Affordable Housing Scorecard
City of Asheville, North Carolina

January 27, 2014

Dr. Mai Thi Nguyen
mai@unc.edu

Executive Summary

Asheville's 85,712 residents make it the tenth most populous city in North Carolina. As a mountain destination for tourists, retirees, and second homeowners, Asheville is becoming one of the most desirable places to live, work, raise a family, and enjoy a wonderful quality of life. With the growth in tourism industry (e.g. retail, food services, hospitality) and the rise in number of in-migrants pushing up demand for housing, these intersecting trends create an affordable housing challenge in Asheville.

This report seeks to develop a "scorecard" for the city of Asheville to compare how the city fares in terms of affordable housing production (both quantity and type). How does the city of Asheville stack up to other comparable cities such as Greenville, South Carolina and Wilmington, North Carolina? In terms of new affordable housing production, the city of Asheville produces a significantly higher number of rental units per year on average (77 units) than Greenville (34 units) or Wilmington (47 units). Asheville also produces a much greater number of homeownership units on average per year (37 units) than Greenville (7 units) and Wilmington (9 units). Even compared to larger cities, such as Durham, the Asheville Consortium, which includes both the city of Asheville and Buncombe County, funds and supports a greater number of affordable housing units. In 2013, the Asheville Consortium assisted with 402 affordable housing units, while the city of Durham assisted with 167 units.

How does the city of Asheville score in leveraging non-public sources of funding? There was not much variation across the comparison cities in the way in which cities fund the development of new affordable housing. A significant portion of funding is public funding from HOME, CDBG, LIHTC programs and local funds, such as general fund dollars. Two strategies that the city of Asheville does not employ in addressing their affordable housing problem is a land trust, such as found in Chapel Hill, NC and Greenville, SC and a dedicated revenue stream for affordable housing, such as in Durham, NC. These two tools should be explored for their applicability in the city of Asheville.

This report also offers "promising" practices from other places that might be applied to the city of Asheville. These promising practices include thinking about ways to develop permanent affordable housing (e.g. land trust), creating a dedicated funding stream for affordable housing, identifying vacant land or infill opportunities for affordable housing development, developing mixed-income neighborhoods, and facilitating meetings for an affordable housing network of stakeholders on a regular basis to discuss and collaborate on affordable housing initiatives/projects.

The City's leadership has shown a clear commitment to addressing the affordable housing challenge in Asheville and has worked hard to engage relevant public, private, non-profit stakeholders in tackling these challenges. This study shows that the efforts on the part of the City's leadership and staff have been effective at supporting affordable housing activities and producing new affordable housing units. It also reveals that there are a variety of other tools that the City can explore to support an even greater number of affordable housing.

Introduction

Asheville's 85,712 residents make it the tenth most populous city in North Carolina.[1] As a mountain destination for tourists, retirees, and second homeowners, Asheville is becoming one of the most desirable places to live, work, raise a family, and enjoy a wonderful quality of life. With the growth in tourism industry (e.g. retail, food services, hospitality) and the rise in number of in-migrants pushing up demand for housing, these intersecting trends create an affordable housing challenge in Asheville. According to the 2009 Buncombe County Housing Needs Assessment and Market Study, fewer low- to moderate-income households are able to afford to buy a home in Asheville and a greater number of renters are cost-burdened (i.e. paying 30% or more of their income for rent). According to the 2012 American Community Survey, 38.2% of homeowners with a mortgage and 47% of renters living in Asheville were cost-burdened.

The lack of affordable housing has become one of the most pressing concerns among residents, elected officials, and affordable housing stakeholders. The city's leadership has shown a clear commitment to addressing the affordable housing challenge in Asheville and has worked hard to engage relevant public, private, non-profit stakeholders in tackling these challenges. There have been numerous public discussions and studies that have identified the barriers to affordable housing and supply and demand dynamics including (but not limited to) a 2008 Affordable Housing Plan for the city of Asheville developed by an Affordable Housing Task Force, a 2009 Housing Needs Assessment and Market Study for Buncombe County, establishing an Affordable Housing Advisory Committee in 2011, and a 2013 survey of developers to examine the barriers to housing development. Building off prior studies, this report seeks to develop a "scorecard" for the city of Asheville to compare how the city fares in terms of affordable housing production (both quantity and type) and leveraging of resources from other sectors (e.g. non-profit, private). This report will also offer "promising" practices from other places that might be applied to the city of Asheville. Finally, this report will offer information for elected officials and decision-makers to evaluate whether a goal can be set for the number of affordable units that can be supported by current city investments and policies.

Based on similarities in population size and industrial mix, the cities of Greenville, South Carolina and Wilmington, North Carolina were selected as comparable case study comparison sites. The Town of Chapel Hill and City of Durham were also included in this study because both offer different and innovative ways to address affordable housing. The town of Chapel Hill has partnered and partially funded the Community Home Trust to supply permanent affordable homeownership, while Durham has partnered with mission driven organizations, such as Self-Help Credit Union, that are committed to neighborhood revitalization and providing low-and moderate-income housing. These public-private partnerships offer valuable insights into leveraging resources to further affordable housing goals.

---

[1] 2010 U.S. Census Bureau

Asheville, North Carolina: Affordable Housing goals and achievements

Although the city of Asheville is a thriving, bustling destination for tourism, what threatens the livability for those who live and work in the city is housing affordability. Over the last decade, city leaders and community stakeholders have engaged in numerous planning-related activities to understand and address problems associated with affordable housing. These planning exercises have identified several main demand and supply side drivers contributing to the housing affordability problem. On the demand side are: low-wage jobs in the tourism sector and increasing in-migration of higher income households. On the supply side, there is a low supply of rental housing in general, even fewer affordable rental units, and a low supply of for-sale housing that is affordable to low- and moderate-income households. The mountainous terrain and lack of developable land within the city limits increase costs, thereby making it more expensive to build in Asheville and encourages housing development outside city limits or even in neighboring counties. Both the demand and supply side factors have contributed to rising numbers of households, renters and homeowners, paying a greater proportion of their income on housing. By 2012, 38.2% of homeowners with a mortgage and 47% of renters were cost-burdened.[2] This was an increase from 2005-2007, when 25% of homeowners and 41% of renters were cost-burdened. Compared to the four comparison sites and the statewide average, a higher proportion of Asheville's homeowners were more cost-burdened than homeowners in all other sites except for Wilmington, North Carolina (see Appendix A). Interestingly, Asheville had the lowest proportion of renters who were cost-burned (47% in 2012) compared to all other sites: Greenville (47.9%), Durham (51.8%), Wilmington (57.2%), and Chapel Hill (57.5%). Asheville's proportion of renters who were cost-burdened was even lower than the statewide average of 49.7%. More detailed housing comparisons across sites can be found in Appendix A.

Affordable Housing Production in Asheville/Buncombe County NC

The 2010-2015 Consolidated Plan for the Asheville Regional Housing Consortium set annual and 5-year targets for affordable housing production by type for the City and the four-county region that comprises the federal HOME program Consortium. A performance report for the use of CDBG and HOME funds for 2011, 2012, and 2013 was provided in the

[2] American Community Survey. 2012. U.S. Census Bureau.

