DR. MATT HEINZ
Supervisor
District 2

33 N Stone Ave., 11th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701
(520) 724-2702
district2@pima.gov

Pima County Board of Supervisors

To: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

From: Matt Heinz, Supervisor, District 2

Date: April 24, 2024

RE: BOS Regular Agenda 05/07/24: Dedicated Affordable Housing Funding, Options

---

Please add this item to the May 7, 2024, Regular Agenda. Thank you.

Board of Supervisors:

Discussion/Direction/Action: In furtherance of Policies 1, 2, and 3, of the recently adopted Prosperity Initiative (*Pima County Board of Supervisors Policy E 36.2, Reducing Generational Poverty and Improving Individual and Community Wealth*), directing the County Administrator to come back to the Board at our **August 19, 2024**, Board Meeting with *initial* options vetted by staff for the **establishment of a dedicated Pima County Housing Trust Fund, for the development and preservation of affordable housing in Pima County.** Such Fund, which could have a single or multiple funding sources, should be able to achieve annual combined revenues for affordable housing of at least $10 million per year to start (FY2026), with the ability to grow to meet increased demand in future years.

Potential funding mechanisms to evaluate and present to the Board for discussion and further direction on August 19th may include any one, or combination of, the following: (A) a portion of the primary property tax dedicated to affordable housing (similar structure to PAYGO policy), (B) a new secondary property tax for affordable housing backed by bonding, (C) Document Recording Fees; (D) voluntary Developer Impact Fees (similar to the Tempe model), (E) a Pima County sales tax dedicated to affordable housing, and/or (F) other options that could be achieved through a vote of the Board of Supervisors and/or the electorate.

The direction is to bring back the pros and cons, legal requirements, and potential costs to Pima County taxpayers of various vetted options, as well as a synopsis of what the impact would be in terms of number of affordable housing units created or preserved over the next 10 years compared to the projected need – for discussion/ further direction/ potential action in August. The discussion should also include an overview of any previous attempts at implementing a Pima County Housing Trust Fund and where they fell short.

In terms of the use of the Trust Fund, in addition to gap-funding *grants* as we have been implementing these past two years, options for further discussion should include the potential provision of long-term *loans* for affordable housing projects as well, thus creating the ability to re-invest those same dollars in additional projects down the road. The focus should remain on both homeownership and rental opportunities, including the preservation of existing affordable housing.

The Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission, which includes representation from all districts and jurisdictions, and already vets and recommends the allocation of $5M per year in gap funding for affordable housing development and preservation, can help provide oversight of the Housing Trust Fund.

CC: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
Jenifer Darland, Director, Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions
Dan Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development
Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management
Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney

Attachments:

BOS Policy E 36.2: Reducing Generational Poverty and Improving Individual and Community Wealth

State and Local Housing Trust Funds; 2022 white paper; National Low Income Housing Coalition

County Housing Trust Fund Revenues, 2022; HousingTrustFundProject.org

Purpose

1. To establish an evidence-based policy framework to guide long-term efforts to strategically address generational poverty, improve individual opportunity, and create community wealth, while also tactically addressing the immediate needs of those currently experiencing poverty.

2. To provide implementation direction to the County Administrator's Office, County departments, outside agencies that receive County funding, and County committees and commissions on how County services, regulations and expenditures, including grant funds, can be more effectively aligned to reduce generational poverty and the costs of poverty.

Background

In addition to the moral case for reducing poverty, there is a large financial cost borne by the community, including local governments and taxpayers, to provide emergency and crisis management services, as well as unrealized economic and workforce gains. Research shows that certain policies and investments not only directly assist those in need, but also reduce costs to the community as a whole and return greater long term value. This is especially so when focused on families with children, and particularly those families experiencing generational poverty (defined as children who grow up in families with incomes below or near the poverty line and continue to experience low-income status into adulthood.)

Multiple efforts to address early education, workforce development, affordable housing, homelessness, health and criminal justice are underway across the County. Many existing efforts focus on alleviating the immediate suffering of those in poverty. While motivated by compassion and often effective in their narrow goal, they are not enough to move people out of poverty. This is not an argument to reduce the safety net, but **to adopt an evidence-based approach to guide a long-term effort to break the cycle of poverty**. While a wide variety of individual and societal benefits are associated with these types of interventions, the most basic measures of success are increased incomes and assets, and decreased household costs for those living in poverty.

