We are going to continue to fight them. We still need to continue to make progress.

The question goes back to the idea of what do we need to create as a committee structure.

Go ahead, Bob.

SPEAKER ONE: I would like to add one
other element to that. That is ownership. The history that I spoke about earlier about red lining and FHA and subsidized housing, what that essentially did is gave European-Americans subsidized homeownership in appreciating markets. The housing community development policy for African-Americans was subsidized rentals in increasingly disinvested markets. Right now, if you look at Allegheny County, the white homeownership rate is 70 to 80 percent. The black homeownership rate is 30 percent. As Fred just talked about, that is at risk. A lot of that housing stock is, you know, deteriorating, needs to be stabilized.

When you're talking about what to do with vacant properties and particularly vacant houses in a neighborhood like Homewood, I think ownership has to be a part of that conversation. There's more -- not everybody is suited for homeownership maybe homeownership isn't necessarily the answer. Maybe it is. There are other kinds of
ownership as well. Ownership absolutely needs to be part of that conversation.

The other thing is the wealth gap. Nationwide, the average white wealth is over 100,000. The average black wealth is 5,000. There's a tremendous wealth gap.

MR. TAGUE: 100,000 and 5,000; did you say?

SPEAKER ONE: Yes, nationwide. I don't know the particulars for Allegheny County. A lot of that has to do with homeownership.

The question as Homewood gets developed, as neighborhoods like the Hill District get developed, and property values increase, who is going to capture that increased value. Who is going to capture the wealth? That, I think is a fair-housing issue as well.

I would encourage, if there are folks in Homewood who want to work on that issue, you know, we provide free legal representation to community-based nonprofits.
that are engaged in housing an community
development activities. Please feel free to
contact us. We would love to work with
community based organizations that are
working on that issue.

MS. GERHARDT: This is Helen Gerhardt.
We talked, we very briefly touched on
community land trusts, and the way that those
can be used in conjunction with policies and
procedures on land banks that really do
affirmatively further fair housing. I think
that might be of interest to a subcommittee
as well.

From what I understand -- I'm just
beginning a study of this -- this is a way to
really preserve homeownership and keep
housing at affordable levels over the long
haul, so you have true neighborhood
stability. Right now there's a lot of
neighborhoods getting broken up, people being
displaced out to the outer suburbs.
Community land trusts can help not just
preserve homeownership for individuals, but
help keep neighborhoods and all the relationships and the small businesses, all of that intact.

I hope we can look at that as well.

MR. BROWN: I just want to piggyback on that. That was a comment I was going to make.

We have been working with Michael Brown from Burlington. There's a small community of us that have been working on this for several months a municipal. For us, the impetus was around preserving park space that the Larimer Consensus Group had designated in their vision plan process. We actually partnered with Allegheny Land Trust.

We started working with Michael Brown to figure out how we could preserve park space. That's a result of this notion of creating this mixed-income community by using park space to do market rate housing around it.

It's part of a strategy. We've been in conference with Michael brown for the past few months. His company is one of the
leading companies in the country on community land trusts. It would behoove us to kind of -- what Helen was referring to, how can we look at their approach, which is very good. Even if you buy a house, and you want to move and sell it, you only can sell it at a certain percentage point. The rest of the money has to stay the house, so that another moderate or low-income person can purchase the house at that price. You can't cash out in their models.

There's a lot of complexities to it. When he tells you the straightforward nature of it, it's about preserving affordable housing for people in low-income communities.

**MS. GERHARDT:** It really does support mixed-income housing and that kind of social inclusion and integration.

**MR. TAGUE:** That's one of the heart of the issues also. You mentioned earlier about the integration piece. It builds for a better community if it's a mixed income, a mixed community, in my opinion at least.
One item in closing out on this, I wanted to -- because, remember, this is an intergovernmental group here. Basically, it's not the Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations. It's about all of us.

What I'm asking for -- we have, as I had mentioned earlier, three committees. Do any the things we've talked about fall under those committees? Do we need to create something else? Do we need to create another committee? Suggestions, ideas?

For example, you're the chairman of the affordable housing committee. Does any of this fit under your committee?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think so. I think the land banking, land trust, the gentleman right here, what he was saying fits under that really well. We need to sit down and talk and do some networking as far as where do we go, and even breaking that committee down into subcommittees, subworking groups, to be able to bring back the information and make recommendations.
MR. TASURE: Are you able to do that? Does everybody agree with that? In other words, you would organize that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure.