2013 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report. These two reports are used to evaluate Asheville Consortium's annual affordable housing performance based on the Consortium's annual targets. In all three years (2011, 2012, and 2013), the Consortium has met the annual affordable housing target of 240 total units. The Asheville Consortium assisted with 397, 419, and 401 affordable housing units for 2011, 2012, and 2013, respectively. More specifically, the Consortium outperformed in two categories: New construction (or rehab) for homeownership and rehabilitation or repair of owner-occupied units. The Consortium has also performed well in the new construction for rental and homeownership assistance categories, meeting the annual targets in 2 out of the 3 years (2011 and 2013) for both of these categories. The only category in which the Consortium has underperformed significantly is rehabilitation/repair of rental units.

Table 1: Affordable Housing Targets and Outcomes, Asheville Regional Housing Consortium

Production Type/Performance measures			Achievements			
	Annual Targets	5 year Targets	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	5 Year Percentage
New construction (or rehab) for homeownership	15	75	16	39	27	109%
Rehabilitation or repair of owner-occupied units	40	200	50	72	91	107%
24 New construction for rental*	100	500	128	72	115	63%
Rehabilitation/Repair of rental units	25	125	0	6	0	5%
Homeownership Assistance (Down payment assistance)	10	50	24	8	10	84%
Rent or Relocation Assistance	50	250	179	221	159	224%
Total units	240	1200	397	419	402	105%

Source: City of Asheville and Asheville Regional Housing Consortium. 2013. Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report.

Whereas the units in Table 1 were assisted by CDBG or HOME funds, there were 235 affordable housing units that were developed or assisted without these funds in 2013 and these included:

- 6 new affordable rental units assisted with Housing Trust Funds
- 26 new affordable single-family homes assisted under the City's fee rebate program
- 158 emergency repairs completed by MHO in Asheville & Buncombe County that were not Asheville CDBG-assisted
- 15 additional households provided with down payment from Mountain Housing Opportunities

(Source: Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report. 2013. City of Asheville)

When these units are added to the units assisted with CDBG and HOME funds, a total of 1,453 units of affordable housing are assisted in the three years.

Comparing the Asheville consortium's Affordable Housing Performance to other Cities

Although the Consortium has performed well meeting its own targets for affordable housing, it is instructive to assess whether the Consortium performs well relative to other jurisdictions. To conduct this comparison, the most recent performance indicators were obtained for each jurisdiction. A comparison of affordable housing assistance and activities (e.g. acquiring property or land for affordable housing) was conducted across five jurisdictions: Asheville/Buncombe, NC, Greenville, SC, Wilmington, NC, Chapel Hill/Orange County, NC[3] and Durham, NC. It should be noted that there are two Consortia: Asheville/Buncombe and Chapel Hill/Orange, while the others are cities only. As shown in Table 2, Asheville/Buncombe far outperformed all other comparison cities/counties, including both cities of similar sizes and those that are much larger, including the city of Durham. In 2013, Asheville's Consortium assisted with 402 affordable housing units. The city of Durham assisted with 167 units, Wilmington assisted 115, Chapel Hill/Orange County assisted 81, and Greenville only assisted 42. A major factor contributing to the high performance numbers in Asheville/Buncombe is the 159 people receiving rental assistance. The other jurisdictions do no provide the same level of rental assistance.

[3] The 2012-2013 CAPER was not readily available online for Chapel Hill/Orange County. Attempts to contact the Orange County Housing Consortium to obtain the most recent CAPER was not successful.

Table 2: Annual Housing Production/Assistance Comparison: Asheville/Buncombe, NC, Greenville, SC, Wilmington, NC, Chapel Hill/Orange County, NC and Durham, NC

Production/Performance Measures	Asheville/Buncombe Annual Targets	Asheville/ Buncombe, NC	Greenville, SC	Wilmington, NC	Chapel Hill/Orange County, NC[a]	Durham, NC
		Produced				
		2013	2012-2103	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013
New construction (or rehab) for homeownership	15	27	1	8	0	2
Rehabilitation or repair of owner-occupied units	40	91	21	12	0	5
New construction for rental	100	115	15	75	56	80
Rehabilitation/Repair of rental units	25	0	2	3	0	0
Homeownership Assistance (Down payment assistance)	10	10	0	17	15	8
Rent or Relocation Assistance	50	159	0	0	10	1
Acquire Property and Substandard housing for revitalization	0	0	3	0	0	71
Total	240	402	42	115	81	167

[a] These are objectives for the year, but not actual production. Actual production numbers were not available.

Sources: All data are taken from the most recent Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report for each city, except for Chapel Hill/Orange County. The Annual Action Plan for 2011-2012 from the Orange County HOME Consortium was used for Chapel Hill/Orange County.

Although it clear that Asheville is outperforming other cities in regards to the city's use of CDBG and HOME funds on affordable housing, these numbers do not include affordable housing produced or assisted by the private or non-profit organizations if they do not receive these funds. To obtain these numbers, further research should be conducted by contacting all affordable housing developers in each city and obtaining affordable housing production data. Unfortunately, this data was not easily accessible and was outside the scope of this research report.

The City of Asheville Affordable Housing production (New Construction)

While the above analysis gives a broad overview of a variety of affordable housing activities in Asheville/Buncombe County, the next section examines affordable housing production, rental and homeownership units, in the Asheville city boundaries. Data for this analysis was obtained from the City of Asheville's Community Development Department and contains information about number of units produced and funds used to produce the units for the years between 2007-2013. As shown in Table 3, the number of affordable housing units produced each year varies significantly. The range of affordable housing units produced ranged from a high of 286 units between 2008-2009 and a low of 56 units between 2012-2013. The average number of affordable housing units produced per year during this study period was 139.5 units. Asheville produced more affordable rental units (589) than homeownership units (248) during this period. The average rental units

produced each year was roughly 98 units and the average homeownership units produced was 41 units. The amount of funds expended to produce affordable housing in any given year also varied significantly.

Table 3: Tenure by Year, 2007-2013

	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013	Total
Rental Units	67	207	12	72	66	37	128	589
Homeownership Units	7	79	75	20	23	19	25	248
Total Units	74	286	87	92	89	56	153	837
Total Funds Expended[a]	$1,001,093	$4,764,850	$911,405	$1,777,901	$7,558,667	$932,111	$415,725	$17,361,752

[a] Funds include: HOME Budget, HTF funds spent, Fee rebate, Buncombe County
*Note, the 837 total units do not include 32 foreclosed units but does include units underway but not completed

There are three major programs that the city of Asheville utilizes to support affordable housing production: Fee Rebates, HOME Program, and the Housing Trust Fund. Table 4 shows how many units are produced in each of these programs and also how other funds are layered with these programs in order to fund these units. The HOME program produced the majority of housing during this period: 402 rental units and 67 homeownership units, for a total of 469 units. But, it should be noted that many different types of funds were used to produced these units: $2.8 million in HOME funds, $8.6 million in Housing Trust Funds, $3.65 million from Buncombe County, and $134,754 in fee rebates. The Housing Trust Fund program produced 192 affordable housing units utilizing $1.7 million from the Housing Trust Fund, $43,783 in fee rebates and $9,630 from Buncombe County. The Fee Rebate program produced 176 units of affordable housing, $170,085 coming from the Fee Rebate program and another $176,370 coming from Buncombe County.