On November 1, 2022, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to begin working with cities, towns, tribes, experts, practitioners, and those with lived experience, to research and develop evidence-based policy options to reduce generational poverty and improve individual and community wealth. Guiding principles were established to guide the research. For example, in addition to being evidence-based and well informed, the policies were to be applicable at the local government level, target populations experiencing the highest rates of poverty, have the greatest potential for impact, and take into account historic and systemic inequities.

The outcome was a recommended set of 13 policies. These policies were also informed by three cross-policy strategies:

- Crime reduction and prevention
- Climate resilience and environmental justice, and
- Two-generation or whole family approaches to policy development and implementation.

These strategies have impacts that cut across many of the policies included herein. For example, crime prevention and reduction are key elements to reducing poverty and have disproportionate impacts on children. Exposure to and victimization from violence in childhood, which is more likely to happen in areas of concentrated poverty, can harm a child's health, well-being, and achievement, with lasting consequences including a negative effect on their development and reducing future educational attainment and earnings. At least seven of the policies included herein have proven crime reduction or prevention outcomes. These include policies focused on low-income neighborhoods where the impact on families can be multifaceted, as well as those focused on children that have been shown to reduce the likelihood that a child will be involved in crime at adulthood.

The Climate resilience and environmental justice strategy is critical because a strong causal link also has been established between exposure to pollution and childhood health, as well as future adult outcomes, and even the health of the next generation. Low-income communities are disproportionately exposed to pollution and climate change impacts. Consideration was given to policies and programs that support the transition to a clean energy economy through the enhancement of workforce training opportunities for low-income job seekers, while also effectively reducing greenhouse gas emissions and exposure to other pollutants.

Finally, the "two generation" strategy is important because research shows positive effects on family wellbeing and economic mobility through two-generational or whole family approaches to policy and program design and implementation. For example, successful approaches address both adult-related needs (i.e. post-secondary education and workforce development), along with parents' caregiving responsibilities, and providing child-focused resources (i.e. early childcare and education).

Many of the policies included herein are interrelated and may be more effective when bundled or implemented together.

Policy

It is the policy of the Board of Supervisors to:

1. Increase the supply of housing by prioritizing practices and investments that result in diverse housing types and prices in neighborhoods, ensuring affordable housing options are available throughout Pima County, especially in low poverty, high opportunity neighborhoods.

2. Improve quality of life and opportunity in high poverty neighborhoods by investing in both physical and social infrastructure in ways that intentionally strive to center the priorities of residents, improve access to resources, prevent the displacement of vulnerable residents, reduce exposure to violence and build community wealth in these high poverty neighborhoods.

3. Improve housing stability among renters and homeowners, especially in high poverty/low opportunity neighborhoods, by preventing evictions and foreclosures, increasing homeownership, developing more affordable housing, and reducing home energy and weatherization costs.

4. Provide healthcare insurance enrollment assistance to protect against medical debt.

5. Reduce unintended pregnancies by increasing access to contraception, and improving use of long-acting reversible contraception and education.

6. Increase access to affordable high quality early childcare and education for families with children.

7. Increase college and other post-secondary educational and training opportunities for children and youth by improving access to children's college savings accounts, and through other evidence-based practices.

8. Identify and prioritize safe, reliable, and affordable transportation and mobility options, and encourage mixed-use and transit-oriented developments where appropriate, to better connect disadvantaged communities with jobs and other resources, and reduce travel times, traffic injuries, transportation costs, and air pollution.

9. Expand broadband services and address barriers so all Pima County residents have access, equipment, and skills for digital inclusion and to expand opportunities for economic growth for rural communities.

10. Prioritize workforce development for low-income job seekers with evidence-based case management practices that include apprenticeships, on the job training, and supportive services that prepare participants for jobs with self-sufficient wages and benefits.

11. Improve job quality for workers and expand the employment capacity of employers already offering quality jobs, with quality jobs defined as those that provide competitive, equitable and self-sustaining wages, family friendly benefits and practices, and consistent scheduling.

12. Improve the financial capability for families and small businesses to increase their access to fair credit and to gain and protect income and wealth building assets.

13. Increase small/micro business ownership and expansion opportunities, prioritizing entrepreneurs of color, women-owned businesses and businesses operating in high poverty neighborhoods.

