Councillor Galluccio suggested working with the School Department on outreach. It is through the schools that the families who really want to stay in Cambridge can be found. Developing relationships with principals and after school programs.

Councillor Simmons asked who decides what housing gets built, for example, the size of the units, whether the housing is rental or homeownership; all of these decisions end up being decisions about who will live in Cambridge. Ms. Jameson said that the goal is to serve a variety of housing needs. Particular units and buildings are often determined by market opportunities. The issue of rental versus homeownership often depends on the site.

Councillor Murphy asked that the information requested by the committee on demographics, market demand, the Boston eligibility limits, and any other requested information which may pertain to amending the inclusionary zoning income eligibility limits be provided by early December in light of the time constraints for Council action on the pending petition to amend the ordinance.

Mary Reed, Eviction Free Zone, suggested more limited equity co-ops and condominiums and using Section 8 funds for homeownership. She added that the committee should look at the waiting list for public housing as a part of the information about the demographics of housing need in Cambridge.

Councillor Galluccio thanked all those present for their participation. The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m. on motion of Councillor Murphy.

For the Committee,

Anthony D. Galluccio

Councillor Anthony D. Galluccio, Chair

decisions should be made in the context of actual information about what income residents are being forced to leave Cambridge because of housing costs.

Councillor Decker said that she is not sure how she feels about increasing the income limits. However, she agrees with Councillor Galluccio about the need for real information on which such a decision must be based. She would also like information and statistics about who is at the shelters, who goes to the Multi Service Center. Councillor Decker stated that she would like the following information as well:

- What is the average salary for employees of the City of Cambridge, not department heads, but paraprofessionals, support staff, etc., and what housing assistance they qualify for?

- What would a family with two adults, two kids and a household income of $60,000 be able to afford, and what assistance would they qualify for?

- How is the new Census data being used to shape housing policy?

Councillor Decker also requested information about the possibilities of affordable housing at 238 Broadway. She said that she wants to know that the City's affordable housing staff is at least looking at the issue.

Ms. Jameson said that CDD does look at the market data on a regular basis. She would be happy to provide a summary of that information for the committee. With regard to using the new Census data, she informed the committee that one of the challenges of working with the data is that the income data is not tied to data bout household size. In response to the issue of collecting data about the income of those contacting CDD about affordable housing, while it would be difficult to get information about past telephone calls, it would be possible to analyze applications that have been submitted and to track the interest in the new middle-income homeownership program.

Councillor Galluccio said that he feels that it is essential that every person who calls to inquire about affordable housing be sent an application with a return envelope or encouraged to come in and fill out an application.

Councillor Simmons asked about outreach and suggested that CDD put the name of a contact person on its information sheets about affordable housing programs. Ms Jameson described the outreach for the new program, which included sending information to all the nonprofits, to all the schools for the kids to take home to parents, to the libraries, CDD's data base of applicants, ads in newspapers, the cable channel and the website.

Councillors Decker and Simmons suggested sending 10 copies to each City Councillor.

Selma O'Brien, 2 Mt. Auburn Street, stated that she is a new tenant and commended the committee for strong support of the tenants and of keeping the building affordable. She said that she was troubled by Harvard's approach, which seemed unnecessarily confrontational.

Councillor Galluccio then moved to the issue of housing assistance for residents with incomes above 80% of median income. He noted the Council's interest in adjusting the income eligibility units for the residents of the affordable units that residential developers are required to provide under the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance and requested an update from the CDD. Ms. Jameson said that in response to City Council concern, CDD has been looking at how to address the housing needs of middle-income residents being priced out of Cambridge. One way that CDD has responded is through the new moderate-income homeownership program. However, the CDD staff recommends keeping the income limits for the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance at 80% of moderate income. When staff members analyze what is affordable in Cambridge, especially in view of recent decreases in rent, the needs of lower income residents are much more insurmountable. People earning between 100% and 120% of median income really do have some options in the city. There are a good number of units available.

Councillor Galluccio asked about the current income eligibility for inclusionary units. Ms. Jameson responded that incomes must be no greater than 80% and are targeted at incomes of 65% of median income. The average income of occupants falls between 50 and 80%.

Councillor Galluccio asked what Boston's income limits and average incomes are for its inclusionary zoning program. Mr. Cotter said that for the rental units, eligibility for half of the units is 50% of median income or less and for the other half, the limit is 80% of median income. For homeownership, half the units eligibility is capped at 80% and half at 120%, with an overall target of 80%.

