CITY OF BOULDER
HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA
DATE: November 14, 2018
TIME: 3 PM
LOCATION: Main Library, Boulder Creek Room, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL/ 3:00 p.m.

2. AGENDA REVIEW

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   a. October 24, 2018

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (non-agenda items) / 3:05 p.m.

5. BOARD STUDY & DISCUSSION / 3:15 p.m.
   a. Subcommunity Planning Project Overview – Informational Item

6. MATTERS FROM COUNCIL / 3:45 p.m.
   a. Affordable Housing Goal Study Session - Input

7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD / 4:45 p.m.
   a. Standing committee reports
      • No reports: Public Engagement, Regional Housing, Boards Liaison, CU
   b. Special committee reports
      • Affordable Housing Resident Concerns: next steps - Decision
      • Alpine-Balsam: report on joint board meeting – Informational Item
      • No reports: Area Median Income, Community Benefit, Subcommunity Planning
   c. Unfinished business
      • Annual letter to council: review draft – Feedback
      • Review and update HAB application - Decision
   d. New business
      • Future role of committees – Decision
      • Changes to agenda format - Decision
      • Consensus decision-making models - Feedback

8. MATTERS FROM STAFF / 5:45 p.m.

9. DEBRIEF MEETING AND CALENDAR CHECK / 5:50 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT / 6:00 p.m.

Informational Item: updates and education; no action to be taken
Feedback: discussion and comments on board processes; may result in action to change them
Input: discussion and comments to shape staff work on housing issues, projects and policies; no action to be taken
Decision: Vote on board processes, work plan, agenda items, etc.
Recommendation: Vote on the board’s input to city council

For more information please contact the HAB Secretary at 303.441.4134, or via Email at marinc@bouldercolorado.gov. Board agendas are available online at https://bouldercolorado.gov/boards-commissions/housing-advisory-board. Please note agenda item times are approximate.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose
The purpose of this study session is to share information with City Council and receive feedback about the Subcommunity Planning program, a localized planning effort to address a range of issues and opportunities and to implement the goals of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP). The memorandum includes observations of the program as it has been described and applied in Boulder, provides case study examples and national best practices from programs around the country and identifies six foundational elements of successful programs.

Evolution of Topic
The 2015 BVCP Major Update, adopted in 2017, identifies community interest in localized planning to offer targeted solutions for different community geographies and bridge the gap between broad policies and site-specific project review. At the January 2018 City Council Retreat, subcommunity planning was identified as a priority program for the year to address this interest and implement goals of the BVCP update. In June 2018 a Senior Planner was hired to manage and implement the program. Over the past three months, the planning team has evaluated BVCP goals, past subcommunity planning efforts, applicable case studies and recent community input to evaluate the city’s approach to subcommunity planning and identify a strategy for evolving this approach and implementing the program.
With an expressed interest from residents and council in re-establishing a subcommunity planning program, six foundational elements are identified to provide clarity and direction for the program moving forward: (1) Definitions; (2) Boundaries; (3) Prioritization Criteria; (4) Scope and Deliverables; (5) Schedule and Phasing; and (6) Community Engagement. Staff and council will explore during tonight’s session, to be followed by a second session that will help shape the remaining elements. Creating clear expectations for the six foundational elements of subcommunity plans will facilitate efficiency in plan development and review as well as support transparency in the effort. The development and documentation of the program is consistent with the city’s Engagement Strategic Framework.

Questions for Council

1. Does Council agree that the proposed definitions capture the intent and purpose of Subcommunity Planning in Boulder?
2. Does Council find that revising the existing subcommunity boundaries is critical to the success of the subcommunity planning program?
3. Does Council agree with the approach to use measurable criteria for subcommunity prioritization for planning?

BACKGROUND

History of Subcommunity Planning in Boulder

Subcommunities in Boulder were first identified in the 1970 Comprehensive Plan as an approach to planning that translates large-scale planning ideas to the human scale. The original subcommunities were intended to focus community interests to a neighborhood level and provide residents with access to important community assets and services, such as schools and parks. The original concept intended to sub-divided each subcommunity into four neighborhoods; each neighborhood possessing its own school, park and small convenience shopping facility. In 1977, the Comprehensive Plan identifies five subcommunities: North; Northeast; Central; Southeast; and South. The main change in concept between 1970 and 1977 was that the subcommunity became the main unit in which residents should have access to community resources and services and the sub-division of each subcommunity into four neighborhoods was abandoned.

While subcommunities were identified in 1977, the areas were not used as a tool for planning until the late 1980s. In 1989, the City identified a gap between the scale of the comprehensive plan and
site-specific plans. Subcommunity planning was recommended as a method to better address issues at this “in-between” scale. In 1992, the map was revisited by staff and council, and nine subcommunities were identified: Central; Crossroads; University of Colorado; East; Southeast; South; North; Palo Park and Gunbarrel.

The first subcommunity plan to be taken on by residents, council and staff was the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan. The area was identified by council as the first subcommunity for planning because of the presence of vacant, developable land that remained in the area and the need to determine the future of these lands. The planning process began in the fall of 1992 and the final plan was adopted in the summer of 1995 and then amended in both 1996 and 1997. The effort included a collaborative process between the public, city staff, other public agencies, a large steering committee and a team of consultants. Interviews with former staff and community members involved in the process revealed that the planning effort was a significant undertaking that included robust community engagement and frequent public communication. While controversy arose throughout the process, today the plan is considered by staff as well as council members and residents to be a successful tool that was able to both communicate expectations about the future and provide paths towards implementation for specific goals and initiatives identified in the plan. The North Boulder Subcommunity Plan resulted in the rezoning of some areas within North Boulder, the creation of five new zoning districts based on the plan’s design principles, land use patterns and future growth recommendations and the adoption of an ordinance requiring dedication or reservation of right of way in conformance with mobility maps included in the Plan. The North Boulder Subcommunity Plan is available as Attachment A.

