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As a result of the June 2015 Arlington County Board meeting, Housing Division staff was directed to gather further feedback from the community on certain areas of the Affordable Housing Master Plan (“Master Plan”) and Implementation Framework (“IF”).

Between July 25 and August 1, Arlington County offered residents an opportunity to provide feedback on issues within the Affordable Housing Master Plan such as the criteria that dictates where to locate affordable housing and the proposed forecast for the geographic distribution of affordable housing within the County. Staff hosted three in-person Open Houses (Saturday, July 25, Monday, July 27 and Tuesday, July 28) and an online Virtual Forum (open Saturday July 25 through Saturday, August 1).

Staff presented a series of poster boards to provide background on the Affordable Housing Master Plan including why affordable housing is important to Arlington County, specific goals within the Master Plan, more detailed information about previous goals and targets, and proposed forecasts for geographic distribution of affordable housing. The boards were created as a visual aide to assist residents in providing feedback on two specific survey questions, which were answered via a Likert Scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).

In total, 192 survey responses were collected, which included 26 responses from the in-person Open Houses and 166 responses via the online Virtual Forum.

Support for Policies that Impact Location

The first question asked whether the participants agreed with stated Master Plan policies to determine where affordable housing should be located in the future. These policies include:

- a. Make every reasonable effort to prevent the loss of market-rate affordable rental housing (MARKs)
- b. Produce committed affordable rental units (CAFs) within transit corridors consistent with the County’s adopted land use plans and policies
- c. Integrate affordable housing goals and policies into County sector plans, economic development strategies, Master Transportation Plan and other County planning efforts.

About 63 percent of respondents (121 total responses) selected Strongly Agree or Agree when asked whether they agreed with the aforementioned policies. To contrast, about 33 percent (64 total responses) selected Disagree or Strongly Disagree.
Support for Forecast of Future Distribution of Affordable Housing

The second question asked respondents whether they agreed with the County’s forecast for the future distribution of affordable housing, which is represented on the below map.

A total Of the 192 survey responses, a total of 117 respondents (61 percent) selected Strongly Agree or Agree when asked whether they thought the proposed distribution was reasonable. A total of 65 respondents (34 percent) said they either Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed with the proposal.

Respondents were asked to explain why they selected “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree”. The most common reasons that respondents disagreed with the County’s proposed distribution goals were:

**Schools:**

“More effort needs to be made to tie distribution [of affordable housing] to the school districts [within] the County”

“Location [of affordable housing]...should be correlated to school capacity and availability of other services”

“I’d like to see the County limit growth in South Arlington until the problems of school overcrowding can be solved”
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“By failing to...analyze school performance as it relates to the distribution of affordable housing, the draft [AHMP] misses the mark.”

Geographic Distribution:

“R-B corridors and Jefferson Davis corridors have Metro, and should have higher proportional shares [of affordable housing] than Columbia Pike, which only has buses.”

“The proposed distribution is] missing the Glebe Road corridor and Lee Highway / [East Falls Church] is far below where it should be.”

“There seems to be more opportunity for development along Lee Highway and opportunity to repurpose space in Crystal City and the Jefferson Davis corridor.”

Cost to County

“The absolute numbers appear to be drawn from a hat without regard for the costs to the County.”

“I am deeply disappointed that the Housing Study ignores issues of cost, which are considerable, both in terms of direct financial impact and on impact of other county services.”

Overall, the majority of respondents (56 percent) responded that they either strongly agreed or agreed that the Affordable Housing Master Plan’s stated policies for achieving geographic distribution were appropriate and that the proposed forecast for how affordable housing will be distributed was reasonable.

“Arlington’s affordable housing is why so many of us call Arlington home: [it] is because affordable housing paved the way for our families to live, learn, and continue to grow in its rich diversity.”

“Strongly agree [that] we need to be especially committed to affordable housing along transit corridors.”

“I think the pie chart [depicting forecasted distribution in] 2040 looks terrific...[but I would like to see] concrete plans about how the County plans to achieve this distribution.”

“I am happy to see that, in the long term (2040), there are plans [for affordable housing to be located in] North Arlington, [and that affordable housing will be expanded] in many parts of the County.”

“It makes sense to] preserve the units we currently have. As we create new CAFs, [the County should] increase the term of affordability beyond 60 years.”

