
Public Input on Housing Issues and Potential Solutions in Virginia

Prepared by:
Performance Management Group
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia



ABOUT THIS REPORT

The Performance Management Group (PMG) at Virginia Commonwealth University is helping to facilitate the creation of a statewide housing policy. As input to that process, PMG solicited and analyzed public comments on critical housing issues and potential solutions in the Commonwealth. PMG constructed internet pages that asked respondents to share their ideas as interested individuals and as representatives of various organizations with an interest in housing issues.

The primary purpose of this effort was to gather ideas (similar to a town hall concept) concerning the potential range of options that may be available to help meet Virginia's current and future housing needs. This report was not designed to gauge strength of public sentiment or the viability of any suggestion offered. It does not provide a representative sample of Virginians opinions on housing issues within the Commonwealth.

PMG prepared this report to share with members of the Governor's Housing Policy Advisory Committee as they begin their exploration of ways to address critical housing needs. This report is one of several methods that the Advisory Committee is expected to use to gather information.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this document reflect the public comments received and the analysis performed by PMG. Nothing in this document should be viewed as the official endorsement or position of the Governor's Housing Policy Advisory Committee or any other state agency or state government representative.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

Project Overview 1
Methodology 2
Response Rates, Representation and Geographic Distribution 3

FINDINGS

Land Use Planning and Regulation 6
Housing Development Programs 8
Deep Housing Subsidy Programs 9
Building/Environmental Standards and Real Estate Practices 10

APPENDIX A

Public Input Policy Arenas and Questions..... 14

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

Project Overview

On April 30, 2010, Governor McDonnell issued Executive Order 10, establishing Virginia's first executive housing policy framework. The Governor's framework will guide the development of statewide housing policy. An interim policy report will be presented in the fall.

The Governor's housing policy framework will address homelessness and affordable housing, as well as workforce housing, economic development, healthy neighborhoods, effective coordination with transportation, environmental issues and other housing related opportunities. The housing policy framework is being developed by the Housing Policy Work Group and Housing Policy Advisory Committee chaired by Bob Sledd, Special Advisor to the Governor.

Governor McDonnell previously identified homelessness and foreclosure as critical issues to consider. Separate Task Forces are currently undertaking efforts to address these issues and their work will be included in the housing policy recommendations.

The first meeting of the Housing Policy Work Group took place on June 17. A housing issues framework initially developed by the Virginia Housing Commission provided a starting point for discussion.¹ Work Group members examined five broad policy areas and began identifying critical issues to be addressed:

- Residential Land Use and Development
- Housing Affordability
- Mortgage Financing
- Housing and Environmental Standards
- Coordination of Housing and Community Services

Work Group members expressed the need to gather public comment on potential solutions to critical housing issues. Members agreed that a web-based approach would be both time and cost-efficient while providing significant opportunity for comment from across the state.

Public input was designed to accomplish two major goals. The first goal was to generate information on potential solutions for addressing critical housing issues for Work Group and Advisory Committee consideration. The second goal was to gain information that would be useful to help develop more focused priorities under each broad policy area.

¹ *Setting a Housing Policy Agenda: Summary of Key issues within a Framework of Five Broad Policy Areas*, (<http://dls.state.va.us/VHC.HTM>) was adopted by the Virginia Housing Commission in October 2006. It was updated in June 2010 under the Governor's housing policy initiative to reflect changes in issues since 2006.

Methodology

Staff from the Virginia Housing Development Authority (VHDA) and the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) identified policy areas and input questions based on the outcome of the Work Group session as well as the previous work of the Virginia Housing Commission. Issues associated with housing affordability and residential land use were determined to be so intertwined that they were combined into one policy area.