Following the completion of the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan, the city’s Planning Department hired an independent consultant to conduct an evaluation of the planning process to identify gaps, lessons learned and opportunities for process improvement in subcommunity planning. This study, conducted by Community Matters, Inc. is available as Attachment B. The evaluation included eight recommendations to strengthen subcommunity planning processes in Boulder:

1. Agree on the purpose of the Subcommunity Plan
2. Develop a set of performance criteria or checklist for the plan’s development
3. Establish and agree upon the focus of the plan at the outset
4. Establish ground rules regarding how the plan shall connect to other areas
5. Describe the desired end product
6. Consider a section that incorporates related policies and principles from already adopted documents as a means of achieving the integration desired by citizens.
7. Consider developing a policy paper that articulates the City’s stand on predictable development.
8. Develop a document that illustrates the intent of each planning tool and how it is used in the decision-making process.

These recommendations as well as recent best practices from national case studies will help inform the approach to re-establishing the subcommunity planning program in Boulder.
ANALYSIS
Subcommunity Planning and the BVCP

Today, the BVCP is the primary tool to guide the Subcommunity Planning process. Chapter Five of the Plan provides information about the intent and process of subcommunity planning.

Definitions
The BVCP defines both subcommunity and area planning under one umbrella, as:

Subcommunity and area planning bridges the gap between the broad policies of the comprehensive plan and site-specific project review (development applications or city capital projects). The planning horizon is the same as that for the comprehensive plan – 15 years. Such plans are prepared through a process that requires residents, neighbors, businesses and land owners and city (and sometimes county) departments to work together toward defining the vision, goals and actions for an area...

Subcommunity and area plans are adopted by the Planning Board and City Council and amended as needed with the same legislative process as originally adopted. Land Use Map changes proposed in subcommunity and area plans may be incorporated into the comprehensive plan concurrent with the adoption of the area plan. Subcommunity, area and neighborhood planning efforts are processes in which all are given opportunities to collaborate and innovate in achieving local as well as wider community goals. (pg. 110-111)

While this description provides an idea of key actions for subcommunity planning, it does not describe what a subcommunity plan is or how it might be used in the future. Creating a definition that clearly identifies the outcome of these actions and the functions it will serve in the future can help set expectations surrounding subcommunity planning for the community. There is also a lack of distinction between subcommunity and area planning. These are distinct tools and greater specificity may be required to differentiate between the two products, processes and outcomes.

The 2015 BVCP update includes ten subcommunities:
1. Central Boulder
2. Central Boulder – University Hill
3. South Boulder
4. Southeast Boulder
5. Colorado University
6. Crossroads
7. East Boulder
8. North Boulder
9. Palo Park
10. Gunbarrel

While the latest update of the BVCP does not define a subcommunity, the current definition can be found on the city’s website: “Subcommunities are distinct areas within the service area of the city
(Area I and II), as defined by physical boundaries such as roads and parks.”
https://bouldercolorado.gov/planning/comprehensive-planning-policy-and-design

Boundaries
The 2015 map of subcommunity boundaries and inclusion of ten subcommunities is a change from the previous BVCP update. This latest update splits the Central Boulder subcommunity into two subcommunities: Central Boulder and Central Boulder – University Hill. The boundaries of subcommunities have evolved over the last 50 years to align with various physical features like topography and roads as well as with demographic data collection methodologies, such as U.S. Census Tracts. For additional information on the evolution of subcommunity definitions and boundaries, refer to the staff report, Attachment C.
At the January 2018 City Council Retreat, questions regarding the need for boundary modification were raised by council members. In general, the existing boundaries provide the following benefits:

- Clearly distinguish 10 distinctive regions within the city
- Align with major roads for ease of distinction
- Generally, align with census tract boundaries

The following issues with the existing boundaries may substantiate reasoning for refinement:

- “Downtown Boulder,” has recently been the focus of several planning efforts and development studies. With a unique set of land uses and adjacencies, established districts, and previously-defined plans and design guidelines, the area may merit its own subcommunity.
- There is currently little alignment between subcommunity boundaries and a variety of methods for mapping Boulder neighborhoods.
- Key community corridors currently act as the boundary lines between subcommunities but may serve as the “heart” of some areas/neighborhoods.
- There are areas within the city and/or the BVCP service area (areas I and II) that are not assigned to a subcommunity and therefore may not be included in a subcommunity plan as part of the program.

The following challenges to changing existing boundaries may indicate that only minor adjustments should be made to boundary lines:

- Since the 1990s, the city has tracked demographics, community feedback and opinion, and public investment by subcommunity. Retaining these boundaries allows the city access to a significant amount of data and allows us to track change over time. This data becomes an important tool for communicating with residents about city policies, programs and initiatives. It also serves as an important tool for making decisions about the future of each subcommunity.
- Boundaries have remained relatively consistent since 2005 and constituents are familiar with the name and general character of their current subcommunity. Changing boundary lines with or without community engagement bears the risk of distracting from the true goals of the program.

Prioritization
The BVCP identifies six criteria for selecting the priority for the development of subcommunity and area plans:

1. Extent to which the plan implements the comprehensive plan goals
2. Imminence of change anticipated in the area
3. Magnitude of an identified problem
4. Likelihood of addressing a recurring problem
5. Cost and time effectiveness of doing the plan
6. **Extent to which the plan will improve land use regulations, the development review process and the quality of public and private improvements**

These criteria lay out some critical goals for subcommunity and area planning. The criteria listed do not, however, provide measurable features of subcommunities or metrics that could be used to weigh the priority of one subcommunity over another. This leaves room for discretionary decision-making in prioritization and creates ambiguity in the process for community members. Providing residents with transparency in the prioritization of subcommunities for planning and using measurable data of existing conditions to support the schedule for subcommunity planning has become popular in cities across the country as data collection and analysis processes have improved and become more easily translated for public consumption.

**Case Studies**

Staff researched neighborhood and small area planning programs across the country to identify successes, failures and best practices of current programs of a similar scale. The full report of case study research can be found in Attachment D. The research reveals that many programs, such as the Planitulsa program in Tulsa, Oklahoma, which was able to communicate expectations about process and outcomes with city staff, councils, consultants, and the public prior to engaging in a planning effort proceeded with reasonable schedules and products. Other agencies, such as the City of Detroit, which did not set clear expectations for key elements of the planning program, often were forced to go back and re-define their expectations for these features, delaying plan completion and implementation. This finding mirrors the recommendations and lessons learned in the 1996 Evaluation of the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan Process (Attachment B).