Councillor Galluccio said that he believes the income eligibility limit for rental units has increased, and requested that CDD check the current figure. He added that he continues to be concerned that CDD does not track the requests for assistance. It is very important for the City Council to know the demographics of the residents seeking housing. Members of the City Council believe that they know the community and who is leaving because of housing costs and are convinced that especially over the last five years, moderate-middle income residents are being priced out. He would not have a problem with CDD's recommendation if CDD had data about the requests and market data, but he is not comfortable with setting income limits based on philosophy. He wants to see data about the market demand in Cambridge, and he does not want Cambridge residents to lose the inclusionary zoning opportunities presented by the residential development that will take place in North Point. He is not suggesting that the 15% requirement be changed, nor is he suggesting that all of the affordable units be made available to higher income residents. Perhaps the City should look at trying to target some units to residents with incomes of 80% to 100% of median income. These affordability if a source of funding to maintain affordability can be found, just as it would expect such a commitment from any other owner of an expiring use building.

Councillor Galluccio requested that Harvard inform the City Council in writing of what commitments it can and cannot make. If Harvard cannot commit at this time to keeping the building affordable past the date of the expiring use, even if subsidies to maintain the affordability are available, the City Council should know that now, not 10 years from now. However, in light of the inevitably painful, even catastrophic effect on the relationship of the university with the city government and the citizens that putting this building to another use would have, he would suggest that Harvard make such a commitment now and get credit for being a good neighbor.

Councillor Simmons agreed that such a commitment would be a win-win event for the City, Harvard and the tenants. It would be better not to have this conversation for the next ten years.

In response to a question from Councillor Galluccio, Ms. Powers said that Harvard would provide written response within a month.

Councillor Murphy asked if the Massachusetts Congressional delegation has been helpful, and whether they have been approached yet. Mr. Weunschel said that they have not yet sought assistance from the legislators because he believes that it is still too soon to involve them. The CHA wants to work with the federal administrators first, but is certainly not averse to involving the federal legislators if it becomes necessary.

Councillor Galluccio then invited public comment.

Hedwig Pocius, 2 Mt. Auburn Street, said that she hopes that the CHA is looking for project-based subsidies, to make sure that in addition to protecting the current tenants, the affordability remains in the city of Cambridge. There is no funding to cover the replacement of 94 affordable units in Cambridge. Ms. Pocius emphasized that Harvard must understand that the residents of 2 Mt. Auburn Street are not students. They are adults and permanent residents and do not want to be treated like students. Ms. Pocius also said that the tenants are requesting an ombudsperson, someone who is not part of the building management, to speak to the tenants.

Ms. Jameson informed Ms. Power that Just-A-Start has a tenant/landlord mediation program that could perhaps be useful in this respect.

Kathleen Williams, 2 Mt. Auburn Street, stated that she is a 14-year resident of the building. She does not know a lot about the expiring use issue. She is not yet a senior citizen, but she is 55 years old and disabled. It is very frightening to her to think that she may be turned out of her home in ten years. She had expected to live there for the rest of her life.

expiring use programs, but the 10 C program is not included in the list of programs for which such use is authorized.

Ms. Jameson said that CDD staff have been working with a very knowledgeable housing consultant to research possible avenues of funding that HUD could use for this building.

Councillor Galluccio questioned the likelihood of HUD resolving this problem much before the expiration date of the use restriction and said that if HUD is not going to find a solution soon, then he would hope that Harvard would provide written assurance of the intention to keep the building as affordable housing as long as subsidies are available and of the intention to actively seek such subsidies. He invited the representatives of Harvard University to comment.

Ms Powers said that Harvard is interested in engaging in a collaborative and cooperative discussion on the many issues that touch on Harvard-owned residential property and the responsibility of the university to house more of its own community, as has been requested by the City Council. Harvard wants to explore maintaining affordability at 2 Mt. Auburn Street past 2012, but Harvard also needs to explore how to use its property to address university needs and city needs as well. They would like to have a thoughtful discussion of how this building could fit into an overall discussion of how Harvard can best use its property to the benefit of the city and the university. Additionally, Harvard supports the principles of inclusionary zoning and would like to utilize these principles in its development of housing both for its community and in furtherance of the city's goal of inclusion.

