THE MILE HIGH CITY

## Affordable Housing Permanent Fund

Presentation to INC July 9, 2016

- The Need for More Affordable Housing
- 2013-16 Progress
- Permanent Fund Concept Development
- Stakeholder Engagement and Public Awareness
- Revenue
- Expenditures
- Oversight
- Next Steps
- Rapid population growth
- Housing supply unable to keep pace with demand
- Denver housing prices rising at twice the national rate
- Rents have increased 30-35\% since 2010
- Jeopardizes market-rate affordable units
- 4K units could lose affordability protections in next 5 years
- Increasing gentrification and concentration of poverty
- Federal funds are declining
- 87,000 households 0-80\% AMI are housing costburdened
for crivsenves visit call
Denverfiop:agy|lat more than 30\% of income on housing $+{ }_{3}$ utilities
- 2013-16 Steps to Address Affordable Housing
- Issued 3x5 Challenge
- Issued "Housing Denver," five-year strategic plan
- Created \$10M Revolving Loan Fund utilizing 2014-15 GF dollars
- Allocated \$8M to Affordable Housing from General Fund in 2016
- Launched 250-unit SIB program for chronic homeless
- Adopted construction defect ordinance
- Hosted 2015 \& 2016 Housing Summits
- Strengthened City's Affordable Housing Preservation Ordinance
Fon cirs seucquysilicg in Gentrification/Involuntary Displacement Study - Announced intent to create Affordable Housing Permanent
- Established Permanent Fund Working Group
- Significant financial modeling by BMO and consultant
- Led to \$15M/year and 6,000-unit goals
- Rigorous vetting of a dozen funding sources
- Led to two preferred options: property tax and development fee
- Numerous one-on-one and small group meetings
- Significant media coverage
- Denver Post, DBJ, Westword and neighborhood newspapers
- Monthly Stakeholder Committee meetings starting in Sept 2015
- Developers, service providers, finance experts and many others
- Informational presentations to Council Committee
- Public Meeting No. 1 at East High School in April (350 athterndees)
- Two revenue sources would be effective 1/1/17
- Property tax (less than 1 mill)
- Development fee (simple "flat" structure, no fee higher than \$3/sf)
- Goals:
- At least \$150M in first 10 years (6,000 housing units)
- 50 percent from development fee
- 50 percent from property tax
- Why these two sources?
- Fair, balanced, equitable and communitywide approach
- Relies on long-term stability of property tax
semecanaptures revenue during economic upcycles from development
- Cost of 0.5 mill on median single-family home $(\$ 300,000)$
- \$12 per year
- Cost of 0.5 mill on every $\$ 1$ million of commercial value
- \$145 per year
- Cost of $\$ 1 /$ sq ft fee on new 2,500 sq ft home
- \$2,500
- Cost of $\$ 2 /$ sq ft fee on new $25,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{commercial} \mathrm{bldg}$.
- \$50,000


## Development Fee

- One-time fee on new construction, new sq footage \& intensified uses
- Payable at time of building permit approval
- For residential, IHO would no longer apply to new projects but there would be build option under the development fee
- Court-tested methodology established "legally justified maximum fee," draws nexus from development to jobs to housing need
- Nationally respected consultant David Rosen \& Associates (DRA)
- 2 Technical Advisory Groups (residential \& commercial developers)
- Second phase of analysis: Feasibility Study
- Shows at what threshold a fee tips a project into a financially infeasible position based on ROE analysis
- Proposed fees lowered even more based on additional input and analysis, including comparison to fees in peer cities:
- San Diego
- Sacramento
- Boston
- Boulder
- Seattle
- San Fran

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0.80-\$ 2.12 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \\
& \quad \$ 0.50-\$ 2.58 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \\
& \$ 8.34 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \\
& \$ 0.09-\$ 9.53 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \\
& \$ 5-\$ 17.50 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \\
& \$ 16.01-\$ 24.03 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Uses of Funds

- Permanent Fund will provide flexibility to create, preserve and rehab affordable housing units based on conditions in rental, homeownership and real-estate markets.
- Income Limits
- Rental Housing: Up to 80\% AMI (\$64,100 for family of four)
- For-Sale Housing: Up to $100 \%$ AMI (\$80,100 for family of four)
- Homeownership: Up to $120 \%$ AMI (\$96,120 for family of four)
- Programs include down-payment and mortgage assistance
- Other
- 8\% administrative cost cap
- Some funds for supportive services
- Leverage new and existing expertise to create competitive programs and streamlined investment decisions:
- Dedicate some existing OED staff to Permanent Fund deployment
- Hire new OED, CPD and CAO staff
- Streamline investments \& create competitive opportunities:
- Transition from rolling applications to semi-annual competitive application aligned with CHFA's tax credit process
- Create an online shared application for LIHTC developments for CHFA, CDOH and OED

