



**Mountain Housing Council
Policy Working Group Meeting Summary
Tuesday, October 18, 2022**

Attendees: Ben Mills, Hilary Hobbs, Lynn Baumgartner, Yumi Dahn, Fred Ilfeld, John Falk, and Peter Greenburger
Facilitation: Steve Frisch and Kristina Kind

Purpose: Identify key strategies for 2023 State advocacy.

Topic	Discussion	Next Steps
<p>I. Review 2022 Legislative Session</p>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Statewide housing agenda is affordable housing focused and there is an increasing focus on below 60% AMI with financing policy and guidelines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key questions to answer: How do we swim upstream on this issue? How do we get set asides for above 80% AMI in current guidelines? Most housing advocates are advocating for affordable housing. Who are the partners and what are the partnerships we need to build for achievable housing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ How do we get the “yes and” message to resonate with the affordable housing advocates? Partners we have worked with: CA Coalition for Rural Housing, Housing CA, CA Housing Partnership, Housing Now, Housing WG in CA, National Low Income Housing Coalition ■ New partnerships we could build: RCRC (right now housing isn’t one of their key objectives, Placer and 	

	<p>Nevada Counties are members), California State Association of Counties (CSAC), League of CA Cities (future opp to focus on proactive issues), Bay Area Council, Silicon Valley Leadership Group (largely tech/business focused)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One talking Point: Housing is a roadblock to economic development in rural counties. ● State housing policy has no “regional” specific strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a “one-size fits all” mindset in the legislature that does not look at regional impacts. There is no mechanism for bringing issues of mountain communities forward in the current process. ● No Legislative “Champions” for Mountain or Resort Communities ● No Legislative Champions For Middle or Achievable Housing ● Trend Toward Authorizing Regional Housing Agencies in Urban Areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Almost all housing accelerator funds are going to urban areas. 	
Key Strategic Questions	<p>What is the right lens/key strategy for getting set asides for achievable housing?:</p> <p>Is This a Housing Play, Economic or a Climate Play?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Affordable housing advocates are so strong and there are only limited funds for housing (and we’re generally not competitive to receive these funds), would we have better success with a climate or economic strategy instead? ● This strategy could get funding for the infrastructure for housing rather than housing. For ex. If state subsidized infrastructure for density along transit corridors, it would take out some of the cost for building and help make achievable pencil. ● Rural climate is sensitive to change. More easily maintained through climate action. ● We could advocate for pots of funding for rural and urban areas – 	

keeping these separate and a synchronous approach with climate. There is one group working on this. Affordable Housing Climate Solutions Working Group (intersect between housing affordability/availability and climate. Staffed by CA YIMBI)

Focus on Tax and Incentive Policies for Missing Middle/Achievable?

- No shared language of what is “achievable housing” at the State level.
- Take some portion of existing funding pots for housing and have a set-aside for achievable (long-term strat).
 - Shorter-term strategy: Truckee is looking into a Truckee-specific AMI defined making it easier to get the housing we want.
- Previous MHC strategy discussed was to go to existing state financing housing programs and recommend that set aside from the existing pot for rural and achievable purposes. Really important to note this would reduce \$ for affordable and put us against affordable housing proponents. Is there someone to carry this?
- Or do we want to advocate for a strategy to expand the pools of funding and as the pools expand, expanding funds can go to rural and achievable?
 - Who would draft this legislation? MHC doesn’t have the heft to lift this.
 - Socialize idea of achievable housing to address state economic issues.
 - John could pitch to CAR. Bring together white paper, “Real Challenge of Housing in CA. Thinking through draft legislation to show the affordability gap.
 - There will be two main groups opposing; Organized labor and affordable housing advocates
- Influence criteria for affordable housing to provide more flex to meet demand (ie. more 1 bedrooms than 3)

“Champions” Process (Partnership Strategy/ Increased Agency Outreach)
Increase outreach/Have more coordinated approach.

- Identify who could be the key legislative and agency champions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Track all of their communications over time ● Develop cultivation strategy with each champion ● 3-6 month outreach plan in advance of leg processes ● Ask champions to act on our goals. ● Caballero is the closest to a housing champion in the state. We also need champions at the HCD, Office of Planning and Research, Governor's office of Business and Economic Development. Tim Robertson Pro Housing ● Could the CA Tahoe Conservancy be a champion?- This is a good question to ask TRPA. <p>Coordination with Lobbyists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Get Joel's viewpoint on where they could spend time. ● Local Control versus Prescriptive Policies ● Advocate for 5K and above <p>Local Control versus Prescriptive Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Jurisdictions would like to keep local control. Maintaining ability to control types of housing units (workforce vs second home) to meet housing need. <p>Parking Lot. This group is focused on State and Federal Policy only. Consider local financing options/solutions as a topic for the next MHC quarterly meeting (eg. Parcel tax) and also moving forward a MHC broader communication play around low-income housing.</p>	List of Questions:
2023 Priorities/Next Steps	<p>Policy Platform</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MHC will keep the policy platform and shift priorities to incorporate today's discussion. ● Recommendations: Expand Outreach To Potential External Partners (League of CA cities, CAC, RCRC, Bay AREa council) ● Decide if Leg "Champions" Process is workable? It takes a lot of time and resources. \$60K/year 	<p>MHC will draft and send to this group by November 7th for review and feedback</p> <p>MHC will send a Doodle Poll for Capital Days: Jan 31-Feb 2 and March 14-16</p>

Next Meeting		November 28, 2022, 2-3 PM
---------------------	--	------------------------------