MR. TASURE: What about any of the other issues, where do they fit? That's parts of it. Where does inclusionary zoning, where does that fit? Does that fir under -- would you be willing to help out on that, Bob?

Absolutely, affordable housing and fair housing.

MR. TASURE: Do we need to create -- for example you mentioned about, talked a little bit about barriers for the previously incarcerated. Is that something we need something separate? How would you envision that?

MS. KINTER: I just want to mention that the City of Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations completed a study regarding barriers to housing for previously
incarcerated persons. We provided a series
of recommendations in the study that we would
like the task force to support and talk
about. If it's under affordable housing -- I
think we have the work. We don't need to
have a new committee to discuss this. At the
next meeting we can bring forward the actual
and talk about the recommendations that are
in there.

As far as the land banking, and we're
talking about inclusionary zoning under
Lyle's committee. I guess we will be setting
up some meetings before our next full
meeting. We meet quarterly. The next full
meeting will be in June or so.

MR. TAGUE: That was a question I was
going to ask. We set it up as quarterly
meetings. Do we need to meet more often?

I'm not saying monthly. Do we need to
meet bimonthly?

MS. KINTER: Maybe that's a question
for the steering committee. Each committee
needs to meet before the next full committee
meeting. If you are interested in joining
any of the these committees, all you have to
do is give me your name. I'll write it down.
You will be include in the e-mails that go
out for the committee meetings. It's up to
the committee chairperson to organize those
meetings and put them together. I, of
of course, will assist in that.
We also don't have -- Adam's committee
with the information outreach, we don't have
a chair of that. We need to figure that out.
Is anybody interested in that?
If you're interested in the committee,
talk to Sarah about it. Sarah was working
with Adam on it.
Obviously, we need to let people know
what we are doing also. That's important.
You're right.
What I'll do, if anybody is interested
in joining the steering committee, just let
Sarah know that. What I'll probably do is
arrange for conference calls so we can talk
about, does this committee need to meet more
often. We can also discuss whether we feel it's important -- we don't want to put everything under Lyle.

You do have a job; right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The commission is keeping me real busy.

MR. TAGUE: That's also important. We can talk about if there's something else we need to create. I'm not a big fan of creating additional committees. That spreads everything out. The work groups might be a way of looking at it, to work on a specific issue, and then bring it back to the full.

Our membership, so you know, if there's people that you think should be sitting around the table, not necessarily the individual, but organizations that are missing here that need to be here, I think it's important to let us know that also. If there's somebody that you think ought to be here, let Sarah know that. This is not exclusionary. We want to be inclusionary. That's important. You can't get 500 people
around the table either, or you'll get nothing done.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the mission of this task force? What's the goal that it's trying to accomplish?

MS. KINTER: Create policies to put forward to do the analysis of impediments in the future for both the county and the city, and have a forum for intergovernmental cooperation regarding those policies.

For example, Bob talked today about inclusionary zoning, which is an important policy that this task force supports. We should be bringing up, do the analysis of impediments in the county and city.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The AI right now is currently out on display on our website. It's in draft form right now, along with our five year consolidated plan and our annual action plan. We have a public hearing set for April 1st, 2015 at 5:30, 200 Ross Street, 1st Floor Conference Room.

MR. TAGUE: Does anybody have any
comments that they would like to make besides Helen?

I'm kidding. Go ahead.

MS. GERHARDT: I guess, in terms of time sensitivity, there are ways, I think, that this task force might have some -- might think about the ways in which they want to have immediate influence or education and outreach to those that are forming those policies that may be involved in writing the policies for the land bank. Who are going to be the final three people on that land bank board? Are they going to truly represent the communities that will be most impacted by those policies?

Maybe we can be thinking about ways that we could address our elected officials and those that have those appointment powers. There's a wide range of different kinds of policies and procedures written across the country for different land banks. They have incredibly different impacts. We can have a truly constructive influence, I think, at
this point. I think we made need to act with
some --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It sounds like, if this task force hopes to influence the
upcoming AI, that needs to happen now, like
today. There's a draft of it already.
There's going to be a public meeting in
April. Then it's going to be passed and
finished. If there's something urgent that
this task force should do, that may be one of
the things, to go through that, scrutinize
it, find out what recommendations need to be
made to change it before it's too late. Here
it is. It's the next year one. It's already
published.

MS. KINTER: I agree. I think you
should join the e-mails of the impediments
committee and assist in that.

Currently Jay Goren is the committee
chair of that. I have a list of all the
people that signed up to be part of that.
Their whole task was to do that. I'm not
sure how often they met the last three or
four months.

You're right, it is urgent.