Table 4: Tenure by Primary Program by All Sources of Funding, 2007-2013

	Fee Rebate	HOME	Housing Trust Fund	Total
Unit Type				
Rental Units	15	402	172	589
Homeownership Units	161	67	20	248
Total Units	176	469	192	837
Sources of Funding				
Fee Rebate Expended	$170,085	$134,754	$43,783	$348,622
HOME Funds Budgeted		$2,817,541		$2,817,541
HTF Spent		$8,642,118	$1,709,571	$10,351,689
Bouncombe County Expended	$176,370	$3,657,900	$9,630	$3,843,900
Total	$346,455	$15,252,313	$1,762,984	$17,361,752

*Note, the 837 total units do not include 32 foreclosed units but does include units underway but not completed

Table 5 displays all the funds used to produce 589 rental units and 248 ownership units and then calculates the average cost per unit. On average, more public funds were used to

produce rental units than homeownership units. In particular, a greater proportion of Housing Trust Funds were used on rental units versus homeownership units: $8.8 million for rental and $1.5 million for homeownership. On average, $25,162 of public funds was spent per rental unit as compared to only $10,246 of public funds for homeownership units.

Table 5: Tenure by Fund Type by Cost Per Unit, 2007-2013

	Fee Rebate Expended	HOME Funds Budgeted	HTF Spent	Bouncombe County Expended	Total Funds	Average Cost per Unit
Rental Units (589 units)	$172,154	$2,274,936	$8,853,343	$3,520,250	$14,820,684	$25,162
Homeowneship Units (248 units)	$176,468	$542,605	$1,498,345	$323,650	$2,541,068	$10,246
Total Units (837)	$348,622	$2,817,541	$10,351,689	$3,843,900	$17,361,752	$20,743

*Note, the 837 total units do not include 32 foreclosed units but does include units underway but not completed

To determine how program funds were used, a cost per unit by primary fund type was calculated in Table 6. It should be noted that this table only shows the cost for each primary fund, not all the different funds used to develop these units. For the Fee Rebate program, the average amount used for rental versus ownership units was not substantially different: $919 and $970, respectively. The average amount of HOME funds budgeted for rental units was $5,659 and $8,098 for homeownership units. The cost per unit for homeownership units using Housing Trust Funds was $39,042, which was significantly inflated by 32 foreclosed units. If these units were completed and added to the affordable housing stock, the average cost per unit would have only been $15,016. Even when the 32 units are included in the analysis, more Housing Trust Funds dollars are spent per unit on homeownership units than on rental units. Only $5,399 of Housing Trust Funds is spent per rental unit.

Table 6: Cost Per Unit by Tenure by Primary Fund, 2007-2013

	Fee Rebate		**HOME Budgeted**		**HTF Spent**	
	Number of Units	Cost Per Unit	Number of Units	Cost Per Unit	Number of Units	Cost Per Unit
Rental	15	$919.43	402	$5,659.04	172	$5,399.57
Ownership	161	$970.77	67	$8,098.58	20	$39042.27*

*This average is impacted by the 32 units that were foreclosed on. If the 32 units had been completed, the cost per unit for homeownership units using Housing Trust Funds would be $15,016.26.

To gain a sense of how the city of Asheville's affordable housing production compares to other similar sized cities, the community development staff of the cities of Greenville, SC and Wilmington, NC provided yearly construction data of rental and homeownership units. Table 7 shows annual production of rental and homeownership units in Asheville exceed both Greenville and Wilmington. Asheville produces a significantly higher number of rental units per year on average (77 units) than Greenville (34 units) or Wilmington (47 units). Asheville also produces a much greater number of homeownership units on average per year (37 units) than Greenville (7 units) and Wilmington (9 units).

Table 7: Production of Affordable Rental and Homeownership Units by City by Year

	Asheville, NC[a]		**Greenville, SC[b]**		**Wilmington, NC[c]**	
	Rental	Ownership	Rental	Ownership	Rental	Ownership
2007-2008	67	7	86	6	4	12
2008-2009	207	79	27	5	144	13
2009-2010	12	75	40	15	0	9
2010-2011	72	20	20	6	49	4
2011-2012	66	23	16	7	9	9
2012-2013	37	19	15	1	76	8
Total	461	223	204	40	282	55
Average per year	77	37	34	7	47	9

[a] Source: Jeff Staudinger, City of Asheville, NC

[b] Source: Wayne Leftwich, City of Greenville, SC

[c] Source: Suzanne Rogers, City of Wilimington, NC

The case study comparisons between the city of Asheville and other comparable cities/regions show that Asheville has made tremendous strides in supporting and producing affordable housing. Annual rates of new affordable housing construction of rental and homeownership units in Asheville far outpace all other comparison cities and regions.

Leveraging funds for Affordable Housing

According to the 2012-2013 CAPER, Asheville/Buncombe's CDBG and HOME funds leverage an average of $6.23 for every $1. The city of Asheville allocates funding each year towards a Housing Trust Fund (HTF). Between 2012-2013, Ashville allocated $420,000 towards loans to developers to produce 128 rental units. In July 2013, the city contributed an additional $500,000 to the HTF to support more affordable housing. In 2012-2013, the funds dispersed included a $120,000 loan to build six rental units, which is an average of $20,000 per unit. Another 22 units were supported with a $387,000 loan using HTFs, for an average of $17,590 per unit. Asheville also has fee rebate programs for city permit fees, water department fees and Metropolitan Sewage District fees. In 2012-2013, a total of $117, 161 was dispersed in the form of fee rebates to support 26 single-family homes and 75 rental units. The fee rebates on average per unit equals $1160. Both the HTF and the fee rebate programs appear to be effective tools to increase the supply of affordable housing in Asheville.