The Performance Management Group at Virginia Commonwealth University (PMG) prepared a web-based portal for soliciting public comment under the four identified policy areas:²

- Housing Affordability and Residential Land Use
- Mortgage Finance and Foreclosure
- Housing and Environmental Standards
- Coordination of Housing and Community Services

VHDA and DHCD prepared a list of housing partner organizations and stakeholders for input distribution. Links to the input web page were sent on June 24 to 120 organizations and key stakeholders requesting their input as well as their assistance in transmitting the web links to members and other interested parties. Two web page links were available: one for organizations to use to reflect the collective views of their membership and one for individuals. Both websites contained identical policy areas and questions.

Respondents accessing the web pages were asked to indicate their representation and region using drop-down boxes:

Status

Concerned Citizen
Builder or Developer
Realtor
Mortgage Lender
Private Nonprofit Housing
Private Nonprofit Human Service Organization
Local Government Agency
State Agency
Elected Official
Federal Agency
Other

Location

Northern Virginia
Hampton Roads
Greater Richmond
Central Virginia
Shenandoah Valley
Southwest Virginia
Southside Virginia
Chesapeake Bay Area

Respondents were able to access all four policy areas and provide input for any questions they choose to respond to. Responses for each question were limited to 250 words. Comments provided by close of business on July 9 were captured and incorporated in this report.

² Appendix A lists the questions used under each of the four policy areas

Response Rates, Representation and Geographic Distribution

The web portal received two hundred and sixty nine (269) total responses between June 24 and July 9.

Table One provides a summary of policy areas receiving comments by status and geographic location provided through the Organizational response page. Seventy percent of total organizational responses addressed Affordability and Land Use and Housing and Community Services issues. All together, nonprofit housing, human service organizations and local government agencies account for 70 percent of all responses. There were no responses from mortgage lenders or elected officials. The Northern Virginia region reflected the highest number of responses (approximately 33 percent) with the Greater Richmond and Hampton Roads regions combining for 31 percent of responses. Southside, Southwest and Chesapeake Bay regions accounted for slightly more than 10 percent of responses.

Table One					
Organizational Responses	Affordability & Land Use	Housing and Community Services	Housing & Environmental Standards	Mortgage Financing	Totals
Status					
Concerned Citizen	4		2		6
Builder or Developer	2	1	2		5
Realtor	1			1	2
Mortgage Lender					0
Nonprofit Housing	10	10	3	5	28
Human Service Org.	8	17	4	1	30
Local Government Agency	7	5	4	5	21
State Agency	1	2		1	4
Elected Official					0
Federal Agency	1				1
Other	6	5	3	2	16
Location					
Northern Virginia	15	14	3	5	37
Hampton Roads	9	4	2	2	17
Greater Richmond	5	9	2	2	18
Central Virginia	6	5	4	1	16
Shenandoah Valley	3	4	4	2	13
Southwest Virginia	1	2	1	2	6
Southside Virginia		1	1		2
Chesapeake Bay Area	1	1	1	1	4
Total Organizational	40	40	18	15	113

Table Two provides a summary of policy areas receiving comments by status and geographic location provided through the Public response page. Affordability and Land Use witnessed the highest percentage of responses (37 percent) followed by Housing and Environmental Standards at 29 percent. Housing and Community Services represented 18 percent of all responses and Mortgage Financing 16 percent. Concerned citizens provided slightly more than half of the total responses (51 percent). Local government agencies represented the next highest response rate (12 percent). No responses were provided by respondents categorizing themselves as mortgage lenders.