“Affordable housing is part of the fabric that makes Arlington what it is.”

“The proposed forecast [looks balanced to me].”
I think this looks like a fair plan to spread affordable housing across Arlington and within corridors where there is access to transit and the costs are not prohibited.

While I think the goal of distributing affordable housing throughout Arlington is ideal, transportation options, current single family zoning and other factors mean that some areas make more sense in the planning process than others. As we continue to plan, I would like to see options such as two family housing and ‘tiny houses’ in some of the North Arlington neighborhoods where more density might not make sense.

It makes sense to place affordable housing in transit corridors, but it also makes sense to create transit opportunities everywhere, thus making the entire County more connected and allowing for people to live [everywhere].

I really value the diversity of our schools and the community, and think it’s great that we pride ourselves on providing a vibrant, equal opportunity community for everyone.

Affordable housing, both rental and owned, is crucial if Arlington wants to stay a vibrant community.

This is an important plan for maintaining our County’s diversity and continuing to welcome long-term rental households who are being stressed by rising real estate costs.

The AHMP is a good plan to address the serious loss of affordable units. It is an opportunity to take charge of the direction we want the county to move to take care of all of its citizens, to do our part in reducing the ever growing income gaps, to maintain our inclusive, diverse population. It’s a plan to be proud of.

About the Data
Surveys were collected both at in-person Open House events as well as via the online Virtual Forum, which was distributed using the online survey platform known as SurveyMonkey. Nearly 70 participants attended the Open House events, yet less than half of these participants chose to fill out the survey. Thus, the County received a greater number of surveys collected electronically versus those collected in-person at the Open House sessions, 166 responses as opposed to 26 responses respectively.

The online survey could not be restricted to Arlington residents given the constraints of the online platform that was used. Thus, it is difficult to determine whether all responses were submitted by Arlington residents. In addition, it is hard to determine whether there were any duplicate survey responses from respondents who participated in the online survey more than once or from respondents who participated in the survey at both the in-person Open House and via the online survey.

Finally, this summary provides quotes from comments received. Quotes may be edited slightly to correct spelling or insert words in brackets for clarity. Opinions expressed in the forum or summarized in this document do not reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected official.
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Comments

Question 1) Do you agree with the following policies relating to the geographic distribution of affordable housing?

a) Make every reasonable effort to prevent the loss of market-rate affordable rental housing (MARKs)

b) Produce committed affordable rental units (CAFs) within transit corridors consistent with the County’s adopted land use plans and policies

c) Integrate affordable housing goals and policies into County sector plans, economic development strategies, Master Transportation Plan and other County planning efforts.

The following comments were submitted in response to Question 1:

This is not an equitable distribution of AH. Why is everything north of Lee Highway exempt from Affordable Housing? Why is the southern part of the county carrying the weight of AH? To include, most importantly, the children at APS.

County Board needs to put pressure on APS to provide data requested about neighborhood students. 1) Percent covered by free and / or reduced meals and 2) Academic achievement comparing neighborhood results.

Why are you not considering more micro-units? Also, is there any place for time homes in an urban village? I am thinking long-term, not failed tiny homes.

Consider the individuals receiving social security, and other low-income people. Take a census on the amount of homeless in your area and also their incomes, and make their housing affordable so that all will have housing.

The three policies listed above are neither here nor there and don't tell the amount of housing/level of expenditure /effect on schools and don't tell the geographic distribution.

If you only economize and do not take into account disparate impact by creating pockets of poverty by concentrating all the housing in one area, you create an undo burden on the people who re in that housing to overcome the effects of concentrated poverty.

The plan needs specifics on how to require distribution

I agree with the concept of the plan but I am not sure it is practical. The plan is swimming against a strong economic current.

Glad to see focus on transit corridors instead of "old" larger neighborhood service areas.