<u>Implementation</u>

The County Administrator is directed to:

1. Refer to the Prosperity Initiative's Policy Recommendations Report dated November 2023 for the guiding principles that informed this policy research, initial policy implementation ideas, the research and evidence that supports these policies, and overall policy intent.

2. Identify key metrics for measuring progress. At a minimum, the development of metrics should be informed through expanded partnerships with University of Arizona faculty, participation in the Urban Institute's Mobility Action Learning Network, and a review of the United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona's Cradle to Career Partnership metrics, and relevant metrics included in the University of Arizona's MAP Dashboard.

3. Establish a multi-departmental implementation team led by the County Administrator or Deputy County Administrator, and supported by Community & Workforce Development, and the Finance Department, to develop annual work plans, and to operationalize and institutionalize these policies across County government.

4. Conduct periodic scans of the County budget, plans, programs, services, and regulations to identify opportunities to realign existing operations and resources to implement these policies cost effectively.

5. Structure future departmental budgets in such a way that expenses made to further these polices can be tracked over time.

6. Continue to encourage a regional approach to implementation by regularly engaging with incorporated cities and towns, unincorporated communities, and tribes, across the County. This may involve different forms of engagement and different representatives than were involved in the policy development, depending on the preferences of each local government. School districts, Pima Community College and the University of Arizona should also be engaged in this implementation phase.

7. Continue to increase partnerships with the Tohono O'odham Nation, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Native American organizations and community members.

8. Increase and maintain awareness of this Board policy among County departments, external stakeholders and the general public. Seek public and stakeholder input regularly.

9. Continue to review evidence to ensure that research remains relevant and any new evidence-based research informs and is incorporated into ongoing efforts. Poverty reduction is increasingly a focus at the national, state and local government level and new research will continue to be available and should be reviewed regularly.

10. Provide comprehensive progress reports to the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis and include regular updates in the financial forecast documents provided to the Board each month after the necessary financial tracking mechanisms are in place.

<u>Responsible Department</u>

County Administrator's Office

<u>Review for Continuance</u>

This policy will be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors for continuance every four years.

Adopted Date: December 5, 2023

State and Local Housing Trust Funds

By Michael Anderson, Director, Housing Trust Fund Project, Center for Community Change

State and local housing trust funds advance the way the US supports affordable housing by guaranteeing that revenues are available each year to provide housing to the most economically vulnerable community members. Established by legislation, ordinance, or popular vote, housing trust funds direct public revenue to meet specifically identified local housing needs. Cities, counties, and states have developed proven models that support innovative approaches to all aspects of addressing affordable housing and homelessness. The impact of housing trust funds demonstrate that state and local government can provide decent affordable homes for everyone if communities are willing to commit the resources to do so. Establishing a state or local housing trust fund is a proactive step that housing organziers and advocates can take to make systemic change in their community.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Since the 1980s, state and local housing trust funds have employed the model of committing public funds to address communities' most critical affordable housing needs. With more than 820 housing trust funds in cities, counties, and states, those funds have become core elements in housing policy throughout the US. In 2021, state and local housing trust funds generated nearly $3 billion for affordable homes. The popularity and proliferation of housing trust funds is due to their flexibility, sustainability, and success in addressing critical housing needs. Housing trust funds are distinct funds that ideally receive ongoing, dedicated sources of public funding to support the preservation and production of affordable housing and increase access decent affordable homes. Housing trust funds systemically shift affordable housing funding from annual budget allocations to the commitment of dedicated public revenue. While housing trust funds can also be a repository for private donations, they are not public/private partnerships, nor are they endowed funds operating from interest and other earnings.

Forty-seven states, the District of Columbia, and the territories of Guam and Puerto Rico and have created sixty housing trust funds. Eight states, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, and Washington, have created more than one state housing trust fund, reflecting a recognized value in committing public revenues to accomplish precise objectives, such as addressing homelessness or providing rental assistance. City housing trust funds number 605 and include 122 city housing trust funds in 36 states, bolstered by another 186 jurisdictions participating in Massachusetts' "Community Preservation Act," and 296 communities certified in New Jersey by the Council on Affordable Housing. County housing trust funds number 157 and include 69 county housing trust funds in 17 states, with one county creating two housing trust funds. Additionally, the state of Pennsylvania has 49 county housing trust funds and the state of Washington has 39 county housing trust funds created under state enabling legislation.