- Develop online term sheets for greater transparency


## DENVErstructured Affordable Housing

## Advisory Committee

- A key part of the new Affordable Housing Permanent Fund would be the restructuring of the Mayor's Affordable Housing Advisory Committee. The new Committee would be formalized in ordinance and would:
- Recommend goals, objectives and policies to inform affordable housing budget priorities annually
- Recommend goals, objectives and policies to inform 3- to 5year strategic plans for the Fund, including goals for mix of:
- AMI ranges
- Rental and homeownership
- Supportive services
- Land banking
- The Committee also would:
- Review semi-annual and annual performance and outlook reports
- Recommend:
- New programs
- Metrics to be tracked
- Community engagement strategies
- Housing priorities, including geographic priorities
- Methods to leverage and maximize dollars
- Annual budget priorities
- Ex-Officio Members (serving by virtue of title \& office)
- Mayor's Office Representative
- Executive Director of the Office of Economic Development
- Executive Director of Community Planning and Development
- City \& County of Denver Chief Financial Officer
- City's Top Homelessness Official
- Executive Director of the Denver Housing Authority
- Executive Director of Denver Urban Renewal Authority
- Executive Director of the Colorado Housing and Finance Authority
- Executive Director of the Colorado Division of Housing


## 21 Members

THE MILE HIGH CITY

- Appointed by Mayor
- Housing finance expert
- Homeless provider
- Community Housing Development Organization
- Impacted community rep (e.g. resident of deed-restricted housing)
- Major employer
- Private-sector, market-rate real estate industry representative
- For-profit affordable housing developer
- Non-profit affordable housing developer
- At-large community member
- Appointed by Council
- Member of Denver City Council
- Affordable housing advocate
- At-large community member


## Additional Info

- Body would:
- Be staffed by OED
- Meet monthly in publicly noticed and open meetings
- Minutes would be recorded and published online
- Members would be subject to City's Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest policies
- Most members would serve staggered two-year terms


## City Council

- City Council will continue to approve annual affordable housing budget line item
- There will be some reflection of goals in the budget process
- Council will continue to approve contracts above \$500,000
- Do other cities in the metro area impose development fees?
- Yes
- Will this hurt Denver's ability to compete?
- No. Out of 26 metro area jurisdictions, Denver ranks:
- 7th lowest on combined city and county sales tax rate
- 8th lowest on county property tax mills
- 5th lowest on sales, property, other taxes as a \% of total income
- How long have you been working on this?
- We've spent a year working openly with stakeholders, experts, consultants and the public to arrive at this proposal.


## City, County and School Mill Levy Rates (2015)
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## DENVER <br> THE MILE HIGH CITY

## Denver's Tax Rates are Competitive

Highest and Lowest Residential Property Taxes among Largest U.S. Cities (Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, June 2016)

| Rank | \$300,000 Home | Tax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Bridgeport, CT | $\$ 11,634$ |
| 2 | Aurora, IL | $\$ 11,630$ |
| 3 | Detroit, MI | $\$ 11,427$ |
| 4 | Newark, NJ | $\$ 9,137$ |
| 5 | Milwaukee, WI | $\$ 8,392$ |
| 49 | Denver, CO | $\$ 1,985$ |
| 50 | Cheyenne, WY | $\$ 1,956$ |
| 51 | Washington, DC | $\$ 1,867$ |
| 52 | Boston, MA | $\$ 1,499$ |
| 53 | Honolulu, HI | $\$ 765$ |

## DENVER <br> THE MILE HIGH CITY

## Denver's Tax Rates are Competitive

Highest and Lowest Commercial Property Taxes among Largest U.S. Cities (Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, June 2016)

| Rank | \$1,000,000 Property | Tax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Detroit, MI | $\$ 49,502$ |
| 2 | New York, NY | $\$ 47,472$ |
| 3 | Chicago, IL | $\$ 43,249$ |
| 4 | Minneapolis, MN | $\$ 39,047$ |
| 5 | Milwaukee, WI | $\$ 34,360$ |
| 18 | Denver, CO | $\$ 28,758$ |
| 46 | Long Beach, CA | $\$ 13,500$ |
| 47 | Las Vegas, NV | $\$ 13,473$ |
| 48 | Raleigh, NC | $\$ 12,472$ |
| 49 | Virginia Beach, VA | $\$ 12,364$ |
| 50 | Seattle, Washington | $\$ 10,508$ |

Development impact fees are a common source of revenue for jurisdictions across metro Denver, funding public investments such as affordable housing, transportation, parks and public schools.