The following programs offer active examples of best practices for the first three of the six foundational elements of the subcommunity planning program.

**Definitions**

In 2016, the City of Tulsa’s Planning and Development Department produced “A Guide to Small Area Planning.” The guide describes what small area planning in Tulsa is, why small area planning is conducted, how the plans are used and what should be expected once plans are adopted and approved as local policy. The document uses clear language to describe key terms, relationships and impacts of small area planning in Tulsa. The document also includes a “Frequently Asked Questions” section to support communication with residents and provide transparency in the program and processes. This information can be accessed by community members on the City’s [website](#).

**Boundaries**

In Cambridge, Massachusetts, the City’s Community Planning Division applies city-wide goals in a neighborhood context through their Neighborhood Planning Program. The program is based on the City’s 1953 Planning Study, *Thirteen Neighborhoods: One City*, which found that none of the city’s previous attempts at subdividing the community were useful for planning purposes and used the “neighborhood unit principle” to divide Cambridge into
workable residential areas for planning. The neighborhood planning unit is a concept developed by Clarence Perry in the early 1900s that encourages public facilities, like schools, be located at the heart of a community and surrounded by residential and commercial development, as well as other community facilities like parks and churches. This is very similar to the original intention of the Boulder subcommunity components, which planned for residential communities to have access to services and facilities within their subcommunity; an idea that continues to surface today in both the BVCP and Transportation Master Plan’s support for 15-minute neighborhoods. Cambridge’s neighborhood area boundaries cover 100 percent of the city’s land area and align with US Census tracts to allow for demographic tracking over time.

**Prioritization Criteria**

In November of 2016, Denver’s Community Planning and Development Department released its *Neighborhood Planning Initiative Strategic Plan*. A key component of this strategic plan is the provision of data-based indicators of "planning need" at the neighborhood scale. These indicators help to establish which neighborhoods within the city have the greatest need for a plan, relative to all the other neighborhoods, and which neighborhoods should be prioritized in the Neighborhood Planning Initiative’s (NPI) work plan. The indicators are organized by five themes: livability; investment; policy and regulation; economy; and demographics. Each theme is broken down into 3 measurable criteria, evaluated and mapped across the city. This criterion is then weighted and scored to generate a level of planning need on a scale of zero to five, (0 being the lowest need to 5 being the highest). Community members can access the strategic plan, indicators of planning need and criteria online. They are also able to see how their neighborhood scored relative to others and what phase of the work plan their neighborhood will receive planning.

These examples offer insight into how Boulder may approach subcommunity planning moving forward, through clearly-defined terms and boundaries and with transparency in prioritization of subcommunities.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Creating a Durable Program**

The legacy of planning and planning impacts in Boulder have provided national models for growth management, historic preservation, multi-modal access and service, and sensitive land use and zoning regulations. As a subcommunity planning program takes its first steps, clear communication and understanding among council, staff and the community about the foundational elements of the program will provide a path forward towards both the planning process and plan implementation. Six foundational elements will serve to provide clarity about program purpose, process and outcomes. These elements are:

1. **Definitions**
2. **Boundaries**
3. **Prioritization Criteria**
4. **Scope and Deliverables**
5. Schedule and Phasing
6. Community Engagement

The BVCP provides a level of direction for each of these elements, however, a greater level of detail as well as some revision are provided in the below recommendations with the aim of achieving greater clarity among staff, council and the community about subcommunity planning in Boulder.

1. Definitions

While the BVCP provides some definition surrounding subcommunities and subcommunity plans, there remains a level of ambiguity that may benefit from further definition of the following terms:

**Subcommunity**

*Why is Boulder divided into subcommunities?*

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan describes the city’s core values, principles and policies to be implemented across Boulder. How these initiatives get applied to areas throughout Boulder is dependent on localized conditions of the built and natural environments as well as the motivations and desires of residents, land and business owners. Dividing the city into subcommunities creates more focused areas of study and provides a framework for managing change and implementing policy.

**Existing Definition**

(From <https://bouldercolorado.gov/planning/comprehensive-planning-policy-and-design>)

Subcommunities are distinct areas within the service area of the city (Area I and II), as defined by physical boundaries such as roads and parks.

**Proposed Revision**

A subcommunity is an area within the service area of the city (Area I and II) that is defined by physical boundaries, such as roads and topography, and census tracts. Each subcommunity has distinct and commonly shared physical, natural and social characteristics.

**Subcommunity Plan**

**Existing Definition (From BVCP p. 110)**

Subcommunity and area planning bridges the gap between the broad policies of the comprehensive plan and site-specific project review. Area plans typically address planning issues at a more detailed level than subcommunity plans.
Proposed Revision

A Subcommunity Plan is a tool for residents, land owners, business owners, city officials and city staff that communicates expectations about the future of a subcommunity and guides decision-making about subcommunity preservation and change over a 15-year horizon.

What can a subcommunity plan process do?

- Supplement the Comprehensive Plan by providing a further level of detailed direction for the future of Boulder subcommunities
- Integrate city-wide planning efforts at a neighborhood scale
- Establish a forum for subcommunity residents to share ideas and concerns about the future of their area
- Provide residents with opportunities to play a role in the planning, design and implementation of future preservation and change in their neighborhood
- Define desired characteristics of a subcommunity that should be preserved or enhanced
- Identify gaps and opportunities in city services and resources
- Identify gaps and opportunities in the private market for features like housing and retail
- Prioritize projects for preservation and/or change within the subcommunity
- Identify implementation tools to realize the vision of the plan
- Help shape critical capital budget decisions and public investment priorities
- Communicate expectations about the future of a subcommunity to residents, local businesses, the development community, City Council and staff
- Identify and describe and how each subcommunity can implement city-wide goals

What can a subcommunity plan process NOT do?

- Replace the site review process for new development or redevelopment projects
- Provide site design for specific parcels within a subcommunity
- Delay development projects or site review
- “Solve all the city’s problems”

What is the difference between a subcommunity plan and an area plan?