ISSUE SUMMARY

There are three key elements to any state or local housing trust fund:

1. Administration and oversight: Most housing trust funds are administered by a public or quasi-public agency. Housing advocates are not always comfortable with the performance of local agencies or departments and may not find this an easy condition to accept. Although there are alternatives, such as a nonprofit or Community Development Financial Institution administering the fund, there are very few examples of such models. In the long-run, it is desirable for elected officials to accept ownership and responsibility for addressing critical housing needs and

designate the housing trust fund as one way in which they intend to do this. A best practice administrative characteristic of housing trust funds is the creation of an appointed oversight or advisory board. Most housing trust funds have such boards. They are typically broadly representative of the housing community, including banks, realtors, developers, nonprofit development organizations, housing advocates, labor, service providers, and low-income residents. These boards can be advisory, but it is preferable to delegate some authority to them, including at least advising, if not determining, which projects receive funding from the trust fund; overseeing policies; and evaluating and reporting on the performance of the fund. An oversight board provides considerable expertise to the operation of the trust fund, and maintains a connection and avenue for accountability to the community.

2. Programs: The basic programmatic issues for housing trust funds should be defined in the ordinance or legislation that establishes the fund. Definition ensures that the key operating components of the trust fund are not subject to the whims of changing Administrations. Staff and board members will need to develop an application cycle, program requirements, and administrative rules.

3. Funding: What defines a housing trust fund is securing a dedicated revenue source. This means that the source of funding is committed by law to generate funds for the housing trust fund. Thus, by resolution, ordinance or legislation, a certain percentage or amount of public funds are automatically deposited in the housing trust fund each year. Securing a dedicated revenue source for a housing trust fund is a significant advance over the way low-income housing has historically been funded. With a dedicated revenue source, advocates no longer have to argue for scarce resources with city council members, county commissioners, or state legislators during the annual budget process. They will no longer have to compete with other worthy causes in a budget process that is generally neither fair nor generous towards low-income housing. The dedicated revenue source guarantees a regular, but possibly fluctuating, source of funds.

Key Decisions to Make

To ensure that a trust fund succeeds, several decisions must be made about its implementation, including identifying eligible applicants, eligible activities, and requirements that must be met to receive funding. Eligible applicants typically include nonprofit developers, for-profit developers, government entities, Native American tribes, and public housing agencies. Eligible activities are usually broadly defined, including new construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, emergency repairs, accessibility, first time homeownership, operating and maintenance costs, and many others. Most housing trust funds provide loans and grants through a competitive application process, although some establish distinct programs and make awards through these initiatives. Grants are important to ensure that housing can be provided to meet the needs of those with the lowest incomes. Some housing trust funds provide rental assistance. There are a few state and local housing trust funds that specifically serve the needs of people experiencing homelessness and define their activities accordingly.

Among the most important decisions to be made regarding implementation of the trust fund are defining the specific requirements proposals must meet to be eligible for funding. Chief among these is the income level of those who benefit from the housing provided. Most housing trust funds serve populations earning no more than 80% of the area median income (AMI), but many serve lower-income households either entirely or in part by setting aside a portion of the funds to serve those populations in particular. Without setting aside funds to serve very low-income (50% of AMI) and extremely low-income households (30% of AMI), these most critical needs are unlikely to be met, given that it is easier and less expensive to create a development proposal serving higher incomes. It is important to give serious consideration to set-asides and other programmatic issues that enable funding for those with the most critical housing needs.

Another key decision are requirements for long-term affordability. Many state and local housing trust funds require that the homes and apartments supported through the trust fund remain affordable to the targeted population for a defined amount of time, or in perpetuity. Housing advocates may identify other requirements to incorporate, including accessibility for people with disabilities, mixed income, green housing and energy-efficiency principles, transit-oriented housing, rural housing, and housing-related services requirements.

Revenue Sources

Identifying public revenue sources for a housing trust fund is always a significant challenge. Different revenue sources are available to different types of jurisdictions, because each jurisdiction controls specific taxes and fees. Research must be done to identify appropriate funding sources.

The most common revenue source for a city housing trust fund is a developer impact fee, sometimes implemented in conjunction with a zoning ordinance. These impact fees are most often placed on non-residential developers to offset the impact that the development's employees may have on the housing supply. Along with linkage fees, many jurisdictions also use inclusionary zoning *in-lieu* fees. The second most common revenue source for city housing trust funds is a voter approved property tax. Other cities have committed various fees, such as condominium conversion fees or demolition fees, along with taxes, including property taxes, real estate excise taxes, and hotel and motel taxes (including AirBnB). Revenues from tax increment districts are an increasingly popular revenue source for housing trust funds.