Table Two					
Public Responses	Affordability & Land Use	Housing and Community Services	Housing & Environmental Standards	Mortgage Financing	Totals
Status					
Concerned Citizen	28	16	23	13	80
Builder or Developer	6		4	1	11
Realtor	4	1	3	4	12
Mortgage Lender					0
Nonprofit Housing	5		3	4	12
Human Service Org.	2	2	1		5
Local Government Agency	9	3	5	2	19
State Agency			1	1	2
Elected Official		1	2		3
Federal Agency	1				1
Other	2	5	3	1	11
Location					
Northern Virginia	19	6	14	9	48
Hampton Roads	7	4	7	3	21
Greater Richmond	9	6	9	5	29
Central Virginia	12	5	4	3	24
Shenandoah Valley	2	5	3	2	12
Southwest Virginia	4		2	1	7
Southside Virginia	1		2	1	4
Chesapeake Bay Area	3	2	4	2	11
Total Public	57	28	45	26	156
Overall Totals					
	97	68	63	41	269

Responses by geographic region mirrored the percentages for Organizational responses. Almost one-third of all responses came from Northern Virginia (31 percent) with Hampton Roads and Greater Richmond regions combining for 32 percent.

More than one third of the total 269 responses addressed Affordability and Land Use (36 percent). Housing and Community Services reflected 25 percent of responses followed by Housing and Environmental Standards (23 percent) and Mortgage Financing (15 percent).

Table Three provides information on responses by Status, or representation. Concerned citizens provided nearly one-third of all responses. Nonprofit housing, local government and human service organization accounted for 43 percent of the total responses combined. Realtors, state and federal agency representatives, elected officials and mortgage lenders accounted for less than 10 percent of total responses.

Table Three Rank Order Responses by Status		
Concerned Citizen	86	32%
Nonprofit Housing	40	15%
Local Government Agency	40	15%
Human Service Org.	35	13%
Other	27	10%
Builder or Developer	16	6%
Realtor	14	5%
State Agency	6	2%
Elected Official	3	1%
Federal Agency	2	1%
Mortgage Lender	0	0%

Table Four summarizes the number and percentage of responses by geographic region. Northern Virginia represented 32 percent of all combined responses. Greater Richmond (17 percent), Central Virginia (15 percent) and Hampton Roads (14 percent) regions reflected nearly equal response percentages. These four regions combine for 78 percent of all responses.

Table Four Rank Order Responses by Region		
Northern Virginia	85	32%
Greater Richmond	47	17%
Central Virginia	40	15%
Hampton Roads	38	14%
Shenandoah Valley	25	9%
Chesapeake Bay Area	15	6%
Southwest Virginia	13	5%
Southside Virginia	6	2%

FINDINGS

PMG staff captured individual comments in a comprehensive database. The database was shared with VHDA and DHCD staff for review to gain their input on common themes. PMG conducted a separate analysis of the comments as well. Mutual agreement was reached that suggestions reflected four main issue areas:

- Land Use Planning and Regulation
- Housing Development Programs
- Deep Housing Subsidy Programs
- Building/Environmental Standards and Real Estate Practices

PMG conducted a content analysis of the data base by reviewing and classifying each comment offered to reflect the suggestion or solution offered. In some instances, this required the separation of multiple suggestions contained within long responses to help ensure each suggestion was represented in the analysis. Nearly 1,600 suggestions were captured. Comments were then sorted within the database by common categories of responses to reveal key themes under respective policy areas.

This report is intended to provide insight to members of the Working Group and Advisory Committee on where they should focus their initial efforts in developing a statewide housing policy and potential solutions for addressing the most pressing needs. The following sections provide a summary of the overall input received and reflects the areas commented on most frequently. Comments and suggestions reflected in this report are those of the respondents.

Land Use Planning and Regulation

This policy area focuses on improving land use planning, zoning and other regulatory mechanisms to improve the ability to retain and increase affordable and decent housing stock.

A. Paying for infrastructure and service costs associated with growth

- Local, state and federal government resources were most frequently cited as appropriate revenue sources. Respondents suggested that local and state taxes should be increased to pay for necessary improvements including: raising property taxes; increasing sales taxes on certain “sin” and “luxury” items; and, Tax-Increment Financing (TIF).
- User fees and proffers were perceived as appropriate ways to raise revenues, but this was not unanimous. It was suggested that some fees should be paid in advance by developers while others would be collected from the buyers in the form of fees or one-time tax assessments.