MR. TAGUE: The suggestion is that we -- that committee needs to review it, definitely the committee needs to look at that. Should we as a task force all look at it?

I think we should all look at it and comment. I think what we might consider doing is maybe sending our comments to Jay. Would that make sense, since he's chair of that committee?

MS. KINTER: I can't speak for him.

MR. TAGUE: I like to speak for people who are not here.

Anyways, I think you're absolutely correct. I think there are certain things that are time sensitive. We need to move on them. We'll try to organize that and keep us -- even though we might not have a physical meeting, we need to basically keep this work out in front of us, so that we don't miss opportunities. I think one of the
things you were talking about is not missing
an opportunity to comment on this. Once it's
done, it's too late.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are there any
public hearings?

MR. PETRUCCI: There's just going to
be one public hearing. When we developed the
AI, we had four community meetings in each
section of the City of Pittsburgh. Our
consultants met with numerous social service
agencies, housing agencies, development
agencies. We also put out residential
surveys to the City of Pittsburgh. Also we
sent out organizational surveys for the
community-based organizations. We've also
met with the Housing Authority and with Urban
Redevelopment to develop this plan.

MS. LEONARD: Can you announce when
that meeting is one more time.

MR. PETRUCCI: April 1st, 200 Ross
Street, 1st Floor Conference Room. It starts
at 5:30 p.m.

MR. TAGUE: It will actually happen.
It's April Fool's Day. It will happen; right.

MR. PETRUCCI: It will happen, yes.

MR. TAGUE: Is there any new business?

I think this was a pretty good discussion. Thank you again, Bob, for your input.

As most of us look at, there is a lot of work to be done out there.

Fred; right?

It doesn't matter how many years you're at it, there's still work to be done.

Thank you.

Tom, do you have any comments?

MR. CUMMINGS: Tom Cummings, Urban Redevelopment Authority. I think some of the issues discussed today -- Bob, thanks for the summary of inclusionary zoning. I think a lot of those will really dovetail with the affordable housing task force of the city to be looking at some of those policies. I think there's a real overlap with that.

I just had a couple of suggestions
possibly for new membership. I don't know if they are members. I was wondering if anybody from PCRG is a member. They might add value to the committee and their analysis of lending practices.

MR. TAGUE: That study that they do every year.

MR. CUMMINGS: I also wonder if it might -- maybe not. I don't know about membership or participation, maybe information sharing. I think that it would be -- we really don't have any developers here, with Pat Fenton excluded.

MR. TAGUE: He's not a real developer.

MR. CUMMINGS: Sure, he is.

There's probably others.

MR. TAGUE: I'm kidding.

MR. CUMMINGS: Perhaps some for-profit developers, I think they could add, I think they would probably add a different viewpoint. It would be helpful for them to hear some of the things we've talked about.

MR. TAGUE: Do we know for-profit
developers we think we should invite?
I use the term membership. The term
is really participation.
MR. CUMMINGS: I can think of a
couple.
MR. TAGUE: Anybody else -- is that
okay, Sarah?
MS. KINTER: Yeah. If you want to
follow up with me, you can send an e-mail to
human dot relations at Pittsburgh pa dot gov
e-mail. Or you can just talk to me after the
meeting. That's the easiest way to contact
me.
MR. HARVEY: To add to what Tom said,
since the task force is going to be created
before our next meeting, should we have
someone from their office come in?
MR. TAGUE: Someone to --
MR. HARVEY: Someone from the
affordable housing task force to be present
at the -- give a presentation, say what they
understand their task to be, what are they
doing, what have they done.
MR. TAGUE: Originally, we had invited Councilman Lavelle to come to this meeting. The idea is to get someone from that task force. I'm not sure how they are going to structure it from a leadership standpoint. What about having -- Councilman Lavelle has expressed interest in this task force and collaborating with it.

Is that who we should invite to our next meeting? Is that a thought, Peter?

MR. HARVEY: I don't think enough about what -- I don't know frankly know enough about the task force and does it make more sense to have someone from -- plus, just the people that are available to come.

MR. TAGUE: That's always an issue.

SPEAKER ONE: The two cochairs -- correct me if I'm wrong -- are Councilman Lavelle and Ray Gastil, the Director of City Planning.

MR. TAGUE: So we can ask maybe Ray to come?

SPEAKER ONE: Sure, or Councilman
Lavelle.

MR. TAGUE: Or both.

SPEAKER ONE: It's going to be
staffed, I believe, by Matt Baron and Michael
Smith, so Matt Baron from the Mayor's Office
and Michael Smith from the Department of City
planning. Maybe one of them --

MR. TAGUE: The idea is we would like
to have someone who can come and talk
knowingly about the task force.