Municipal Impact Fees* in the Front Range

| City | Single Family/Duplex (Per unit) | Multifamily (Per unit) | Assisted Living Senior Housing (Per bed) | Non-Residential (Per Sq Ft) | Mixed-Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARVADA | \$1,390.40-\$1,974.10 | \$1,034.40 | N/A | N/A | \$922.40 |
| AURORA | \$977.25-\$1,244.00 | \$874.00 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| BOULDER | \$2,148.00-\$6,630.00 | \$2,563.00-\$5,695.00 | N/A | \$0.04-\$412.20 | N/A |
| BROOMFIELD | \$2,000.00 | \$1,000.00 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| FT. COLLINS | \$7,136.00 | \$28,260.00 | N/A | \$6.31-\$13.05 | N/A |
| LAKEWOOD | N/A | \$750.00 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| LITTLETON | \$3,762.00 | N/A | N/A | \$1.81 | N/A |
| LONGMONT | \$7,502.00 | \$4,703.00 | N/A | \$2.91-\$3.03 | N/A |
| THORNTON | \$1.50/sq ft | N/A | N/A | \$3.00 | N/A |
| WESTMINSTER | \$1,976.00-\$2,730.00 | \$1,346 + \$2,000/per acre | \$429.00 | \$2,000/per acre | \$2,000/per acre |
| LOUISVILLE | \$5,726.00 | \$3,149.00 | N/A | \$0.50-\$0.70 | N/A |
| LOVELAND | \$13,085.00 | \$9,055.00 | N/A | \$4.28-\$8.07 | N/A |
| WINDSOR | \$7,608.00 | \$6,976.00 | N/A | \$2.84-\$3.48 | N/A |

[^0]- July 13: Informational presentation to Council Safety and Well-Being (SWELL) Committee
- July 14: Final Stakeholder Committee meeting
- July 21: Public Meeting No. 2
- July 23: Cabinet in the Community
- Aug: Introduction of ordinance at SWELL Committee
- Aug:Mayor-Council meeting
- Aug: City Council meeting (1st reading)
- Aug: Council mtg (2nd reading)
- Educate CPD customers about new fee and process
- Include housing priorities in 2017 budget process
- Enhance OED staffing
- Create new processes for allocating funds effective 1/1/17
- Nominate and confirm new Advisory Body


## Final Thoughts?

# Additional Questions and Discussion 

THE MILE HIGH CITY

## Appendix

## APPENDIX

Comparison of IHO Requirement vs. Residential Linkage Fee at $\$ 2$ per gross square foot

|  |  |  | 12 Story |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighborhoo d Scenario | Housing Requirement | 5 Story Residential <br> 300 units <br> 209,500 gsf <br> Onsite Requirement: 30 units | Residentia* <br> 232 units <br> 304,063 gsf <br> Onsite Requirement: 23 units | 20 Story Residential* <br> 285 units <br> 299,750 gsf <br> Onsite Requirement: 29 units |
| LOW | IHO-CIL | \$1,351,053 | \$1,369,869 | \$1,605,323 |
|  | Linkage | \$419,000 | \$608,126 | \$599,500 |
| MEDIUM | IHO-CIL | \$2,702,100 | \$2,739,751 | \$3,210,668 |
|  | Linkage | \$419,000 | \$608,126 | \$599,500 |
| HIGH | IHO-CIL | \$3,782,941 | \$3,835,652 | \$4,494,930 |
|  | Linkage | \$419,000 | \$608,126 | \$599,500 |

[^1]Dedicated 0.5 Mills, Maximize Assessment Years \$1.50 Commercial and Res Linkage Fee
*Based on historic development figures, assuming uniform application of fee with no exemptions, thresholds etc. - overly optimistic. Purely hypothetical, not a projection of actuals.

Denver Commercial Nexus Analysis - Legally Justified Fees

| NEXUS STEP | OFFICE | HOTEL | RETAIL | WAREHOUSE | MANUFACTURING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SIZE OF PROTOTYPE | $\mathbf{7 5 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{~ s f}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 , 7 0 0} \mathbf{s f}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{s f}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 0 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{s f}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{s f}$ |
| AFFORDABILITY GAP PER <br> GROSS SQUARE FOOT | $\mathbf{\$ 5 6 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 3 . 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 9 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 . 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 9 . 5 7}$ |

## DENVER

Hisdatentall Nexus Study Findings

Denver Residential Nexus Analysis — Legally Justified Fees

| NEXUS STEP | SINGLE FAMILY <br> (owner) | TOWNHOMES <br> (owner) | 12 STORY <br> RESIDENTIAL <br> (owner) | 2 STORY <br> RESIDENTIAL | (rental) <br> RESIDENTIAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (rental) |  |  |  |  |  |