Existing explanation from the BVCP (pg.111):

Area plans are developed for areas or corridors with special problems or opportunities... Area planning is initiated as issues or opportunities arise. Area plans are generally of a scale that allow for developing a common understanding of the expected changes, defining desired characteristics that should be preserved or enhanced and identifying achievable implementation methods.
**Proposed explanation in table format:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcommunity Plan</th>
<th>Area Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses one of 10 subcommunity regions; Subcommunity size ranges from 500 acres to 10,000 acres</td>
<td>Addresses a group of adjacent parcels or a corridor ranging in size from 10 acres to 200 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines a long-term vision for change and preservation in a subcommunity</td>
<td>Envisions short and long-term physical changes to the built and/or natural environment for a specific site or small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impetus for Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommunity meets criteria defined for subcommunity planning and has been identified by pre-determined schedule</td>
<td>Opportunity sites or key issues arise that require a city planning process; The pursuit of an area plan for a site or corridor may be a recommendation included in a subcommunity plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Horizon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Years</td>
<td>2-10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION FOR CITY COUNCIL**

Does Council agree that the proposed **definitions** capture the intent and purpose of Subcommunity Planning in Boulder?

**2. Boundaries**

Subcommunity boundaries have significant implications on how areas of the city are evaluated, prioritized for planning and planned for in the future. Questions have been raised by both council and staff about how the boundaries might be modified to provide the greatest benefit to the city through subcommunity planning. The following are key considerations that may require further exploration by staff to refine current boundaries.

a. Is it important that areas within a subcommunity share any of the following characteristics?
   - Physical/aesthetic characteristics? Similar architectural styles, home sizes, lot layouts
   - Demographics? Income levels? Home prices?
   - Central commercial areas/neighborhood centers
Common public facilities like schools/parks/recreation centers?
- Natural resources like creeks and drainages?

b. Should Central Boulder be further subdivided to establish a Downtown Boulder subcommunity?

c. Should subcommunities cover all of the Service Area (Area I & II)?

**QUESTION FOR CITY COUNCIL**
Does Council find that revising the existing subcommunity **boundaries** is critical to the success of the subcommunity planning program?

### 3. Prioritization Criteria

Providing the community with a defensible, rigorous and transparent method for prioritizing subcommunities for planning aligns with core principles and values of the City of Boulder’s Engagement Strategic Framework. The process will also provide planning board, council, staff and residents with important baseline measurements of how subcommunities are currently serviced or performing.

Developing the criteria will not be a process of creation, but rather of editing. The BVCP and City department master plans all include methods of evaluating existing conditions and measuring goals and performance. The subcommunity planning program offers an opportunity to stack these goals together and evaluate their performance on a subcommunity level. The determination of appropriateness for criteria from these various plans can be based on the following logistic issues:

1. **Do we have the data to measure this?**

   It will be important that not only are prioritization criteria measurable, but that we already have the data to conduct that measurement.

2. **Can this data be mapped?**

   ArcMAP is a powerful geographic information system (GIS) tool used by the city to evaluate data geographically. Evaluating measurable data by subcommunity can be accomplished in minutes using this tool, if the applicable data can be mapped spatially.

3. **Is this data an essential indicator of planning need?**

   The 2015 BVCP Major Update describes the need for “comprehensive plan indicators” to measure the overall health and well-being of the community, environment and economy in addition to the progress relative to the vision and values of the plan and community sustainability and resilience. Today the BVCP offers seven “focus areas.” For the sake of demonstration, these focus areas have been translated by staff into measurable criteria that could be used to evaluate and prioritize subcommunities for planning. See Attachment G.
The questions to be asked of each of these metrics is whether they should be essential determinants for prioritizing subcommunities.

**QUESTION FOR CITY COUNCIL**

Does Council agree with the approach to use **measurable criteria** for subcommunity prioritization for planning?

**NEXT STEPS**

City staff would like to return to City Council to discuss and shape the remaining three foundational elements of the subcommunity planning program. Conversation and input gathered during the September 25th session will be used to inform the following:

4. Scope and Deliverables  
5. Schedule and Phasing  
6. Community Engagement

**ATTACHMENTS:**

C. History of Subcommunity Definitions and Boundaries – Staff Report (2018)  
F. Neighborhood Planning Initiative Strategic Plan, Denver Community Planning & Development (2016)  
MEMORANDUM

TO: Housing Advisory Board

FROM: Kurt Firnhaber, Director of Housing and Human Services (HHS)
      Kristin Hyser, Community Investment Program Manager (HHS)
      Jay Sugnet, Senior Planner (HHS)
      Christian Koltonski, Data and Analytics Project Manager (HHS)

DATE: November 14, 2018 (Study Session)

SUBJECT: Boulder’s Affordable Housing Goals Study Session

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
On October 23, staff introduced to the Housing Advisory Board (HAB) consideration of amending the city’s housing goals including the low- and moderate-income housing goal (also known as the 10 percent goal) and the middle-income goal. During the session, the HAB provided staff direction on the following items: the “why statement” defining the purpose of this work item, the project’s guiding principles, the proposed process including public engagement, and additional information needed to consider the amendment.

This memorandum reflects the direction provided by the HAB and further their consideration of amending the city’s housing goals including:

- Combine the current housing goals to assert one goal serving low- to middle-income (0-150% AMI) households.
- Update the goal to ensure the city’s continued prioritization and investment in creating and preserving homes meets the diverse housing needs of the Boulder community.
- Establish the goal as time-bound to be achieved by 2035.
- Amend the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan in 2020 to reflect the amended housing goals.

The Nov. 14 study session will be followed by a formal public hearing on Dec. 12 to gather community input prior to HAB making a recommendation for City Council consideration in early 2019.
“WHY” STATEMENT
The following “why” statement has been revised from the earlier version reflecting feedback provided by the HAB to be more visionary and aspirational. It is intended to clearly articulate the problem we are trying to resolve.

Boulder aspires to be a diverse and integrated population providing a range of available housing opportunities to serve the needs of the community. Grounded in the belief that the overall well-being of the community is heightened when individuals and families are retained, workforce housing is available, and residents with changing or special housing needs are served.