- Focus and limit development to areas where infrastructure is available and adequate and increasing urban infill efforts to reduce sprawl and maximize investments in existing infrastructure.
- Establish special tax districts to meet local needs.
- Use a mixture of all of the above suggestions as determined by local governments.

B. Fostering intergovernmental planning and cooperation

- Planning should take place on the regional level rather than state or local levels
- Regional planning efforts should incorporate a wide variety of partners including local and regional governmental agencies and officials, nonprofit organizations and the private sector. Housing Authorities and Planning District Commissions were frequently cited as existing organizations who could take the lead on such efforts. It was also recognized that these entities currently lack the decision-making authority and financial resources necessary for this to work effectively.
- Regions should be provided incentives to produce and implement regional plans and the flexibility to creatively meet the unique needs of their region. Incentives could include increased technical assistance and financial resources as rewards to regions who are working together.
- State government can have an important role in making regional approaches work. This includes developing state standards and requirements (including possible mandates for inclusion of affordable housing), state assistance in preparing plans, dissemination of best practices, and state overview and approval of local and regional housing plans.

C. Promoting mixed-use, mixed-income, higher density and transit-oriented development

- Document the benefits of this type of development and best practices and educate local officials, developers and housing consumers to increase demand.
- Target available tools and resources to support this type of development (TIF, LIHTC, CDA's, etc.). Provide additional "points" or credit when applying for state resources.
- Make strategic investments in transit improvements to provide incentives for creating this type of development (roads, public transit, high speed rail, etc.)
- Encourage localities to provide incentives such as fast track approval programs, density bonuses and other incentives for mixed-use/income and higher density developments close to transportation and services.
- Relax or eliminate the Dillon Rule to give localities greater flexibility. Provide technical assistance to localities/regions that are trying to zone and develop incentives for higher density, mixed development around available transit resources.

D. Incentivize local governments to zone land to meet a range of residential needs

- Establish state mandates, such as Urban Development Areas (UDAs), and provide adequate funds to help localities meet utility, highway and other infrastructure needs.
- Permit localities to enact Adequate Public Facilities ordinances.
- Provide technical and financial incentives to local governments who develop adequate housing plans.

Housing Development Programs

This policy area examines ways to preserve and rehabilitate existing affordable housing and future development of safe and affordable housing units.

E. State incentives for revitalization

- The state should continue to provide incentives and tools for localities to use such as Community Development Authority (CDA) and TIF financing, Enterprise Zones, AHP, LIHTC and historic preservation tax credits. Funding for and accessibility to these tools should be increased.
- Create additional incentives such as rehabilitation tax credits for non-historic structures, tax abatement programs and increased financial assistance for communities/regions who have adopted rehabilitation plans
- The state should provide technical assistance to localities and regions to help officials understand the importance and benefits of rehabilitation, inform people about how to access available resources and options for creating locally-based incentives.
- Creating a State Housing Trust Fund or Revolving Loan Fund to help developers and property owners who wish to rehabilitate their properties

F. Preserving affordable housing without concentrating poverty

- Many of the suggestions in item C (above) are relevant to this topic.
- Require mixed income development when seeking state financing. Ensure that existing state program guidelines do not encourage or allow concentrations of low-income units. Large developments should reflect phased housing patterns of different housing prices.
- Create a State Housing Trust Fund to help finance preservation efforts.
- Retain and expand existing programs such as the Housing Preservation Grant Program, Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program and LIHTC Program. Provide tax or other incentives to property owners to accept vouchers.
- Increase inspections to verify income qualifications and ensure properties are being adequately maintained by the tenant and property owner.
- Allow low- and moderate-income families to create savings accounts without penalizing them for accumulating assets that can be used to transition to better housing and increase self-sufficiency.
- Allow renters to access HOME and Emergency Home Repair funds.
- Increase home modification funding sources to permit people to stay in their homes.