The city of Greenville, SC often partners with a variety of non-profit and for-profit housing entities to support their affordable housing efforts. Although the 2012-2013 CAPER from the city of Greenville does not offer specific dollars leveraged, it does mention that funds are leveraged from, "…SC State Housing Finance and Development Authority's Housing Trust Fund and HOME programs, Federal Home Loan Bank – Affordable Housing Program,

HOPE VI, LIHTC and other financial institutions' loans." These sources of funding and the partnerships with other organizations is common across all jurisdictions, thus Greenville is not unique in this respect. Greenville has a very active Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) called Community Works Carolina that serves Upstate South Carolina and attempts to address issues related to wealth building among low wealth families, financial stability, and affordable housing. CDFIs are extremely important institutions that contribute significantly to the supporting affordable housing goals. In operation since 2008, Community Works Carolina[4] has already accomplished the following:

- Assisted 256 families to purchase their first home, which has generated over $36 million in economic impact

- Assisted 105 individuals to save for a home, college education or small business through the IDA Program. These individuals have collectively saved over $89,000

- Funded short term loans to local developers to create 98 affordable housing units which has generated over $16 million in economic impact

- Purchased 17 foreclosed homes for renovation to create a lease purchase program for low wealth families

(Source: http://communityworkscarolina.org/about/missionvision/#2010_ghf_strategic_plan)

Community Works Carolina has partnered with the city of Greenville and United Ministries to develop the Greenville Housing Network. This network, which includes bankers, local government, real estate professionals, architects, contractors, developers (non-profit and for-profits) and other interested groups meets quarterly to discuss issues impacting the production of affordable and workforce housing. Although participation in the Housing Network is voluntary, this in-kind contribution of time by these educated stakeholders is extremely valuable.

According to the city of Wilmington's 2012-2013 CAPER, the city was able to leverage approximately $22.8 million from general funds, loan funds, private foundations, and other sources to support activities, programs and projects that utilized CDBG and HOME funds. This amounts to a leveraging ratio of $11 for every $1 of CDBG and HOME funds combined ($1:$20 for CDBG and $1:$5.7 for HOME). This leveraging ratio exceeds Asheville's leveraging ratio of $6.23 to $1.[5]. A 75-unit affordable rental project for the elderly accounts for a large share of the leverage funds in Wilmington. The city allocated $650,000 in HOME funds to make this $9.2 million project feasible for the lead development partner, Carlisle

[4] Community Works Carolina was contacted numerous times through phone and email to find out more information about the types of funds used to produce affordable housing, but they have been unresponsive to requests for more information. See interview below with Self-Help's Dan Levine for information about funding affordable housing in Durham.

[5] This should be interpreted with caution because cities do not always include the same types of funds into their leveraging ratio, therefore, the ratio may not be comparable across cities.

Development. Like Asheville/Buncombe, Wilmington has also been successful in acquiring Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and other funds from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency. The city of Wilmington also supports the Cape Fear Housing Land Trust, which started operation in 2008 with the goal of providing permanent affordable homeownership to families making between 25-125% of Area Median Income. A total of $21,250 from the General Fund and $7,643 from CDBG funds was provided for administration and general operations of the land trust in FY2012-13. Since its inception, the City of Wilmington has provided $218,880 to the Land Trust for administrative costs. The Land Trust has been successful at raising other funds, particularly from foundations such as the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation and fund raising events. Of the five cities studies, only Chapel Hill and Wilmington have a Community Land Trust, which assists with keeping units affordable permanently. Land trusts are also important institutions that can leverage additional funding and support of affordable housing through grant writing and fund raising. They also support wealth-building activities, which addresses intergenerational poverty.

The town of Chapel Hill utilizes a collaborative model to support its affordable housing efforts. This is in part due in part to the fact that CDBG funding is allocated to the town while HOME funds are allocated to the county. To direct the use of HOME funds, the Orange County HOME consortium was created. The consortium is led by Orange County Board of Commissioners and is comprised of representatives from all the local jurisdictions in the county: Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and Hillsborough. The town of Chapel Hill and the OC HOME Consortium work closely with local non-profits to assist with affordable housing endeavors. These non-profits include the Interfaith Council, Habitat for Humanity, Housing for New Hope, and the Community Home Trust (CHT). These non-profits assist with both the construction of affordable housing and client services (e.g. social services, homebuyer assistance). The CHT plays a vital role in developing permanent affordable housing in Orange County. Currently, the CHT has 203 homes in its portfolio. The average income of CHT homeowners is $37,000, which is well below Orange County's median income. The average sales price of a CHT home is between $90,000 and $150,000, while the average home value in Orange County in 2013 is $315,151. The affordability in price is due to Home Trust retaining ownership of the land and the homeowners leasing the land for up to 99 years. The occupation most representative of CHT homeowners is teacher, while other occupations such as firefighter, nurses, and university employees also benefit from affordable home ownership. While the CHT has been successful in making it possible for low-income families to purchase homes, the non-profit struggles with operational funding. Although the town of Chapel Hill has provided operating and administrative costs to the CHT, these have been insufficient in the last few years to cover the total operating expenses. For example, in 2011-2012, the CHT income was $652,106 while the expenses were $699,580. This is a deficit of $47,474 in operating expenses for the year. The CHT also experienced a deficit of $42,532 for the 2012-2013 year. This suggests that the current funding model, in which revenues are mostly derived from grants, is not sustainable for the Community Home Trust in Orange County. But, this is not to say that all land trusts struggle with a lack of operating funds. In fact, with over 200 land trusts across the United States, there are variety of different organizational and funding models. Furthermore, land trusts vary in the clients they serve and in their portfolio of homes. The main benefit of land trusts is that they work to establish permanent affordable units in a community, which is something that the city of Asheville currently lacks. A land trust is certainly something that the city of Asheville should consider, but in order to determine if it is the right tool to develop affordable housing, more research should be conducted on best

practices for community land trusts. For a list of land trusts around the country, see Appendix B.

In the last few decades, the city of Durham has been engaged in projects that are intended to have transformative effects on neighborhoods. The city's focus has been in two targeted neighborhoods: Northeast Central Durham and Southwest Central Durham. In Northeast Central Durham, the city demolished deteriorated public housing with HOPE VI funding and built a mixed-income development. A total of 600 units, including single family, duplex, and townhouse units were developed. A substantial portion of these units was designated for homeownership. Neighborhood amenities, including extensive streetscape improvements, open space and recreational features, a new community center, and a new neighborhood commercial district were also developed.

The city continues to invest funding in revitalizing Northeast Central Durham, but in the last few years, the city has shifted their efforts and funding towards major revitalization efforts in the Southside neighborhood in Southwest Central Durham. Leveraging resources from Self-Help Credit Union, Duke University, and McCormack Baron Salazar, a private development company, the city of Durham is currently in the process of completing a dramatic transformation of one of the most distressed neighborhoods in the city. This development project is estimated to cost $48 million when complete. The city has demolished a large public housing development in the Rolling Hills subdivision and is in the process of developing phase one of a mixed-income development that includes 80 apartments for low-income tenants in a 132-unit housing development. This first phase costs $20 million and utilizes $11.5 million in low-income housing tax credits that was sold by the private developer.[6] The first phase should be complete by the end of 2013. In addition to the mixed-income development, Self-Help Credit Union and Duke University have partnered with the city to provide affordable single-family housing to low- and moderate-income families. Duke University has offered to provide $10,000 loans for a down payment on ten single family homes in the neighborhood. These loans are only available to Duke employees who earn less than $40,000 a year. The down payment loan will be forgiven after five years of occupancy. To make the homes even more affordable, Self-Help Credit Union will offer below-market mortgage interest rates to homeowners. In order to leverage funding from the various private and non-profit entities, the city of Durham has paid for a substantial amount of the pre-development work with CDBG funds and has directed most of their future CDBG and HOME funds for the next 20 years to support the redevelopment of the Southside neighborhood. In addition to this, the city council passed a one-cent property tax increase in the summer of 2012 that is a dedicated funding stream for affordable housing. This can be used to address affordable housing needs throughout the city, not just in Southside. Revenues from the property tax increase are expected to generate $2.3 million per year for low-income housing and social services and will continue to generate revenue for low and moderate income housing in the years to come. The city of Durham's efforts to develop and support affordable housing has been focused on 1) transformative neighborhood change which includes mixed-income development, 2) redirecting substantial portions of available housing funds (CDBG and HOME) to target neighborhoods, 3) leveraging funding from Self-Help Credit Union, Duke

---

[6] Durham News. August 9, 2013. Durham's Rolling Hills rising in $11.5 million a race against time. Available at: http://www.thedurhamnews.com/2013/08/09/3092557/durhams-rolling-hills-rising-in.html

University, and private developers, and 4) creating a dedicated source of funding for affordable housing development and services to buffer the funding cuts by state and federal governments.