To this end, the Boulder community, its leadership and residents, have held a long commitment to securing diverse housing options to meet the needs of the Boulder community serving low-, moderate- and middle-income households. While the city has been committed over time to securing diverse housing and has made great progress in meeting its housing goals the city will revisit our affordable housing goals to ensure continued prioritization and investment in affordable housing continues to meet the changing needs of our community.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
In considering amending the city’s housing goals, the following guiding principles were reviewed and supported by the HAB:

- Affordable housing goals must be easy to explain and understand.
- Allow flexibility to be opportunistic to direct affordable housing resources to address the greatest need in any given year while leveraging resources and maximizing opportunities.
- Periodically review progress toward goals and adjust course as necessary.

A housing goal should be aspirational and time-bound. It must also be set with certain implications in mind including: availability of local funding source; status of federal and financial resources /factors (e.g., tax credits, interest rates, construction costs); development potential; and regulatory constraints. While points of consideration, these matters are outside of the scope of this work item. Each of these items are being pursued as part of a suite of strategies and tools to facilitate future housing production.

It is important to note that the city does not have specific targets within the goal (e.g., income levels, ethnicity, seniors, etc.). While previous city conversations have discussed creating these targets, the city relies on the ability to remain flexible in responding to opportunities that create affordable units. As a result, the city’s affordable homes have effectively served a broad spectrum of the community (as shown in Attachment A).

PROPOSED PROCESS
HAB Study Session
November 14, 2018
Staff will prepare a memo and all necessary elements to conduct a study session considering amendments including additional information requested by HAB.
HAB Board Public Hearing  December 12, 2018
Staff will prepare a memo and all necessary elements to conduct a public hearing considering amendments. The desired outcome is a recommendation to City Council.

Planning Board Public Hearing  January 2019
Staff will prepare a memo and all necessary elements to conduct a public hearing considering amendments. The desired outcome is a recommendation to City Council.

City Council Public Hearing  February 19, 2019
If amendments are recommended, staff will prepare a memo and all necessary elements for City Council consideration to amend the city’s housing goals.

Implementation of Amended Housing Goals  Following Approval
Update Goals in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan  2020

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT
HAB discussed their commitment to public engagement with regards to this work item and future projects and priorities. The resulting public engagement process will include:

• Notice of the study session and public hearings will be emailed to the city’s housing partners and stakeholders. Notice will be included in the Planning Newsletter and other city media outlets.
• Following the November 14 study session an “Affordable Housing Goals” page will be created and posted on the city’s website. This will be linked the HAB page. The site will include memorandums and presentations relating to the conversation. It will advertise all meeting times and opportunities to comment on the possible amendment to the goals including a feature to submit comments through the website.
• The public is invited to contact HAB or staff regarding any questions, suggestions or support for the potential amendments.

BACKGROUND
10 Percent Goal
The City of Boulder has long been committed to creating and preserving permanently affordable housing options to meet the diverse housing needs of the community. In 2000, the city adopted the Comprehensive Housing Strategy, which included the establishment of the 10 percent goal. The original 10 percent goal was based on the number of dwelling units in 2000, which was 45,000, for an absolute number of 4,500 affordable units. Following the work of an Affordable Housing Task Force, the goal was reaffirmed in 2010. It was also revised to reflect 10 percent of the number of housing units at the time of measurement. Therefore, thus being variable.

Since the original adoption of the 10 Percent Goal in 2000, the city has successfully deed restricted 7.5 percent (3,468) homes serving low- and moderate-income persons, housing approximately 8,500 persons. Below is a break-out of the families and individuals who live in the city’s safe and affordable housing. More in-depth information can be viewed at the Affordable Housing Dashboard.
Other successes resulting from the city’s pursuit of the 10 percent goal include increasing the diversity of the community and creating economic stability for residents living in affordable homes. The city’s Affordable Housing program has increased the diversity of Boulder by serving a greater proportion of blacks and Hispanics compared to the general population. Also, data shows most individuals residing in affordable housing only remain for 2-3 years suggesting affordable housing provides stability allowing residents to work toward economic security.

**Middle Income Goal**

With the decline of middle-income households in Boulder the city adopted the Middle-Income Housing Strategy in 2016. The Strategy defined a comprehensive approach to create and
preserve housing choice for middle-income households and puts forth a new aggressive, but obtainable goal that will increase housing options for middle-income households. The goal of the Strategy is to build or preserve 3,500 middle-income homes by 2030. The goal will be achieved with the development/preservation of 2,500 market-rate middle income and 1,000 deed restricted permanently-affordable homes.

Currently the city has 110 deed restricted middle income owner-occupied homes as part of the permanently affordable inventory. The majority of these units were achieved through annexation of land into the city.

**Middle-Income Units Created by Year**

![Graph showing middle-income units created by year](image)

**Boulder County Regional Housing Partnership Goal**

Simultaneous to the city’s progress towards achieving these stated goals, the multi-jurisdictional Boulder County Regional Housing Partnership (Partnership) was convened to expand access to diverse housing across the county, serving low- to middle-income households (30–120% Area Median Income). Driving the [Regional Housing Strategy](#) is the established goal to secure 12 percent of the county’s housing inventory as permanently affordable, serving a diverse mix of low-, moderate- and middle-income households by 2035. In 2017, Boulder City Council adopted [Resolution 1218](#) supporting the work of the Partnership, that includes a 12 percent goal for the entire county.

Based on population and land use projections from communities across the region, the Strategy asserts a regional goal of 20,400 affordable homes of which the 5,700 permanently affordable homes already secured across Boulder County. The 12 percent goal is aspirational yet realistic, as it’s grounded in regional population and build out projections. Since the adoption of the plan, 9 communities across the county adopted resolutions supporting the work of the Partnership and its asserted goals, including the Boulder City Council.
Similar to any goal, it is proposed the Regional Housing Goal will be achieved through a variety of strategies including: bolstering of financial resources; securing land, development and redevelopment options; preserving existing affordability; and alignment of regulatory processes to facilitate production of housing options to reach the goal.