Councillor Galluccio cautioned that it is not in the best interests of Harvard, the tenants of 2 Mt. Auburn or the city to have this building used as a bargaining chip in a neighborhood negotiation. Councillor Galluccio said that he is hearing two contradictory messages from Ms. Power. On the one hand, Harvard wants to keep the building affordable. However, if the city government shuts down Harvard's attempts to meet its own housing needs in other ways, Harvard may need to use this property to meet its own needs.

Ms Power agreed that this might be a factor. She said that Harvard can provide part of the assurance that Councillor Galluccio is looking for. Harvard can commit to working towards finding the funding to keep this building affordable during the use restriction, but cannot make a commitment to maintain the building as affordable housing past 2012.

Councillor Murphy said that he certainly understands the concern that a subsidy source must be found if Harvard is to keep the building affordable past the date that the use restriction expires. However, the City has a very strong policy to make every possible effort to keep expiring use buildings affordable after the use restriction expires, and has applied this policy in every expiring use building in Cambridge, regardless of who owns the building. Clearly, the City will expect Harvard to commit to maintaining

C. C. 106

2

City of Cambridge

HOUSING COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Councillor Anthony D. Galluccio, Chair
Councillor Marjorie C. Decker
Councillor Brian Murphy
Councillor Kenneth E. Reeves
Councillor E. Denise Simmons

In City Council December 9, 2002

The Housing Committee held a public hearing on November 6, 2002 beginning at 5:15 P.M. in the Sullivan Chamber for the purpose of continuing to discuss the future of federal subsidies at 2 Mount Auburn Street and methods to address the housing needs of families with incomes of 80% to 120% of median income, including inclusionary zoning and the new moderate-income homeownership program.

Present at the hearing were Councillor Anthony D. Galluccio, Chair of the Committee, Vice Mayor Henrietta Davis, Councillor Brian Murphy, Councillor E. Denise Simmons and D. Margaret Drury. Also present were Darcy Jameson, Housing Director, Community Development Department (CDD), Chris Cotter, Housing Division, CDD, Cassie Arnot, Housing Division, CDD, Robert Vining, Housing Division, CDD, and Dan Wuenschel, Executive Director of the Cambridge Housing Authority (CHA). Present for Harvard University were Mary Power, Senior Director of Community and Government Affairs, Jim Barrow, Office of Community and Government Affairs, Susan Keller, Director of Residential Real Estate, Harvard Planning and Real Estate, Alexandra Driley, Assistant Director of Residential Real Estate, Harvard Planning and Real Estate and Justin Deri. The following members of the public attended the meeting: Hedwig E. Pocius, 2 Mt. Auburn Street, Kathleen Williams, 2 Mt. Auburn Street, Selma O'Brien, 2 Mt. Auburn Street, Steve O'Neill, 2 Dodge Street and Mary Reed, Eviction Free Zone.

Councillor Galluccio convened the hearing and explained the purpose. He began with the issue of 2 Mount Auburn Street and invited Ms. Jameson to initiate the discussion. Ms. Jameson introduced the members of her staff present and then requested that Mr. Weunschel provide an update on the status of the subsidies at 2 Mount Auburn Street.

Mr. Weunschel explained that 2 Mount Auburn Street, a ninety-four-unit complex for low income elderly/disabled persons owned by Harvard University, was built in the early 1970's under a federal subsidy program known as the "10C" program. The "10C" program no longer exists. Last year HUD informed the CHA that since the program no longer exists, there is no longer a "10C" budget for these subsidies and the program funds are running out. The CHA and HUD have been looking for a source of funds. At this time the issue rests almost entirely with HUD. The federal bureaucracy moves slowly, but CHA staff contact HUD about this issue on a regular basis. Mr. Weunschel said that most likely the new subsidies would be Section 8 subsidies. He explained that there exist legislation and regulations that allow the use of Section 8 funds for building under other

S-365

Committee Report #2

Committee Report from Councillor Anthony D. Galluccio, Chair of the Housing Committee, for a meeting held on November 6, 2002 to discuss the future of federal subsidies at 2 Mount Auburn Street and methods to address the housing needs of families with incomes of 80% to 120% of median income, including inclusionary zoning and the new moderate-income homeownership program.

In City Council December 9, 2002

REPORT ACCEPTED.
PLACED ON FILE.