I agree with some and not with others. I feel geographic distribution is of utmost importance and of greater social value than "no net loss"

As a member of CARD, I do not agree that distribution is not a primary goal of Affordable Housing Master Plan. If Arlington sets as a priority inclusion & diversity it needs to make every effort to not just claim the jurisdiction as a whole is diverse but that children are educated in a diverse environment. That if you live in Arlington, you accept a lit soccer field as a part of the norm, that you don't just want your nannies and maids close by but their kids playing with your kids. While I agree that there is a tremendous loss in CAFs -- more energy needs to be expended on finding ways to provide authentically diverse solutions, rather than completely abandoning the diversity component of the Master Plan. A principal co-chair has made an extraordinary effort in righting this, Katherine Scruggs, with the inclusion of the language of geographic distribution into the Civic Federation resolution. The Supreme Court has had its say this summer as well. The Housing and Urban Development Department of the Federal government has made this a priority. This is an opportunity to remind the County of who it is, in my opinion. I feel like more work needs to be done on the Master Plan if it is a document we can all be proud of.
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Comments

Area 22202 has major transportation - from Rt 1, 66 and 395 - we are an island which has been so overbuilt for infrastructure proposed construction will not be achieved in my lifetime -- slow down

How can Columbia Pike be considered a transit corridor to be desirable for increased CAF? The approved transit plan that was created over 10-15 years was scrapped last year. Now there is NO transit plan currently. However it is the current target for a majority of affordable housing. I also would like to know why there is almost no existing or planned housing north of I-66. Also what are the affects or plans for how schools are affected with the added high risk students and their concentration.

Purple patches show much of what is already built -- not clearly splitting out built vs. possibilities in future. You are also skewing the math/statistics by showing 2010 for 60% MARKs in other slide not shown here vs. 80% in 2014. Filmore in Penrose becoming less affordable for ppl. Work on mixed housing, not only creating pockets of buildings where kids are tagged as below income. Maps skewed to RENTALs. Where are the ownership options, like what Fairlington was for many young people during and after war and then later families?

http://www.academia.edu/8352751/The_Homeownership_Gap_How_the_Post-World_War_II_GI_Bill_Shaped_Modern_Day_Homeownership_Patterns_for_Black_and_White_Americans

Large hole for the Lee-Highway corridor. South Arlington neighborhoods worked hard on the Neighborhoods Plan. Rest of county needs to step up.

There's a fundamental difference between market affordable and CAF. If an area is becoming a better place to live (i.e. the rent increases) the area should be allowed to improve without tying it to the land use decisions of the past. From the point of view of the county government, there's a huge difference between telling a citizen that the apartment next door is the market's best use of the land and telling them that the county wants it to be there (CAF). I would not prioritize preserving existing concentrations of affordable housing over distributing it. I would try to get the proportion shown in the pie chart before I would preserve concentrations of affordable housing on west pike.

None of it shows how it is directly tied to school population projections. This needs to be at least as important as transportation access. Also, differences of more than 5 percent or so in the different areas are unacceptable for in meeting the goal of equal distribution across the county.

(1) Affordable house insufficiently distributed, especially in light of transportation goals. Heavy focus on Columbia Pike affordable housing, but no long-term mass transit plan in sight for Columbia Pike corridor. (2) Heavy focus on installing and preserving affordable housing in developing neighborhoods along Columbia Pike will stall other development in those areas. Affordable housing opportunities should be more generally distributed and planned in established neighborhoods. (3) "Integrate affordable housing goals and policies into [other County planning efforts]." This needs to be DONE before we discuss affordable housing ANYWHERE. What is the mechanism for coordinating AF and transit, schools, economic planning? What are the shared goals, and what sacrifices can each policy make to accommodate success in critical facets of other plans? This last bullet point suggests that such coordinated planning can be done on the fly. It cannot.

CAFS need to be located near strong public transportation services. More resources need to be allocated to schools that have higher numbers of low income or immigrant children to help them overcome learning or language deficits. School service planning should be coordinated with housing development planning. County Board should allocate additional school funding whenever a new CAF is built or a MARK is preserved.

The plan as drawn over distributes affordable housing to the South of Route 50 portion of the county perpetuating the historic economic and minority segregation of Arlington. A reasonable proxy for this is the elementary and high school distribution of Free and Reduced lunch. If we are all Arlington, policies need to rebalance and restore, not solidify the uneven distribution of resources.
You have it backwards: to the extent that portions of the County (such as Lee Highway) do not have sufficient transit access to support affordable housing, the solution isn't to concentrate the housing in the rest of the County. The solution is to invest in high-frequency transit in new corridors. Increasing the number of *corridors* in which affordable housing is prioritized is the only way to have fairer distribution of affordable housing throughout the County. I support the remaining map, if and only if North Arlington also has a true, comparable affordable housing corridor (other than along the Orange Line).