ANALYSIS
The previously mentioned goals and progress have successfully served as a blueprint for the city’s regulations, policies and funding investments toward the development of affordable housing. While making great progress in meeting the housing needs of the Boulder community, a critical need remains. The following information will detail the existing need and impact of an amended goal and is captured in a snapshot in Attachment A.

Critical Housing Needs Remain
While the city has made great strides towards the 10 percent goal and is now setting its sights on addressing the middle-income housing needs of the community -- housing affordability and availability remains a critical issue. Escalating home prices are taking a toll on the household and economic security of Boulder’s residents, puts businesses and institutions at a disadvantage in attracting and retaining a competitive workforce, and places pressure on the community value of inclusivity and diversity.
The following statistics show the rapidly increasing housing costs occurring in Boulder and across the region:

- Since 2010, the median home price in Boulder has increased 60%, from $535,000 to $855,000 as of December 2017
- Market median rents have jumped 31% in Boulder since 2010, from $1,480 to $1,940
- The area median income, which translates into wages, have only risen 9.6% since 2010 while the cost of housing has increased by 31% for rentals and 60% for home ownership
- 22% of the Boulder population live in poverty
- In Boulder, 43% of household earn less than $50,000 per year
- In Boulder, County, 21,580 households are severely cost burdened, paying more than 50% of their income toward housing costs (e.g. rent, mortgage, utilities)

According the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) the city’s projects growth will add residents, housing, and jobs.

“As of January 2015, the City of Boulder (Area I) had approximately 44,725 housing units, 104,800 residents and 98,500 jobs.

Over the next 25 years, Area I is projected to add about 6,500 housing units, 19,000 residents and 19,000 jobs. CU student enrollment could increase by a range of 5,000 to 15,000 additional students by 2030.”

Boulder is, and will continue to be, a regional job center resulting in positive and negative impacts – economic prosperity, in-commuting, and high demand for existing housing. The housing demand will need to meet the needs of a diversified workforce and supporting a range of jobs and incomes. More information regarding the Jobs: Housing Balance can be reviewed on the city website.

Projected Achievement of the 10 Percent Goal

To consider amending the city’s housing goals, the first step is to evaluate projected affordable housing production. Based on the production of units over the past 18 years, the city produces an average of 132 units per year either through acquisition or new construction. This is a conservative estimate of unit production.
This historically-based production rate will result in the 10 percent goal being reached by 2029. The following table reflects the number of units needed to meet the 10 percent (adjusted for annual residential growth) and the projected progress.

However, city staff is optimistic that with multiple projects in the production pipeline, the city could achieve the 10 percent goal in approximately 5 years.

Varying Goal Implications
According to the BVCP, the city will reach residential housing capacity by 2040 with a projected build out of 52,000 homes. The Regional Housing Strategy adopted the 12% percent to be achieved by 2035 to address the immediacy of the region’s housing needs and to prioritize and expedite the regional efforts to meet these needs.
To align with the Regional Housing Strategy goal and to maximize regional partnerships and investment opportunities, the following goal scenarios demonstrate the number of affordable homes needed to address the city’s housing needs by 2035 (aligning with the Regional Housing Partnership). The scenarios below employ an adjusted unit count of 50,680 homes as the projected number of total residential units in Boulder in 2035. The following information assumes the middle-income goal is translated from a numerical unit count to a percentage of the city’s total housing stock.

Also captured in Attachment A, the following table demonstrates the impact of each goal percentage in terms of the number of units needed, unit types in terms of income levels and the year of attainment. These projections are based on the conservative rate of 132 units per year and does not account for increased production rates or possible downturns in the economy or potential decline in the housing market that would affect affordable housing production significantly.

The city of Boulder produces approximately 132 affordable units per year. It leverages its funding to effectively maximize the number of units that can be built or acquired.
The table demonstrates that combining the goals and increasing the goal to 12% is achievable by mid-2030, given the current pace of affordable housing development serving the city’s needs, therefore supporting the overall regional goal. Adopting an even higher goal will further the city’s efforts to meet the need while it may take longer than the 15 years. As well, any goal, in terms of number of units or duration, will only be achieved through a combination of acquisition, redevelopment, and new construction, a variety of funding sources, facilitative regulatory practices and favorable market conditions.

What is Needed to Facilitate Production
The HAB requested information regarding contextual factors needed to be considered and what is needed to achieve the goals identified above.

The rate of production may be impacted by a variety of factors. These factors include land use; permitting, construction and regulatory environment; and funding and financing availability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Availability of developable land; Restricted uses and density; Market competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting, Construction and Regulatory</td>
<td>Shortage of skilled labor; Cost and timing of entitlements; Challenges to creating diverse housing options (construction defects law, lack of incentives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Financing</td>
<td>Availability of funding (equity, debt); Cost of financing (interest rates, tax credit pricing); Cost of construction (land, materials, wages); Development pace (limiting regulated revenue sources)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While many of these factors present macro level issues requiring local communities to respond rather than control, there are strategies being pursued across the region to facilitate rather than impede housing development.

Presented in the Regional Housing Strategy, a variety of strategies are presented that will need to be pursued in concert to achieve any housing goals. Strategies include:

- **Bolstering Financial Resources** to create the fiscal supports necessary to leverage sources needed to achieve regional and local housing goals.
- **Secure Land and Development/Redevelopment Opportunities** to create diverse housing options.
- **Preserve Affordability** through the purchase and deed-restriction of currently affordable housing.
- **Consider Regulatory Processes** to ensure rules and regulations facilitate and not impede housing creation and preservation.

To continue on its path of achieving its housing goals, as is or amended, will require the city to continue to actively and effectively partner with the housing development community, prioritize and invest resources creating and preserving permanently affordable homes, and facilitate a regulatory environment supportive of the goal.
NEXT STEPS
The HAB will hold a public hearing on Dec. 12 to consider a recommendation to City Council. It is anticipated that City Council will consider updating the affordable housing goals on Feb. 19, 2019.