The next meeting is April -- when is
our next?

MS. KINTER: June.

MR. TAGUE: The question, in closing,
is should we meet sooner. I mean, there's no
bylaws that say we have to meet quarterly.
We can meet more often. Do we need to
schedule a meeting sooner than later, is the
point I'm making.

MS. GERHARDT: A suggestion. Because
the affordable housing task force is in its
formative stages it seems like a good time to
meet sooner and to work on this in maybe a
more concentrated way, just because we're at a very formative time, in terms of potentially developing a citywide policy.

MR. TAGUE: Is that also true of land banking?

MS. GERHARDT: I think they are very connected. This task force can be looking at the way that these things are coming together at this time and how we might have an influence on this formative period.

MR. TAGUE: Are we talking about having a meeting, for example, next month?

MS. GERHARDT: What are other --

that's my --

MR. TAGUE: I'm just throwing it out for conversation.

MS. KINTER: I think we can do that. I think we can put together a meeting in April.

MR. TAGUE: If there's no objection to it, we'll try to. Again, some of this stuff, as has been pointed out, is timely. I think we need to consider that also.
The other thing is the consolidated plan. The county and city are doing those. Those will also affect affordable housing. Those hearings are going on also, right, the comprehensive plan?

MR. PETRUCCI: The five year plan and the annual plan will also be at the hearing on April 1st.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The county is a little behind. Their hearing will be a little bit later than April.

MR. TAGUE: When is the city's hearing?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: April 1st.

MR. PETRUCCI: Our fiscal period starts April 1st. The county's fiscal period starts July 1st. Their hearing will be probably some time in, my guess would be May.

MR. TAGUE: We'll have to let the task force know when those meetings are. We all agree the comprehensive plan has a significant effect on it, along with the AI.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The thing to me
is market-driven development alone will not produce affordable housing where the market is hot. To support grants that maintain standards or whatever, it takes affirmative action. It takes a will and actual effort and money and policy, you know, from the political entities to influence that. It's not just that the five year plan is relevant to affordable housing. It is the dominating plan if you want to influence spending and policy direction to incentivize and try to actually create affordable housing in good, strong markets where the market forces just don't -- will not do it by itself.

MR. TAGUE: You're absolutely right. Is PHFA part of this?

They are a significant player in all of this, right, Fred?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. TAGUE: Are there any other developers nonprofit that should be, along with the Action Housing, are there any others that need to be at the table?
MR. BROWN: I think we should be considering organizations at the nonprofit level that are doing affordable housing projects, rehab projects, so that there might be a task force on the regional level that looks at the metrics of putting out X amount of houses a year to meet the standard or the need.

I know OBB because we worked with them. That's one of those organizations that probably should be invited. I think even having RTP, Rebuilding Together Pittsburgh here might be influential in the number of places that they are already being asked to do work. Is there a way that we can get Steve to look at that work differently, and talking with the entities that have contracted with him to really set aside some of this work to address this particular issue?

I think there's a lot of people doing work already who I think, through the relationships we have with them, would be
willing to look at doing some of this. They just need more resources and muscle to make it happen. I think we need to look at helping those organizations. They constitute the pivot and paradigm shift in the community. All of us have other jobs. These are projects and events that we are engaging in. What I'm suggesting is that we help people engage in a long-term strategy that's a journey and not an event. Through our event, we can add value, resources, technical assistance to help out. At the end of the day, they are going to be doing this day in and day out. This is a highwater mark for us because it's an issue. Once this issue disseminates a little bit we're off to the next issues. They are still going to be having to deal with maintaining it and moving it forward.

That would be my suggestion.

MR. TAGUE: Are there any closing thoughts, any remarks before we adjourn?

MS. REYNOLDS: I have a question for
Sarah.

April is still fair housing -- are there any events of interest that might be of interest to this group that you know of?

MS. KINTER: I know that the fair housing partnership poetry slam is on April 23rd. I think it's a Thursday. I can send out an e-mail about anything coming up.

April is National Fair Housing Month. There's lots of events going on.

MR. TAGUE: I would assume that all of us probably know that, or should know that.

I would again like to thank everybody for coming. There will be a number of e-mails sent out. There are no parting shots. It's been rather informative.

Thank you very much for joining us today. We are planning on doing another meeting in April. Sarah will send that out. Like I said, if there are any folks you think also need to be at the table, let us know that.

(Proceedings concluded at 10:55 a.m.)
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