To compare Self-Help, a CDFI that is dedicated to neighborhood revitalization and affordable housing, with Mountain Housing Opportunities, Dan Levine, Assistant Director of Real Estate for Self-Help was asked directly about how Self-Help leverages other funds besides CDBG and HOME funds. He responded as follows:

> "I wish I could say that Self-Help has a bunch of innovative funding strategies for funding land acquisition and construction gap financing, but I'm afraid we don't. We've been innovative in terms of getting site control and collaborating with other non-profits and community groups, most notably through a 0% interest rate Duke University loan to fund initial acquisition for a land bank of properties we own for housing development. However, the "takeout financing" in terms of how developers buy the land at cost from us typically goes back to CDBG and HOME dollars. In other words, Duke dollars let us acquire property and hold it with few carrying costs but grant funds are still needed to turn the property into affordable housing. The only additional "creative" source of any significance in Durham--and it is a big one--is general funds raised by the City through its "Penny for Housing", in which for the last couple of years Council agreed to dedicate one penny of the city property tax rate toward affordable housing. In Durham, this amounts to about $2.3 million per year" (Personal Communication, January 26, 2014).

Scoring Asheville's Affordable Housing Performance

This study of affordable housing production and assistance in five cities shows that:

- The city of Asheville's affordable housing production and assistance is outperforming annual targets

- The city of Asheville's affordable housing production and assistance is outperforming all four comparison cities: Greenville, SC, Wilmington, NC, Chapel Hill, NC and Durham, NC

- The city of Asheville is using its state and federal grant dollars efficiently

- The city of Asheville's housing trust fund and rebate programs have been very effective at assisting developers to make affordable housing development feasible

- The city of Asheville has the political support as well as institutional/organizational

capacity to tackle the affordable housing challenge

- The local community development corporation, Mountain Housing Opportunities, has efficiently and effectively utilized Housing Trust funds, LIHTCs, HOME funds, NeighborWorks funds, and other funding to produce affordable rental and for sale housing

Future Considerations

It is apparent that much effort has been taken to understand the affordable housing challenges in the city of Asheville and that effective programs, policies and practices have been adopted that have made housing affordable for residents in the city. Even as such, there still remains a large proportion of residents that pay too much of their income on housing. The lack of affordable housing threatens the livability and economic vitality of the city. As local elected officials, city staff, and affordable housing stakeholders consider future directions to address the housing affordability problem, they should consider the following "promising practices"[7]:

- *Permanent affordability*: If Asheville continues to be a desirable city and housing prices continue to increase, the city should consider ways to keep housing permanently affordable. The cities of Chapel Hill and Wilmington both have a community land trust that allows for permanently affordable homeownership.
- *Dedicated funding for affordable housing*: The City should consider ways to raise more funding for affordable housing. Durham's penny property tax increase is one model but there are others that should be explored.
- *Identifying opportunity areas*: The city should identify areas of opportunity for affordable housing development (e.g. vacant land or redevelopment opportunities) while also ensuring that affordable housing is not geographically concentrated in space. The city of Asheville can look at models in other cities, such as Charlotte, NC, that have created thresholds for maximum number of affordable housing units per neighborhood to ensure that low-income housing is not concentrated.
- *Neighborhood Planning:* Affordable housing considerations should be central to all neighborhood planning efforts in the city. The city should consider ways to develop mixed-income neighborhoods to reduce the potential for concentrating poverty.
- *Housing Trust Fund:* Continue to invest in the Housing Trust Fund because it has been an effective tool in increasing the supply of affordable housing.
- *Economic development and Workforce Development:* Diversifying the local economy with higher paying jobs is necessary to address the long-term economic viability of the city. This must be coupled with workforce development in order that residents have the skills to take advantage of these higher paying jobs.
- *Continue and Expand Affordable Housing Coordination with Buncombe County:* The housing affordability problems in the city of Asheville have spillover effects on the county and coordinated efforts between the county and city to address affordable housing can be more effective in meeting the needs of residents at all income levels. Any future plans for affordable housing should be in collaboration with the county.
- *Affordable Housing Network:* The city already has a strong network of affordable

[7] The term "promising practices" is used here instead of "best practices" because these practices might be better suited for some communities than others. Therefore, considering the local context is important before implementing any of these practices.

housing stakeholders (e.g. individuals who were members of the Affordable Housing Task Force) and should continue to engage stakeholders through regular meetings to continue efforts and to facilitate collaborations across different sectors.

Appendix A: Housing Characteristics of Five Cities, American Community Survey 2012 Data