If you have any questions, please contact Kristin Hyser at hyserk@bouldercolorado.gov.
Attachment A

Boulder Affordable Housing Goals

**Purpose**
- Consider the following:
  - Combine the current housing goals to assert one goal serving low- to middle-income (0-120% AMI) households.
  - Update the goal to ensure the city's continued prioritization and investment in creating and preserving homes meeting the diverse housing needs of the Boulder community.
  - Establish the goal as time-bound to be achieved by 2035.
  - Amend the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan in 2020 to reflect the amended housing goals.

**Affordability**

- The City of Boulder is one of the most expensive places on the Colorado Front Range to rent or own a home. The cost of rents and homes has been increasing faster than incomes, forcing many families to move out of Boulder. High housing costs also impacts the retention and hiring of local employees.

- Quick Facts
  - 22.2% of individuals in Boulder live in poverty.¹
  - 42.6% of households are burdened by housing costs, paying more than a third of their income on housing.²
  - 2017 Median Home Price: $855,000; Rent: $1,944

- median home price and rent increase from 2010 to 2017

**Diverse Community**

- The lack of affordable housing impacts populations with lower socio-economic status, ultimately reducing their opportunities in Boulder. Affordable housing is an important tool to create a diverse community.

**Boulder Census Population**

- 88.1% White
- 4.7% Asian
- 5.8% Two or more
- 0.9% Black
- 0.4% American Indian or Alaska Native

**Progress**

- Number of Low/Moderate Income Housing Units Produced
  - 2017: 1,287
  - 2018: 2,500
  - 2019: 2,500
  - 2020: 2,500
  - 2021: 3,468

- 3,468 Low/Moderate Income Homes Secured

**The Need for Middle Income Housing**

- Family of four
  - Teacher: $55,000/year
  - Paralegal: $55,000/year

- Housing costs should not exceed 1/3 of income

**Housing Costs for a Family of Four**

- Maximum Rent: $2,800
- Maximum Mortgage Payment: $2,300

Based on this scenario, this family would be priced out of homeownership but would be able to rent a three-bedroom market rate apartment in Boulder.

*2017 AMI for family of 4 in Boulder County is $98,200*
The city of Boulder produces approximately 132 affordable units per year. It leverages its funding to effectively maximize the number of units that can be built or acquired.

Sources:
- Boulder Annual Tenant Report 2017
- 2010 American Community Survey
- Boulder Area Realtor Association
- Boulder Housing Launch Study
- Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan
- "Low Rent Index"
TO: Housing Advisory Board  
FROM: Affordable Housing Resident Concerns Committee 
DATE: November 4, 2018  
RE: November 12 Report

This is a report for the November 12, 2018 Housing Advisory Board meeting from the Affordable Housing Resident Concerns temporary committee.

It includes a brief history, rationale and specific requests to HAB for a decision on several items, and a follow-up action plan before the committee dissolves as a natural outcome of concluding its efforts.

INTRODUCTION
At the June 27, 2018 HAB meeting, a group of members of the community spoke (during the Public Comment portion of the meeting) about their concerns regarding the recent rate increase for residents of Boulder’s affordable housing.

They also raised some related issues, including the high cost of amenities (parking, storage, utilities).

Because these issues were brought to HAB by the public, because HAB has an interest in engagement, and because HAB members care about the concerns of affordable housing residents, HAB members decided to devote time to exploring these issues. After several board discussions, a committee was formed. Adam Swetlik and Judy Nogg became the members of this temporary committee.

After several reports to HAB, input from staff, and committee work, the committee is ready to bring several items to the board for a vote and to determine follow-up steps before this temporary committee dissolves.

RATIONALE AND ACTIONABLE ITEMS

The committee has determined that all decisions at this point do not involve City Council, as the committee is not making a request of or recommendation to Council.

Months ago, a list of issues was compiled that the board and committee considered.

Recently, the committee has pared down these issues. Most of the items were determined either to be of a scope much larger than this committee (i.e. is AMI the best tool for housing decisions) or not yet warranting board action.

However, there are four items that the committee deems requires board action.
1. Right from the start, there has been board interest in the possibility of extending the notice that affordable housing residents receive of rate increases from 30 days to 60 days. Staff has indicated that this would be a reasonable change. The committee would like HAB to discuss with staff, at the November 12 meeting, the best way for putting this into effect and then VOTE on it.

2. The committee feels that currently there is not sufficient data of affordable housing resident issues to make a fully sound decision about some resident concerns. This includes a broader understanding of why residents leave affordable housing, what the rent increases are for all units, the rate of increase of the cost of amenities, etc.

The committee would like HAB to discuss with staff, at the November 12 meeting, the possibility to proceed with staff and one or two HAB members creating an annual survey for all affordable housing residents that would include providing that data on a yearly basis to HAB. Once the possibility of this method has been determined, the committee requests a VOTE at the November 12 meeting on the matter of a yearly survey for affordable housing residents.

3. The committee takes special interest in the concerns of affordable housing residents about the high costs of parking spaces. Currently, it seems that this issue only pertains to Boulder Junction residents.

Because there are two boards that might deal this issue in a more direct manner (Boulder Junction Access District Parking Commission and Boulder Junction Access District Management Commission), the committee requests that HAB vote to approve (on November 12) that the committee can present this issue to those boards and hand it over to them.

4. HAB has had several discussion of the importance of a feedback loop to the community. For this particular feedback loop about HAB’s efforts in regard to the affordable housing resident concerns, the committee requests that HAB vote to approve at the November 12 meeting, the committee’s plan for a feedback loop that includes a report to be posted on the HAB website page, as well as sending that report to the impacted residents with whom HAB has had contact.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION PLAN

Following the November 12 meeting, the committee will take action on any matters resulting from the four votes.

The committee will write a report in a timely manner. That report will include the history of the issue with HAB, a list of all the issues that were raised and considered, and the final decisions of HAB.

The committee will follow up with the feedback loop.
If an annual survey of affordable housing residents is decided upon, by HAB, a yearly mechanism for providing that report to HAB will be determined.

Once the “loose ends” are tied up, this temporary committee will dissolve.

Affordable housing residents, of course, may bring issues to HAB at any time.
Dear Mayor Jones and Members of the Boulder City Council,

The Housing Advisory Board thanks you for the opportunity to answer your specific questions and to share our priorities with you through our annual letter.