G. Ensuring adequate supply of affordable housing for renters and owners

- Provide additional tax credits to encourage investors and developers of rental property.
- Increase the ability of localities to establish Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) policies and programs.
- Encourage the use of new tools such as the Public Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act (PPEA) of 2002 to encourage the use of surplus public property for affordable housing development.
- Relax or eliminate the Dillon Rule to permit localities greater flexibility in creating local grant and loan funds.
- Establish state mandates requiring regional and local affordable housing. Do not mandate solutions – let local communities decide how to meet targets.
- Make strategic local, regional and state investments in schools, transportation and economic development. Improving these critical community aspects will improve the living attractiveness of localities, encourage business investment and job growth, and improve access to employment and services for all income levels.

Deep Housing Subsidy Programs

Focus is given under this policy area to creating stronger linkages between housing and human service support organizations, increasing self-sufficiency and increasing the ability of localities to access needed financial support.

H. Funding priorities and coordination across housing and human service agencies

- Coordination should begin at the state level to ensure policies and programs are aligned and support state housing policy priorities.
- Provide state technical and financial assistance to support local and regional collaborative efforts to meet the needs of very low income, the elderly and individuals with mental or physical disabilities.
- Increase transitional and supportive housing programs and facilities for low-income elderly, individuals with mental and physical disabilities, traumatic brain injuries, and other special needs populations.
- Implement “housing first” programs.
- Tie state funding to jurisdictional participation in regional planning efforts and coordination of affordable housing providers with human service providers. Create stronger linkages between CSBs, Housing Authorities, Social Services, AAAs and other key organizations.

I. Leverage resources to create community housing opportunities for people living in institutions

- Make the current Auxiliary Grant (AG) provided through the Supplemental Security Income Program (SSI) portable. Current recipients are restricted to living in assisted living environments and some adult foster care homes even though they may not

need this level of care or restriction. Portability would permit them to live in private market or permanent supportive housing with increased self-sufficiency.

- Institute the Housing First Initiative to reduce recidivism rates of people leaving the penal system, people wishing to move away from emergency shelters, and those with similar needs.
- Continue the federal HUD 811 program or create a similar mechanism in Virginia to help low-income people with disabilities leave institutions and gain independence.
- Increase Single Room Occupancy (SRO) facilities located near transit and services.
- Increase the development of transitional and permanent supportive housing facilities such as those developed by Virginia Supportive Housing, Sponsored Residential Model programs and other local initiatives.
- Increase LIHTC set-asides and Housing Choice vouchers.

J. Funding affordable housing and sources of revenue

- Establish a State Housing Trust Fund (SHTF) capitalized through a percentage of real estate taxes, luxury taxes or other funding mechanism(s).
- Create a statewide rental subsidy program for those who qualify for federally subsidized housing vouchers but for whom no vouchers exist. Increase real estate taxes and fines for building code violations to fund.
- Create a home equity line of funding with automatic payroll deductions at a minimal interest rate or issue a long term loan, to be recovered when the home is sold, to encourage maintenance and rehabilitation of affordable housing units.

Building/Environmental Standards and Real Estate Practices

This policy area focuses on regulatory issues related to building and site development standards and real estate industry practices that impact health and safety, accessibility, environmental sustainability and fair access.

K. Incorporating selected building design standards

Several building design standards have been suggested to improve sustainability, safety, affordability and limit environmental impacts of development. Each of these standards offers benefits and detriments to developers and those seeking affordable housing. Respondents were asked to indicate their preference as to how potential changes in selected housing and environmental standards should be implemented.

Table Five provides a summary of responses. Respondents indicated whether they would prefer standards be implemented through incentives (tax breaks, financing, etc.), mandates (laws, regulations, etc.), or be implemented voluntarily. Nearly three quarters of respondents (74 percent) opted for using incentives for encouraging the use of green building standards.