	Asheville, NC		Wilmington, NC		Greenville, SC		Chapel Hill, NC		Durham, NC		North Carolina	
Variables	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
HOUSING OCCUPANCY												
Total housing units	41,691	41,691	53,318	53,318	29,097	29,097	22,228	22,228	104,554	104,554	4,375,400	4375400
Occupied housing units	37,538	90.00%	46,228	86.70%	25,096	86.20%	20,225	91.00%	94,644	90.50%	3,731,325	85.30%
Vacant housing units	4,153	10.00%	7,090	13.30%	4,001	13.80%	2,003	9.00%	9,910	9.50%	644,075	14.70%
Homeowner vacancy rate	2.3	(X)	4.1	(X)	4.2	(X)	1.1	(X)	2.7	(X)	2.4	(X)
Rental vacancy rate	6.2	(X)	8	(X)	10	(X)	10.2	(X)	8.2	(X)	8	(X)
UNITS IN STRUCTURE												
Total housing units	41,691	41,691	53,318	53,318	29,097	29,097	22,228	22,228	104,554	104,554	4,375,400	4375400
1-unit, detached	22,836	54.80%	28,349	53.20%	14,267	49.00%	9,714	43.70%	55,619	53.20%	2,862,306	65.40%
1-unit, attached	2,605	6.20%	5,068	9.50%	1,344	4.60%	2,048	9.20%	7,324	7.00%	164,581	3.80%
2 units	1,871	4.50%	2,108	4.00%	1,341	4.60%	1,156	5.20%	4,168	4.00%	90,527	2.10%
3 or 4 units	2,434	5.80%	2,907	5.50%	2,024	7.00%	1,310	5.90%	4,907	4.70%	120,371	2.80%
5 to 9 units	4,024	9.70%	4,565	8.60%	2,332	8.00%	2,168	9.80%	8,457	8.10%	191,643	4.40%
10 to 19 units	2,139	5.10%	5,446	10.20%	3,136	10.80%	2,942	13.20%	12,976	12.40%	179,660	4.10%
20 or more units	4,175	10.00%	3,386	6.40%	4,231	14.50%	2,753	12.40%	10,189	9.70%	173,071	4.00%
Mobile home	1,547	3.70%	1,489	2.80%	410	1.40%	137	0.60%	914	0.90%	592,216	13.50%
Boat, RV, van, etc.	60	0.10%	0	0.00%	12	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1,025	0.00%
YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT												
Total housing units	41,691	41,691	53,318	53,318	29,097	29,097	22,228	22,228	104,554	104,554	4,375,400	4375400
Built 2010 or later	217	0.50%	163	0.30%	87	0.30%	77	0.30%	701	0.70%	59,497	1.40%
Built 2000 to 2009	6,077	14.60%	8,172	15.30%	4,272	14.70%	3,988	17.90%	22,992	22.00%	894,573	20.40%
Built 1990 to 1999	4,993	12.00%	12,209	22.90%	3,622	12.40%	3,980	17.90%	20,563	19.70%	892,737	20.40%
Built 1980 to 1989	5,199	12.50%	8,557	16.00%	3,561	12.20%	4,446	20.00%	18,258	17.50%	705,617	16.10%
Built 1970 to 1979	4,433	10.60%	5,736	10.80%	3,807	13.10%	3,104	14.00%	12,344	11.80%	632,269	14.50%
Built 1960 to 1969	5,014	12.00%	5,297	9.90%	3,353	11.50%	3,230	14.50%	11,248	10.80%	430,259	9.80%
Built 1950 to 1959	4,535	10.90%	3,971	7.40%	4,787	16.50%	1,663	7.50%	7,161	6.80%	336,495	7.70%
Built 1940 to 1949	2,762	6.60%	3,920	7.40%	2,733	9.40%	840	3.80%	4,547	4.30%	170,776	3.90%
Built 1939 or earlier	8,461	20.30%	5,293	9.90%	2,875	9.90%	900	4.00%	6,740	6.40%	253,177	5.80%
ROOMS												
Total housing units	41,691	41,691	53,318	53,318	29,097	29,097	22,228	22,228	104,554	104,554	4,375,400	4375400
1 room	788	1.90%	1,125	2.10%	452	1.60%	202	0.90%	1,852	1.80%	48,504	1.10%
2 rooms	1,837	4.40%	3,551	6.70%	1,047	3.60%	661	3.00%	2,431	2.30%	70,145	1.60%
3 rooms	3,886	9.30%	7,519	14.10%	3,697	12.70%	3,085	13.90%	12,508	12.00%	296,557	6.80%
4 rooms	9,304	22.30%	10,844	20.30%	6,375	21.90%	4,882	22.00%	21,165	20.20%	779,463	17.80%
5 rooms	9,030	21.70%	9,932	18.60%	5,721	19.70%	3,218	14.50%	22,470	21.50%	1,041,523	23.80%
6 rooms	7,141	17.10%	6,955	13.00%	4,739	16.30%	2,296	10.30%	17,007	16.30%	823,793	18.80%
7 rooms	4,056	9.70%	4,801	9.00%	2,422	8.30%	1,875	8.40%	10,726	10.30%	546,999	12.50%
8 rooms	2,580	6.20%	3,990	7.50%	1,808	6.20%	1,940	8.70%	7,091	6.80%	342,799	7.80%
9 rooms or more	3,069	7.40%	4,601	8.60%	2,836	9.70%	4,069	18.30%	9,304	8.90%	425,617	9.70%
Median rooms	5.1	(X)	4.9	(X)	5	(X)	5.2	(X)	5.1	(X)	5.5	(X)
BEDROOMS												
Total housing units	41,691	41,691	53,318	53,318	29,097	29,097	22,228	22,228	104,554	104,554	4,375,400	4375400
No bedroom	902	2.20%	1,190	2.20%	513	1.80%	218	1.00%	1,976	1.90%	52,340	1.20%
1 bedroom	5,935	14.20%	6,068	11.40%	4,790	16.50%	3,485	15.70%	15,474	14.80%	288,152	6.60%
2 bedrooms	14,897	35.70%	17,770	33.30%	10,830	37.20%	7,301	32.80%	31,457	30.10%	1,172,357	26.80%
3 bedrooms	14,851	35.60%	20,308	38.10%	9,271	31.90%	5,225	23.50%	39,277	37.60%	2,074,707	47.40%
4 bedrooms	3,983	9.60%	6,539	12.30%	2,918	10.00%	4,146	18.70%	13,329	12.70%	631,738	14.40%
5 or more bedrooms	1,123	2.70%	1,443	2.70%	775	2.70%	1,853	8.30%	3,041	2.90%	156,106	3.60%
HOUSING TENURE												
Occupied housing units	37,538	37,538	46,228	46,228	25,096	25,096	20,225	20,225	94,644	94,644	3,731,325	3731325
Owner-occupied	19,705	52.50%	21,987	47.60%	11,455	45.60%	10,049	49.70%	47,919	50.60%	2,441,626	65.40%
Renter-occupied	17,833	47.50%	24,241	52.40%	13,641	54.40%	10,176	50.30%	46,725	49.40%	1,289,699	34.60%
Average household size of c	2.26	(X)	2.28	(X)	2.27	(X)	2.55	(X)	2.38	(X)	2.58	(X)
Average household size of r	2	(X)	2.18	(X)	2.09	(X)	2.15	(X)	2.26	(X)	2.48	(X)
YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT												
Occupied housing units	37,538	37,538	46,228	46,228	25,096	25,096	20,225	20,225	94,644	94,644	3,731,325	3731325
Moved in 2010 or later	5,645	15.00%	8,390	18.10%	4,165	16.60%	4,116	20.40%	16,509	17.40%	1,015,024	27.20%
Moved in 2000 to 2009	20,970	55.90%	26,084	56.40%	14,609	58.20%	11,866	58.70%	55,866	59.00%	1,486,933	39.80%
Moved in 1990 to 1999	5,324	14.20%	6,231	13.50%	2,690	10.70%	2,397	11.90%	12,562	13.30%	597,490	16.00%
Moved in 1980 to 1989	2,388	6.40%	2,179	4.70%	1,448	5.80%	983	4.90%	4,805	5.10%	276,410	7.40%
Moved in 1970 to 1979	1,414	3.80%	1,654	3.60%	1,046	4.20%	470	2.30%	2,471	2.60%	189,976	5.10%
Moved in 1969 or earlier	1,797	4.80%	1,690	3.70%	1,138	4.50%	393	1.90%	2,431	2.60%	165,492	4.40%
VEHICLES AVAILABLE												
Occupied housing units	37,538	37,538	46,228	46,228	25,096	25,096	20,225	20,225	94,644	94,644	3,731,325	3731325
No vehicles available	4,053	10.80%	4,414	9.50%	2,718	10.80%	1,971	9.70%	8,966	9.50%	249,415	6.70%
1 vehicle available	15,322	40.80%	18,879	40.80%	11,491	45.80%	7,875	38.90%	37,669	39.80%	1,235,313	33.10%
2 vehicles available	12,788	34.10%	16,586	35.90%	8,426	33.60%	7,386	36.50%	35,476	37.50%	1,433,919	38.40%
3 or more vehicles available	5,375	14.30%	6,349	13.70%	2,461	9.80%	2,993	14.80%	12,533	13.20%	812,678	21.80%