The most common revenue source for a county housing trust fund is a document recording fee, a fee paid upon filing various types of official documents with a state or local government. Other sources used by counties include sales taxes, developer fees, real estate transfer taxes, and real estate excise taxes.

State housing trust funds are most commonly funded by real estate transfer taxes, followed by document recording fees. However, states have committed nearly two dozen different revenue sources to housing trust funds. Other options include revenue from state-held funds (such as unclaimed property funds), interest from real estate escrow or mortgage escrow accounts, and general obligation bonds.

Often, housing advocates study alternative revenue sources themselves and propose the best options. These are not difficult studies, but do take time and some diligence to obtain the necessary information. Relying on elected officials to identify a potential revenue source is not typically a productive strategy. Suggesting alternatives for their consideration is a strategy with a much greater track-record of success. Some housing trust funds were created through specially designated task forces with responsibility for doing the background research and making recommendations on how best to fund and implement the proposed housing trust fund.

Each state is unique in its treatment of taxes and fees. Research into what the state constitution and statutes permit regarding dedicating public revenues to a specific purpose must be conducted. Research should determine what, if any, limitations are placed on specific revenue options, including any caps imposed on tax or fee rates, any limitations on the uses to which the revenue may be applied, and any commitments already imposed on the revenues collected, among other questions. It pays to be creative in searching for potential public revenue sources. Although an increase in a tax or fee is the most common way to create a housing trust fund, it is also possible to dedicate the growth in revenue from a tax or fee or dedicate a portion of the existing revenue without imposing an increase.

It is extremely important to identify a dollar goal for revenue sought each year for the housing trust fund. This can be based on actual need, a realistic assessment of what can be secured, or an evaluation of the capacity to use new funds. This goal will be the measure by which each potential revenue source will be judged as sufficient. A combination of revenue sources may be necessary to reach the goal.

It is critical to keep the focus on dedicated sources of public funding that will provide an ongoing stream of revenue for the housing trust fund. Other alternatives will be proposed, such as a one-time appropriation, bond revenues, or private sources, but advocates must keep their sights on establishing an ordinance or legislation that will dedicate public funds over time. Several trust funds have been created with one-time initial funding, which can be used to demonstrate the impact of the trust fund to build support for on-going dedicated public revenues.

Reporting

Once a housing trust fund is established and becomes operational, it is critically important and beneficial for the administering agency, the oversight board, and/or housing and homeless advocates to report annually on the accomplishments of the fund. This helps ensure sustained, if not increased, funding, and improves the understanding and support for effective affordable housing programs. These reports typically not only show how the trust fund made advances in specific affordable housing or homeless objectives, but also highlight the impact these expenditures have in creating jobs, adding to the tax base, and extending economic benefits. Many such reports have included stories sharing the impact of a safe affordable home on individual families.

Relationship Between State and Local Housing Trust Funds

One of the most innovative advances in the housing trust fund field is state legislation that enables local jurisdictions to create housing trust funds. Several models allow states to enact legislation that opens a door for local housing trust funds by providing matching funds to encourage and support local housing trust fund efforts, enabling cities or counties to utilize a specific revenue source for local housing trust funds, sharing a new public revenue source with local jurisdictions, or establishing a process whereby local jurisdictions can decide to commit specific funds to a local housing trust fund. Close to 75% of the funds that exist in the US are in states where enabling legislation has encouraged cities and/or counties to advance local housing trust funds. These include communities in Massachusetts responding to the “Community Preservation Act” and localities in New Jersey complying with the “Fair Housing Act.” Washington and Pennsylvania have legislation enabling counties to use document recording fee revenues for local funds. Iowa’s state housing trust fund providing matching funds locally has generated funds in 27 locations throughout the state. Fourteen states have passed legislation to encourage local housing trust funds.