Looking ahead to 2019, we broadly support the approach to housing for 2019 that has been mapped out by City Council and staff.

In this letter, we will: 1) address your request for input; 2) enumerate HAB’S priorities for the coming year; and 3) provide you with information regarding HAB’s actions to date.

**INPUT YOU REQUESTED**

- **How well do you believe Council has done over the last two years in incorporating the priorities of your board/commission?**

HAB believes that Council has successfully engaged HAB’s priorities in the past two years. Firstly, Council fully accomplished the general housing goal of establishing HAB. Additionally, all of the housing issues listed as priorities – Commercial Linkage Fees, Community Benefit, Large Lots, Manufactured Housing Strategy, North Central Boulder Sub-community Plan & Alpine-Balsam Area Plan, and Shared Equity Middle Income Program – either have been or are scheduled to be addressed during the 2018-2019 Council Housing Work Plan.

- **Taking into account the current work plan and the board’s feedback from last year, what additional priorities do you think Council should focus on, over and above the 14 on the attached list?**

HAB does not have any additional priorities for Council’s 2019 Work Plan.

**2019 HAB PRIORITIES**

HAB’s first priority for 2019 is to advise Council on existing 2018-2019 Work Plan issues. HAB looks forward to Council and staff’s guidance in providing effective community engagement and timely input on critical housing Work Plan items.

Additionally, HAB has an interest in pursuing two generative study topics.
Overarching both of these study topics includes HAB’s interest in emphasizing and enhancing community engagement as an operating principle. This interest in community engagement is a clear part of HAB’s goals as stated in the forming ordinance.

HAB has special interest in seeking common ground on issues that heretofore have been divisive. With increased civil discourse on contentious housing issues, HAB feels more common ground can be identified, allowing housing goals to be met in a more optimal manner, providing benefit for the community, staff, and Council.

**STUDY TOPIC 2019 – TINY HOMES**

HAB feels that the community is ready to have a conversation on tiny homes, especially the consideration of a pilot project in a well-considered location. HAB wants to look at all that would be required to recommend this to Council for the 2020 work plan.

**STUDY TOPIC 2019 – OCCUPANCY**

HAB would like to devote some time in 2019 to exploring ways in which the discourse can be more productive on the hot-button issues of occupancy. The exploration of possible changes in occupancy rules will dovetail effectively with Council’s efforts on Community Benefit.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Since HAB’s inception in April of 2018, the Board has worked to formulate its operation and structure, inform and educate all members on critical housing issues, and provide input to Council on housing issues (such as ADUs/OAUs).

In order to allow time to address issues of internal board function and work to bring board members up to speed on housing issues, the Board implemented bi-monthly meetings. One meeting each month was directed towards public engagement and advisory items; the second was dedicated to informational updates and presentations. The additional meetings provided an opportunity for staff to present information on the following topics:

- Alpine- Balsam Overview
- Public Engagement
- Overview of City Housing Programs
- Inclusionary Housing Overview
- Regional Housing Strategy
- Community Benefit Overview
- Affordable Housing Finance
- Community Investment Overview
- Area Agency on Aging Presentation
- Tour of Completed Affordable Housing Projects
- Home Ownership Program Overview
Middle Income Strategy Overview
- Down Payment Program Presentation

Beginning in December 2018, HAB will return to holding one monthly meeting to conduct all business. HAB currently operates under Roberts Rules of Order and, as is required, all meetings are noticed and an agenda posted to the public prior to all meetings.

During the first eight months of operation, the Board completed a public outreach effort in order to gather input from the public on housing solutions. Further information and the results of this project are included in an addendum to this letter.

CONCLUSION

Through our support of Council's 2019 Housing Work Plan and our pursuit of HAB study topics, we look forward to working with Council to achieve more affordability, diversity and accessibility to housing in the future.

Very truly yours,

Masyn Moyer, Board Chair

On behalf of all the Housing Advisory Board Members
Jacques Juilland  Judy Nogg
Mike McKenzie    Adam Swetlik, Board Vice-Chair

(Attachment)
The Housing Advisory Board consists of five voting members appointed by City Council, including at least one renter and one homeowner. The initial appointees will be appointed for terms of one, two, three, four and five years. Future appointments will be for five-year terms. There will also be two non-voting members, one appointed by Planning Board and one by the Technical Review Group.

The Housing Advisory Board will expand the city’s capacity to develop and implement effective responses to Boulder’s housing challenges, primarily affordability, diversity and accessibility, and accelerate progress toward the city’s adopted housing plans, strategies and goals.

Regular meetings will be held on the fourth Wednesday at 6 PM in Council Chambers at 1777 Broadway.

The City of Boulder believes that a diverse work force adds quality and perspective to the services we provide to the public. Therefore, it is the ongoing policy and practice of the City of Boulder to strive for equal opportunity in employment for all employees and applicants. No person shall be discriminated against in any term, condition or privilege of employment because of race, national origin, religion, disability, pregnancy, age, military status, marital status, genetic characteristics or information, gender, gender identity, gender variance or sexual orientation. The Boulder City Charter requires representation of both genders on City Boards and Commissions.

**Name:**

**Home Address:**

**Home Phone:**

**Mobile Phone:**

**Work Phone:**

**Email:**

**Occupation:**
Place of Employment / Retired:

Do you reside within Boulder City limits?:

When did you become a resident of Boulder?:

Rent or own?

Gender:

1. What qualifications, skill sets and relevant experiences do you have for this position (such as education, training, service on governing or decision-making boards, etc.) that would contribute to you being an effective board member and community representative?

2. Have you had any experience(s) with this Board or the services it oversees?

3. Describe a situation where you were involved with a group and had to work through a disagreement or conflict among the members.

4. List all potential conflicts of interest you might have with respect to the work of this board.
5. Why would you like to serve on the Housing Advisory Board? What do you hope to accomplish?

6. What should this new advisory board’s top three priorities be and why have you chosen them?

7. Select one of the City of Boulder’s housing initiatives and make a recommendation for improvement.

8. How have your past and current housing situations affected your life and perspective on housing issues?

9. How can Boulder accelerate the creation of a diversity of housing types and addition of affordable housing within the community?