Table Five Preferences for Identified Design Elements								
Method	Green Building		Universal Design		Sprinkler Systems		Energy Efficiency	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Mandate	8	14	17	28	23	40	27	47
Incentives	43	74	25	42	17	29	29	50
Voluntary	7	12	18	30	18	31	2	3
Total	58	100	60	100	58	100	58	100

Incentives were also the preferred method to implement Universal Design standards (42 percent) with the use of voluntary efforts (30 percent) and mandates nearly equal in preference (28 percent).

Mandates were the single most preferred method for implementing sprinkler systems (40 percent). However, a clear majority (60 percent) of respondents preferred non-mandatory methods with 31 percent of respondents preferring voluntary implementation and 29 percent preferring incentives.

Methods to increase energy efficiency standards were split fairly evenly between incentives (50 percent) and mandates (47 percent).

L. Ensuring appropriate balance between cost and benefits of retrofitting existing properties to meet new standards

- Offer financial incentives such as tax breaks or financial assistance since retrofitting is almost always more expensive than meeting the same standards in new construction
- Do not make changes retroactive unless the dwelling unit is substantially remodeled or expanded to an established standard, as currently required in the USBC.
- Ensure retrofitting does not compromise the ability of the current resident(s) to continue living in their home. Match required improvements with ability to afford and/or provide financial assistance.
- Use Universal Design standards whenever changes are made to access points.
- The current USBC may be sufficient and reasonable to meet the majority of needs.

M. Encourage the use of improved energy efficiency and universal design standards in new construction

- Educate developers and consumers on the cost benefits and improved quality of life that can be achieved through incorporating these standards.
- Provide funding preference for incorporation of these design elements in state funding requests.

N. Reducing the cost burden associated with enhanced domestic waste and storm water regulations

- Provide financial incentives to implement low impact development practices and tie them to use of LEED principles.
- Ensure regulations are based on sound science and do not place an unfair burden on residential development. Runoff and pollution control need be balanced across everyone, including agriculture and commercial development, to meet statewide goals.
- Educate and encourage the use of recycling and conservation to lessen the need for structural solutions.

O. Additional suggestions to improve safety and livability

- Continue to provide funding assistance to help ensure safe drinking water for low- and moderate income individuals.
- Continue to provide incentives to remove or mitigate lead based paint.
- Assist in the installation of strobe light smoke detectors for low- and moderate income individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing.

P. Fair Housing

- No specific suggestions were provided regarding fair housing issues. Comments addressing barriers to obtaining safe and affordable housing focused on supply, program impediments, lack of financial assistance and other issues mentioned elsewhere in this document.

Q. Common Interest Communities/Community Associations

- No specific suggestions were provided regarding common interest communities or community associations.

Foreclosure Issues

The following survey responses relate to issues under the purview of the Foreclosure Task Force.

R. Financial Literacy

- Increase available homeowner education programs and financial literacy courses for first-time homebuyers.
- Increase financial literacy programs in public schools.

S. Residential Appraisals

- Require real estate appraisers to be based within the same region to enhance knowledge of the market and appraisal accuracy.
- Require all appraisal and mortgage companies practicing in Virginia be familiar with alternate methods of appraisal to ensure accurate valuation of units constructed under inclusionary zoning requirements.

T. Lending Practices

- Set firm caps on the amount of mortgage purchased relative to adjusted gross income.
- Establish a set time for foreclosure procedures to permit financial counseling and arbitration occur before final action is taken by the lender.
- Establish a code of conduct that clearly states mortgage lenders and their representatives are required to act as fiduciaries to their clients and always put their clients' interest first.
- Require banks to coordinate activities between their loan modification departments and foreclosure offices to ensure foreclosure is the last available option.
- Require licensing and continued education for mortgage lenders.
- Strengthen protection for renters whose property is going through foreclosure.
- Adopt more stringent regulations against predatory lending and enforce them.
- Permit localities to purchase foreclosed units developed under ADU agreements at the maximum control price. This would discourage financing of these price-controlled units greater than their control price and the loss of foreclosed units to the locality.