FORECAST FOR 2022

2022 will provide two significant opportunities for organizers and advocates to advance local and state housing trust funds: The allocation of Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (“Fiscal Recovery Funds”) included in the “American Rescue Plan Act” (ARPA) and the historic allocation of $15 billion to the national Housing Trust Fund included in the pending Build Back Better legislation. The opportunity with the ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds is clear: there is a lot of unanticpated money on the table for state and local governments and resources at their disposal to make substantial investments in affordable housing, including through housing trust funds. ARPA included $350 billion for states, counties, cities, and tribal governments to respond to the COVID-19 public health emergenecy, to address its economic fall out, and to make communities more resilient for future health emergencies. In 2021, state governments committed at least $3.12 billion ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds to affordable housing, and city and county governments committed at least $511 million. Of the $511 million, local goverments allocated more than $70 million to city and county housing trust funds. The opportunity in 2022 is with state and local governments that have yet to commit the full Fiscal Recovery Funds. Local governments receive funds in two tranches, with 50% provided in May 2021 and the remaining delivered approximately one year later. While some local governemnts have already committed both tranches, many have not yet decided on the funding that they will receive this spring.

If the Build Back Better legislation passes with the current $15 billion allocation to the national Housing Trust Fund, the opportunity for advocates, organizers, developers, and government staff to demonstrate what is possible when we commit resources to make housing affordable to to the most economically vunerable. Established in 2008, the national Housing Trust Fund (HTF) is the first new housing resource since 1974 targeted to the building, rehabilitating, preserving, and operating rental housing for extremely low-income people. In 2016 the first $174 million in HTF dollars were allocated to states, and more has been allocated in each subsequent year. For 2021, the allocation was $689.7 million. With an investment of $15 billion over the next decade, the allocations to states will more than double. This unprecedented infusion of resources to will position states to deliver housing for the people who need it most: families and individuals with the least income and economic means. Coupled with state and local housing trust fund dollars, the HTF could have a transformational impact on how we innovate and advance housing solutions. Additionally, this sustained investment provides an opportunity to debunk the false myth that developing housing for people with the lowest incomes is not economically feasible. In the richest nation in the world, anything is possible if we commit the resources to make it happen.

WINS IN 2021

The following are among the state and local housing trust fund victories celebrated by housing and homeless advocates in 2021 (in alphabetical order by state):

- Winter Haven, Florida established a new affordable housing trust fund, allocating $1.5 million from ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds and then committing $250,000 annually in general fund revenue beginning in 2022.
- Savannah, Georgia allocated $7 million in ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds to the Affordable Housing Fund.
- Kansas City, Missouri allocated $12.5 million in ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds to a new housing trust fund that is under development.
- St. Louis, Missouri allocated $20 million in ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
- Cincinnati, Ohio allocated $6.4 million in ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
- Manchester, New Hampshire allocated $3 million in ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
- Nashua, New Hampshire established the new Housing Expendable Trust Fund, with an initial commitment of $30,000 in general fund and at least $10,000 annually moving forward.
- Knoxville, Tennessee established the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, committing $5 million annually from the general fund for ten years.
- Albemarle County, Virginia established a new housing trust fund.
- Richmond, Virginia dedicated $10 million annually to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which included an allocation of $10 million in ARPA Fiscal Recovery Funds in 2021 and in 2022. The long term dedicated funding source is from revenue recaptured when tax abatement periods end, which is estimated to generate $10 million annually by 2025.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Although it is relatively easy for the public at large, and elected officials in particular, to nod toward the need to provide more affordable homes, committing precious resources to make it happen requires an active campaign. Advocates face the challenge of making affordable housing enough of a priority that elected officials can make the right decision. Housing trust fund campaigns have made important contributions in reframing affordable housing as a policy priority that is integral to the success of every community. Not only is there an obvious connection between jobs and housing, but building housing also fuels the economy in several direct and indirect ways. Housing has a direct relationship to education, health, the environment, and neighborhood quality. Personal stories and connections to real family experiences have given the issue a face that is far more powerful than statistics reflect. Campaigns have created effective communication strategies based on the value frame that everyone deserves a place to call home.

Housing trust fund campaigns have found numerous ways to boast about what housing programs can accomplish, pointing to thousands of remarkable and outstanding examples of good, well-managed, integrated affordable housing. There is no reason to be bashful about this. Housing advocates have an obligation to educate the public and elected officials about the new face of affordable housing. Rarely have housing trust funds been created without public pressure applied by a campaign. Housing advocates have succeeded in making the point that providing decent, safe, affordable homes is no longer an arbitrary decision to which we can simply choose to devote resources or not. Rather, it is an ongoing, essential part of every community that is no less important than streets, sewers, health centers, police and fire protection, schools, and other basic components of a viable community.