I oppose these goals as distorted/incomplete, because they continue to segregate Northern and Western parts of the County from income diversity. Furthermore, *producing* CAFs (as opposed to merely converting MARKs to CAFs in the metro corridors) will wastefully construct them in the most expensive manner. Instead, we should have a housing policy that emphasizes inclusion of all neighborhoods in the solution, including those with cheaper land and little existing affordable housing of any type, rather than cramming in more where we already have it.

The residents of Arlington need to know that they can reside here if they were aware that there was more available affordable housing, not just the limited amount sat aside. By the way who decides what is affordable?

Another 1500 CAFS on the Pike, that is CRAZY. You have way too many CAFs targeted for Columbia Pike in this plan, particularly on the western edge. The area has become very poor and the poorer kids are not doing well in the local schools, just look at the SOL scores. There is a lot of street crime there. This plan gives LIP SERVICE to geographic distribution just like the old plan did. This is no change from the status quo. I absolutely do not support this - you are using housing policy to further segregate Arlington - Didn't the supreme court just say that is ILLEGAL? Halt any future CAFs (and preservations for that matter) for the western edge of the Pike. Put some teeth into this by rezoning other areas of Arlington, particularly the northern part along Lee Highway. I am on Lee Highway all the time and there are a lot of places to build new units. Give the developers better incentives to build affordable housing along real transit corridors where there is a metro or none at all, not the clogged Pike that people want to avoid because it is a parking lot.

The current policies allow for the continuation of focusing on Columbia Pike as the center of affordable housing. This is being done in a vacuum without thinking about the effects on other county services (e.g. Transportation, education). It is also not in the best interest of proving the most opportunities we can for children to break the cycle of poverty. We need to move more affordable housing to the biggest public transit corridors (metro rail) and areas with bus service and metro rail and not all that much affordable housing. We must maintain socioeconomic diversity across geographic lines if we want our children to succeed and to foster a diverse and inclusive society.

I believe that at this point more information needs to be sought on the impact of these decisions on the community. I support the idea that the concerns identified in the letter to the Editor of the Arlington Sun Gazette by Suzanne Smith Sundburg need to be addressed BEFORE any final decisions are made.

There is too much concentration on the western end of Columbia Pike. The schools are stressed and this will only make it worse.

Preservation only serves the bottom line of developers because it is cheaper to renovate than to build new. It works against a he goal of economic integration by keeping the poor folks in poor neighborhoods where they already live. Better to build new and spread it around. The transit corridors don't matter. The county can run an ART bus anywhere.

Time to approve the master plan

Enough already! Time to approve and move in.