Appendix A

Public Input Policy Arenas and Questions

Housing Affordability and Residential Land Use

Economic development generally drives growth in regional labor/housing market areas.

- 1) What are the most appropriate means local governments should use to pay for infrastructure and service costs associated with that growth?
- 2) How can Virginia foster intergovernmental cooperation in labor/housing market regions and develop capacity for more effective planning that addresses regional housing needs? Does Virginia need region specific affordable housing strategies, and if so, then who should develop them?
- 3) Are state incentives needed to encourage revitalization and diversification of older urban, suburban, and rural neighborhoods/communities? If so, then what types?
- 4) How can Virginia best promote mixed-use/mixed-income, higher density, and transit oriented developments?
- 5) How can Virginia better enable the preservation of affordable housing without perpetuating concentration of poverty?

State and local governments share an interest in creating sustainable, multigenerational communities of opportunity (excellent schools, safe streets, close proximity to quality jobs and services, and a variety of housing choices serving the needs of all groups).

- 6) How can Virginia ensure an adequate supply of affordable rental/owner occupied housing to support such communities?
- 7) How can Virginia incentivize local governments to be more proactive in zoning land to accommodate the needed range of residential development?

The efficiency and effectiveness with which Virginia administers housing resources affects program outcomes.

- 8) What should be Virginia's housing funding priorities and how should they be coordinated across housing and human service agencies?
- 9) What role should Virginia play in funding affordable housing programs, and what sources of revenue are appropriate for that purpose?
- 10) Is there another land use and/or housing affordability issue of equal or higher priority? If so, then please state the issue and how it can be addressed.

Mortgage Finance and Foreclosure

The current level of foreclosures in Virginia and the means for preventing their future recurrence are important concerns for homeowners, communities, and the housing industry.

- 1) What kinds of state activities/actions are needed to reduce/prevent foreclosures?
- 2) What kinds of state activities/actions are needed to help/assist borrowers after foreclosure?
- 3) Is there anything Virginia should do to better prepare people to become homeowners?
- 4) Are there steps Virginia can take to improve the accuracy, timeliness, and fairness of residential appraisals?
- 5) Is there another mortgage finance issue of equal or higher priority? If so, then please state the issue and how it can be addressed.

Housing & Environmental Standards

Virginia's approach to regulations not only affects the state's overall attractiveness and competitiveness to investors and employers but it also impacts the provision of safe and affordable housing options.

- 1) Should desired changes to housing and environmental standards be implemented through mandates, incentives, or be completely voluntary?

Green Building Mandate Incentive Voluntary

Universal Design Mandate Incentive Voluntary

Sprinkler Systems Mandate Incentive Voluntary

Energy Efficiency Mandate Incentive Voluntary

- 2) What procedural steps should Virginia should take to ensure an appropriate balance between the cost and benefits of requiring the retrofitting of existing properties to meet newer housing and environmental standards?
- 3) Is there anything Virginia can do to reduce the cost burden associated with enhanced domestic waste and storm water regulations?
- 4) Is there another housing and environmental standard issue of equal or higher priority? If so, then please state the issue and how it can be addressed.

Coordination of Housing and Community Services

Enhanced interagency and intergovernmental relationships are needed in order to effectively and efficiently serve people needing help in accessing both housing and community services.

- 1) Are there viable and sustainable financing models that will enable sufficient leverage of resources to create community housing opportunities for people living in institutions?

- 2) How can Virginia best promote integrated, regional planning to coordinate housing with education, transportation, health care, and energy efficiency?
- 3) How can Virginia empower and more effectively use Planning District Commissions to implement regional initiatives?
- 4) Is there another issue related to coordination of housing and community services of equal or higher priority? If so, then please state the issue and how it can be addressed.