Although housing trust funds are numerous, securing adequate resources to build and maintain affordable homes can be a challenge. Fortunately, there are many creative and successful examples of effective campaign strategies, ranging from coalition building to cultivating allies in sectors related to housing such as education, health, and economic development; to organizing people impacted by the lack of affordable homes.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Housing Trust Fund Project of Community Change, https://housingtrustfundproject.org/.

County Housing Trust Fund Revenues 2022

Jurisdiction	*Housing Trust Fund*	*Revenue Sources*
Pima County, Arizona	Housing Trust Fund	Roof top fee
Alameda County, California	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	Developer impact fees; Boomerang redevelopment funds
Los Angeles County, California	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	Boomerang redevelopment funds
Marin County, California	Housing Trust Fund	Developer impact fees;
Napa County, California	Affordable Housing Fund	Developer impact fees; Hotel tax; County & City; Other
Sacramento City and County, California	Housing Trust Funds	Developer impact fees, Interest and earnings
San Luis Obispo County, California	Housing Trust Fund	Public/private investments
San Mateo County, California	Housing Endowment and Regional Trust	Public/private investments; capital
Santa Barbara County, California	Housing Trust	Public/private investments
Santa Clara County, California	Housing Trust of Santa Clara County	Public/private investments; Interest income

Sonoma County, California	County Fund for Housing	Developer impact fees
Ventura County, California	Housing Trust Fund	County and other
Aspen/Pitkin County, Colorado	Employee Housing Fund	Real estate transfer tax; Sales tax
Summit County, Colorado	Workforce Housing Fund	Sales tax
Telluride/San Miguel County, Colorado	Housing Trust Fund	Developer impact fees; Sales/use tax; Other
Dade County, Florida	Homeless Trust Fund	Food and beverage tax; state & private
Dade County, Florida	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	Carry-over funds
Hillsborough County, Florida	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	General Fund
Pinellas County, Florida	Community Housing Trust Fund	General Fund (County and Cities) Housing Finance Authority funds
Iowa	Local Housing Trust Funds = 22 county and regional funds	State match; Public/private investments; other
Caddo Parish, Louisiana	E. Edward Housing Jones Trust Fund	General fund
Howard County, Maryland	Community Renewal Fund	Property transfer tax
Montgomery County, Maryland	Housing Initiative Fund	Condominium Conversion tax; Developer approval fees; MPDU Program; General Fund; Housing finance; Interest income and other
Grand Traverse County, Michigan	Housing Trust Fund	Tax Foreclosure sales
Kalamazoo City and County, Michigan	Local Housing Assistance Fund	County and City funds; property tax millage

Crow Wing County, Minnesota	Housing Trust Fund	General fund
Ramsey County, Minnesota	Housing Endowment Fund	
St. Louis County, Missouri	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	Sales tax on medical marijuana
Washoe County, Nevada	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	
New Jersey	County Homeless Trust Fund = 8 counties	Document recording fee
Broome County, New York	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	NY Attorney General settlement fund
Dutchess County, New York	Affordable Housing Trust Fund	General fund
Ithaca/Tompkins County, New York	Housing Fund	Appropriations from county and Ithaca; funds from Cornell University
Wake County, North Carolina	Housing Trust Fund	Property tax
Cleveland/Cuyahoga County, Ohio	Housing Trust Fund	
Columbus/Franklin County, Ohio	The Affordable Housing Trust	Hotel/Motel tax; Real estate conveyance tax; General Fund; capital
Montgomery County, Ohio	Montgomery County Housing Trust	Sales tax
Hood River County, Oregon	Affordable housing programs	Construction excise tax
Pennsylvania Counties (Philadelphia on city chart)	Act 137 = 49 counties	Document recording fees
Arlington County, Virginia	Affordable Housing Investment Fund	Developer fees (incl zoning and proffers); County funds; Loan repayments
Fairfax County, Virginia	Flexibility Fund 30300 (A Penny for Affordable Housing Fund)	Real estate tax

Fairfax County, Virginia	Housing Trust Fund 40300	Developer proffers; general fund
Washington	HB2060 and Homeless Trust Fund = 39 counties	Document recording fees
East King County, Washington	ARCH Housing Trust Fund	County/cities funding commitments; other
King County, Washington	Housing Opportunity Fund	Credit enhancement program revenues; General Fund
San Juan County, Washington	Affordable Housing Fund	Real Estate Excise Tax

More information available at housingtrustfundproject.org