	Asheville, NC		Wilmington, NC		Greenville, SC		Chapel Hill, NC		Durham, NC		North Carolina	
HOUSE HEATING FUEL												
Occupied housing units	37,538	37,538	46,228	46,228	25,096	25,096	20,225	20,225	94,644	94,644	3,731,325	3731325
Utility gas	12,588	33.50%	5,630	12.20%	9,868	39.30%	9,992	49.40%	40,083	42.40%	919,136	24.60%
Bottled, tank, or LP gas	1,380	3.70%	1,075	2.30%	443	1.80%	132	0.70%	1,365	1.40%	288,635	7.70%
Electricity	17,642	47.00%	38,448	83.20%	13,867	55.30%	9,769	48.30%	51,332	54.20%	2,266,804	60.80%
Fuel oil, kerosene, etc.	5,163	13.80%	727	1.60%	691	2.80%	128	0.60%	1,423	1.50%	157,871	4.20%
Coal or coke	0	0.00%	14	0.00%	9	0.00%	21	0.10%	0	0.00%	538	0.00%
Wood	541	1.40%	136	0.30%	136	0.50%	78	0.40%	155	0.20%	80,465	2.20%
Solar energy	41	0.10%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	25	0.10%	23	0.00%	821	0.00%
Other fuel	57	0.20%	101	0.20%	33	0.10%	20	0.10%	54	0.10%	5,897	0.20%
No fuel used	126	0.30%	97	0.20%	49	0.20%	60	0.30%	209	0.20%	11,158	0.30%
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS												
Occupied housing units	37,538	37,538	46,228	46,228	25,096	25,096	20,225	20,225	94,644	94,644	3,731,325	3731325
Lacking complete plumbing	139	0.40%	865	1.90%	84	0.30%	57	0.30%	497	0.50%	10,873	0.30%
Lacking complete kitchen fa	345	0.90%	1,053	2.30%	214	0.90%	166	0.80%	909	1.00%	22,766	0.60%
No telephone service availa	1,072	2.90%	2,036	4.40%	1,074	4.30%	540	2.70%	2,489	2.60%	90,175	2.40%
OCCUPANTS PER ROOM												
Occupied housing units	37,538	37,538	46,228	46,228	25,096	25,096	20,225	20,225	94,644	94,644	3,731,325	3731325
1.00 or less	36,934	98.40%	45,297	98.00%	24,663	98.30%	19,891	98.30%	91,920	97.10%	3,635,737	97.40%
1.01 to 1.50	400	1.10%	483	1.00%	310	1.20%	234	1.20%	1,920	2.00%	71,971	1.90%
1.51 or more	204	0.50%	448	1.00%	123	0.50%	100	0.50%	804	0.80%	23,617	0.60%
VALUE												
Owner-occupied units	19,705	19,705	21,987	21,987	11,455	11,455	10,049	10,049	47,919	47,919	2,441,626	2441626
Less than $50,000	939	4.80%	839	3.80%	468	4.10%	228	2.30%	1,173	2.40%	245,512	10.10%
$50,000 to $99,999	1,417	7.20%	1,295	5.90%	1,732	15.10%	119	1.20%	4,096	8.50%	457,078	18.70%
$100,000 to $149,999	3,798	19.30%	2,891	13.10%	1,895	16.50%	441	4.40%	10,714	22.40%	517,321	21.20%
$150,000 to $199,999	4,069	20.60%	3,997	18.20%	1,602	14.00%	920	9.20%	11,891	24.80%	416,507	17.10%
$200,000 to $299,999	4,826	24.50%	5,915	26.90%	2,185	19.10%	1,694	16.90%	12,127	25.30%	415,749	17.00%
$300,000 to $499,999	3,140	15.90%	3,883	17.70%	1,876	16.40%	3,668	36.50%	6,092	12.70%	269,060	11.00%
$500,000 to $999,999	1,192	6.00%	2,490	11.30%	1,431	12.50%	2,433	24.20%	1,528	3.20%	97,448	4.00%
$1,000,000 or more	324	1.60%	677	3.10%	266	2.30%	546	5.40%	298	0.60%	22,951	0.90%
Median (dollars)	195,500	(X)	230,700	(X)	201,200	(X)	376,100	(X)	179,500	(X)	150,100	(X)
MORTGAGE STATUS												
Owner-occupied units	19,705	19,705	21,987	21,987	11,455	11,455	10,049	10,049	47,919	47,919	2,441,626	2441626
Housing units with a mortga	12,845	65.20%	15,227	69.30%	7,987	69.70%	7,147	71.10%	38,813	81.00%	1,611,485	66.00%
Housing units without a mo	6,860	34.80%	6,760	30.70%	3,468	30.30%	2,902	28.90%	9,106	19.00%	830,141	34.00%
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS (SMOC)												
Housing units with a mortg	12,845	12,845	15,227	15,227	7,987	7,987	7,147	7,147	38,813	38,813	1,611,485	1611485
Less than $300	10	0.10%	66	0.40%	0	0.00%	10	0.10%	40	0.10%	3,850	0.20%
$300 to $499	328	2.60%	250	1.60%	221	2.80%	13	0.20%	368	0.90%	44,292	2.70%
$500 to $699	526	4.10%	584	3.80%	589	7.40%	102	1.40%	1,241	3.20%	130,653	8.10%
$700 to $999	2,794	21.80%	1,925	12.60%	1,471	18.40%	318	4.40%	5,107	13.20%	369,517	22.90%
$1,000 to $1,499	4,382	34.10%	4,267	28.00%	2,256	28.20%	1,275	17.80%	14,392	37.10%	553,003	34.30%
$1,500 to $1,999	2,390	18.60%	3,196	21.00%	1,245	15.60%	1,263	17.70%	10,209	26.30%	273,526	17.00%
$2,000 or more	2,415	18.80%	4,939	32.40%	2,205	27.60%	4,166	58.30%	7,456	19.20%	236,644	14.70%
Median (dollars)	1,305	(X)	1,575	(X)	1,387	(X)	2,242	(X)	1,441	(X)	1,209	(X)
Housing units without a m	6,860	6,860	6,760	6,760	3,468	3,468	2,902	2,902	9,106	9,106	830,141	830141
Less than $100	110	1.60%	25	0.40%	49	1.40%	22	0.80%	63	0.70%	10,245	1.20%
$100 to $199	179	2.60%	230	3.40%	216	6.20%	44	1.50%	191	2.10%	88,454	10.70%
$200 to $299	828	12.10%	454	6.70%	744	21.50%	86	3.00%	1,216	13.40%	207,880	25.00%
$300 to $399	1,637	23.90%	1,140	16.90%	848	24.50%	161	5.50%	1,856	20.40%	203,453	24.50%
$400 or more	4,106	59.90%	4,911	72.60%	1,611	46.50%	2,589	89.20%	5,780	63.50%	320,109	38.60%
Median (dollars)	447	(X)	520	(X)	387	(X)	724	(X)	457	(X)	351	(X)
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (SMOCAPI)												
Housing units with a mortg	12,735	12,735	15,167	15,167	7,916	7,916	7,116	7,116	38,692	38,692	1,601,475	1601475
Less than 20.0 percent	4,450	34.90%	4,539	29.90%	3,370	42.60%	2,893	40.70%	15,627	40.40%	679,967	42.50%
20.0 to 24.9 percent	2,131	16.70%	2,524	16.60%	1,445	18.30%	1,330	18.70%	6,919	17.90%	258,172	16.10%
25.0 to 29.9 percent	1,415	11.10%	1,987	13.10%	807	10.20%	980	13.80%	4,360	11.30%	174,093	10.90%
30.0 to 34.9 percent	1,241	9.70%	1,423	9.40%	540	6.80%	570	8.00%	3,237	8.40%	117,406	7.30%
35.0 percent or more	3,498	27.50%	4,694	30.90%	1,754	22.20%	1,343	18.90%	8,549	22.10%	371,837	23.20%
Housing unit without a mo	6,810	6,810	6,734	6,734	3,415	3,415	2,877	2,877	9,030	9,030	818,431	818431
Less than 10.0 percent	2,380	34.90%	2,409	35.80%	1,505	44.10%	1,676	58.30%	3,858	42.70%	352,823	43.10%
10.0 to 14.9 percent	1,503	22.10%	1,375	20.40%	695	20.40%	407	14.10%	1,992	22.10%	164,320	20.10%
15.0 to 19.9 percent	909	13.30%	865	12.80%	427	12.50%	169	5.90%	1,165	12.90%	97,425	11.90%
20.0 to 24.9 percent	561	8.20%	671	10.00%	261	7.60%	138	4.80%	672	7.40%	59,144	7.20%
25.0 to 29.9 percent	437	6.40%	288	4.30%	188	5.50%	62	2.20%	409	4.50%	36,984	4.50%
30.0 to 34.9 percent	235	3.50%	247	3.70%	80	2.30%	82	2.90%	167	1.80%	25,282	3.10%
35.0 percent or more	785	11.50%	879	13.10%	259	7.60%	343	11.90%	767	8.50%	82,453	10.10%
GROSS RENT												
Occupied units paying rent	17,117	17,117	23,474	23,474	13,087	13,087	9,866	9,866	45,610	45,610	1,194,189	1194189
Less than $200	812	4.70%	574	2.40%	482	3.70%	103	1.00%	1,154	2.50%	24,877	2.10%
$200 to $299	1,030	6.00%	845	3.60%	527	4.00%	186	1.90%	1,180	2.60%	37,939	3.20%
$300 to $499	1,126	6.60%	1,380	5.90%	1,312	10.00%	289	2.90%	2,212	4.80%	126,053	10.60%
$500 to $749	4,451	26.00%	6,030	25.70%	4,483	34.30%	2,030	20.60%	13,279	29.10%	397,480	33.30%
$750 to $999	4,769	27.90%	6,880	29.30%	4,322	33.00%	3,537	35.90%	14,954	32.80%	329,400	27.60%
$1,000 to $1,499	3,772	22.00%	6,444	27.50%	1,617	12.40%	2,258	22.90%	10,426	22.90%	223,732	18.70%
$1,500 or more	1,157	6.80%	1,321	5.60%	344	2.60%	1,463	14.80%	2,405	5.30%	54,708	4.60%
Median (dollars)	811	(X)	844	(X)	736	(X)	889	(X)	833	(X)	756	(X)
No rent paid	716	(X)	767	(X)	554	(X)	310	(X)	1,115	(X)	95,510	(X)
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (GRAPI)												
Occupied units paying rent	16,670	16,670	22,826	22,826	12,687	12,687	9,464	9,464	44,591	44,591	1,164,743	1164743
Less than 15.0 percent	1,844	11.10%	1,936	8.50%	1,901	15.00%	1,040	11.00%	5,456	12.20%	147,920	12.70%
15.0 to 19.9 percent	2,148	12.90%	2,325	10.20%	1,780	14.00%	992	10.50%	5,342	12.00%	156,586	13.40%
20.0 to 24.9 percent	2,298	13.80%	2,917	12.80%	1,494	11.80%	1,091	11.50%	5,335	12.00%	151,532	13.00%
25.0 to 29.9 percent	2,556	15.30%	2,581	11.30%	1,429	11.30%	904	9.60%	5,360	12.00%	130,290	11.20%
30.0 to 34.9 percent	1,480	8.90%	2,192	9.60%	1,247	9.80%	536	5.70%	4,441	10.00%	102,238	8.80%
35.0 percent or more	6,344	38.10%	10,875	47.60%	4,836	38.10%	4,901	51.80%	18,657	41.80%	476,177	40.90%