FOR CITY SERVICES VISIT | CALL
DenverGov.org 331

## Boston, MA

## Commercial Linkage*

- Applicability: Commercial developments over 100,000 square feet, collected on gross square footage of whole development (excluding parking)
- Construction Type: Collected on all new construction, extended/enlarged buildings, substantially rehabilitated buildings
- Payment: Phased - due in seven equal installments starting at building permit issuance
- Inclusionary Policy: Yes, 10\% requirement on all rental and for-sale development


## - Outcomes:

- \$134,687,969 collected since program initiated in 1987
- 10,217 income restricted units built over life of program

| Development Type | Required Commercial Linkage Fee |
| :--- | :--- |
| Office | $\$ 8.34$ per square foot |
| Retail | $\$ 8.34$ per square foot |
| Hotel | $\$ 8.34$ per square foot |
| Institutions | $\$ 8.34$ per square foot |

## DENVER <br> Sacramento, CA <br> THE MILE HIGH CITY

## Cominercial/Residential Linkage

- Applicability: Gross square footage of all commercial and residential development (excluding parking)
- Construction Type: Collected on all new construction, addition to existing building, substantially rehabilitated building. Applies to mixed use projects with any combination of above.
- Payment: Lump sum at time of building permit
- Inclusionary Policy: No, only on large scale developments
- Outcomes (Commercial):
- \$34,162,684 since 1989
- 3,339 units built over life of program

| (Resi Development Type | Required Commercial/Residential Linkage Fee |
| :---: | :---: |
| Commercial - Office | \$1.84 per square foot |
| Commercial - Hotel | \$1.74 per square foot |
| Commercial - Research and Development | \$1.56 per square foot |
| Commercial - Manufacturing | \$1.15 per square foot |
| Commercial - Warehouse | \$0.50 per square foot |
| Residential - Single Family/Duplex | \$2.58 per square foot |
| Residential - Multi-Family | \$2.58 per square foot |

## DENVER <br> THE MILE HIGH CITY

## Commercial/Residential Linkage

- Applicability: Gross square footage of all commercial and residential development (excluding parking)
- Construction Type: Collected on all new construction, addition to existing building, substantially rehabilitated building. Applies to mixed use projects with any combination of above.
- Payment: Lump sum at time of building permit
- Inclusionary Policy: Yes, 20\% requirement on for-sale development
- Outcomes:
- More than 6,000 units produced through the City's Affordable Housing Trust Fund since 1990

| Development Type | Required Commercial/Residential Linkage <br> Fee |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commercial - Office | $\$ 4.50$ per square foot |
| Commercial - Retail/Restaurant | $\$ 4.50$ per square foot |
| Commercial - Industrial/Manufacturing | $\$ 2.25$ per square foot |
| Commercial - Hotel/Lodging | $\$ 4.50$ per square foot |
| Commercial - Warehouse/Storage | $\$ 2.25$ per square foot |
| Commercial - Research and Development | $\$ 2.25$ per square foot |
| Residential - Market Rate Rental Unit | $\$ 28,000$ per unit |

## Commercial/Residential Linkage*

- Applicability: Gross square footage of commercial development above 1,000 square feet, net square footage of all residential development. Must mitigate for $60 \%$ of employees generated. Fees vary by development type and location, but up to around $\$ 250 \mathrm{~K}$ per employee mitigated.
- Construction Type: Collected on all new construction, demolition and replacement of existing buildings, additions to existing buildings, substantially rehabilitated buildings.
- Payment: Lump sum at time of building permit
- Inclusionary Policy: Blended


## - Outcomes:

- More than 2,800 units created by Aspen-Pitkin County Housing Authority since 2005

| Development Type | Required Commercial/Residential Linkage Fee |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commercial - Commercial Zone Districts | 4.7 employees per 1,000 sf of net leasable space |
| Commercial - Lodge Commercial Zone Districts | 4.7 employees per 1,000 sf of net leasable space |
| Commercial - Ski Base Commercial Zone Districts | 4.7 employees per 1,000 sf of net leasable space |
| Commercial - Mixed Use Commercial Zone Districts | 3.6 employees per 1,000 sf of net leasable space |
| Commercial - Service/Industrial Zone Districts | 3.9 employees per 1,000 sf of net leasable space |
| Residential - Studio/One Bedroom | 1.25 employees |
| Residential - Two Bedroom | 2.25 employees |
| Residential - Three Bedroom | 3.00 employees |
| Residential - Each Additional | .5 employees |

*Aspen also receives local housing funds through a sales tax and a real estate transfer tax

## 
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[^0]:    *Represents total impact fees on development type.

[^1]:    *Assumes 12 story and 20 story residential as "high cost structures" 27 with elevator and structured parking.