Appendix B: List of 17 Community Land Trusts

Albuquerque, New Mexico. Sawmill Community Land Trust: http://www.sawmillclt.org

Bellingham, Washington. Kulshan Community Land Trust: http://www.kclt.org

Berkeley, California. Northern California Land Trust: http://www.nclt.org

Burlington, Vermont. Champlain Housing Trust: http://www.champlainhousingtrust.org

Chicago, Illinois. Chicago Community Land Trust: http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/dcd/supp_info/chicago_communitylandtrust0.html

Cleveland, Ohio. Cuyahoga Land Bank: http://www.cuyahogalandbank.org

Concord, New Hampshire. Concord Area Trust for Community Housing: http://www.catchhousing.org

Durham, North Carolina. Durham Community Land Trustees: http://www.dclt.org

Deming, Washington. Evergreen Land Trust: http://www.evergreenlandtrust.org

Eastsound, Washington. OPAL Community Land Trust: http://opalclt.org

Flint, Michigan. Genesee County Land Bank Authority: http://www.thelandbank.org

Irvine, California. Irvine Community Land Trust: http://www.irvineclt.org

Marathon, Florida. Middle Keys Community Land Trust: http://www.mkclt.org

Oakland, California. Oakland Community Land Trust: http://www.oakclt.org

Rochester, Minnesota. First Homes: http://www.firsthomes.org

Roxbury, Massachusetts. Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative: http://www.dsni.org

Washington, D.C. City First Enterprises: http://www.cfenterprises.org