Affordable housing is equal opportunity to life liberty and pursuit of happiness for ALL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Distribution Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important that we remain a community that welcomes - and enables - people of all income groups to reside in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do. I believe changes in residential single family neighborhoods should be a consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that geographical distribution should be a goal of the plan, but the policies above continue to support previous actions within the County--preserving and locating new units in one primary area, the Columbia Pike transit corridor. More must be done to locate affordable housing north of I-66 and in the Lee Highway corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If affordable housing is such a worthy goal, it should be distributed throughout the county. Instead I see it disproportionately focused along Columbia Pike. It appears there is still much potential along the Rosslyn-Ballston and Lee Hwy corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe more need to be added near (but not directly on) Lee Highway. Lee Hwy. has excellent bus service to metros and other parts of the county with lots of jobs. BUT Lee highway is very commercial, so 1,2,3 blocks off of it are much more appropriate, safe and pleasant for living, families with children, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can no longer afford to own or rent in Arlington. After 30 years, a divorce caused the sale of our beloved home. The cost of rent, increasing yearly while income remains stagnant made it impossible to rent. I purchased a condo on the border of Arlington and Falls Church (S. Manchester St) for 1/4 of Arlington costs. I miss my Columbia Pike experience. My child went to Drew, TJ, W&amp;L, the UVA. STUNNING EDUCATION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that affordable housing should not be limited to transit corridors, but should be more evenly distributed through all areas of the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must make affordable housing available to those who need it where they live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that north Arlington should step up and start providing affordable housing. Why is the south part of the county the only one to meet demands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no accountability as to increased pressure on schools, there is no analysis as to cost per new affordable unit in terms of taxation, there is no consideration of new HUD rules, e.g., Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, and the impact this will have on the community as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no assessment strategy here - it assumes that the going-in locations of CAFs and MARKs is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington should also produce committed affordable units in other areas with good bus transportation; in particular, ZIP codes 22202, 22205, 22206, 22207, and 22213.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullets 1 and 2 are fine, but 3 is awful. The purple sections MUST run along Lee Highway, too. It's ridiculous that the county pretends that Lee Highway isn't a &quot;transit corridor.&quot; The reason is simply that the county won't call it that. County board member Walter Tejada says he's &quot;been working for years&quot; trying to get the various community groups along Lee Highway to agree to planning. It's ridiculous the amount of deference given to those people. Push for redev along Lee Highway and get housing there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering along &quot;transit corridors&quot; is not sustainable over the long run. It is not clear what the county means by &quot;transit corridor&quot; but I'm assuming along Metro. If bus lines are included in the definition, then it think it is feasible to move CAFs north of Lee Hwy., that is the equitable thing to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is patently absurd to plan housing policy when the units of analysis are geopolitical boundaries created hundreds of years ago. The appropriate unit of analysis for housing policy and other economic analyses are the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (and related units) created and maintained by the Federal government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Disagree, because there is no provision for Local government employees, teachers or hospital workers. Often times they fall in the salary zone that is above "Low income" but below the threshold needed to live in Arlington. This means that the benefit that attracts so many people to Arlington County (Good schools, access to quality medical care, responsive county government, diversity, etc) are not available to those who provide those very services.

Limiting affordable housing to 60% of the AMIL will not end homelessness, so stop pretending that you're doing something wonderful with this. Broaden your horizons and consider all areas served by Metro, Metrobus, ART, etc. Do not sacrifice open space/green space/parkland for this plan. Keep the parks green. Their only use should be as parks.

The CAFs are primarily near metro lines or on Columbia Pike. Why is Metrobus not considered to be a form of transit? Do you think people making only 60% of the AMI are too stupid to figure out how to use buses? Metrobus runs throughout Arlington County. If affordable housing is the goal of the residents of Arlington County, then the affordable housing should be distributed equally across the county. We do not want housing put on park and recreation lands. We need those open spaces, especially in the densest parts of the county. The plan essentially ends up taking away open space from those parts of the County that can least afford to lose it and makes those parts even denser.

Confining the production of affordable rental units withing "current" transit corridors continues to locate it geographically in areas with infrastructure already stressed by the specific needs of certain affordable housing communities. Why not strengthen and enlarge the transit corridors in other areas of the county to allow for placement in all areas of the county?

These policies fail to take into account the impact of the geographic distribution on the academic achievement and social mobility of low income kids. The policies should be amended to include hard targets for the even distribution of percentages of CAFs. The county used to have these targets. I guess the targets are now gone because the county failed to meet its own goals, and there is a belief that the solution to that is to eliminate the goals? Denial is bad public policy.

We have a housing crisis in Arlington that is critical to solve. The plan is important, but it does not go far enough. I view this as an important beginning to much more comprehensive and ongoing work on this issue.

Upper North Arlington needs to also have a "reasonable" share of this so-called "affordable housing," specifically in the 22207 area. The study and "plans" seem to mostly lean towards the South side, specifically 22204.

I think policymakers have to be realistic. If the majority of affordable housing today exists in South Arlington, then this affordable housing must be preserved. My two elementary school age children attend Campbell Elementary, which is a Title I school. They have only experienced positive benefits from the diversity of great families at the school.

There is room to improve more proportional distribution of AF.

If availability of housing and cost of purchase is such that new projects are not feasible, I do not want to pass up and lose affordable housing in S Arlington. We cannot fall further behind in protecting affording housing.

The second tic (re transit corridors) contradicts the Housing Study"s principle calling for "distribution of affordable housing throughout the county." Affordable housing is currently concentrated in a few areas in Arlington, and emphasis on transportation would result in further concentration. Concentration of lower income students results in poor education outcomes and other problems.

Do not agree with the creation of CAFs.

This is a policy for geographic concentration of affordable housing. Calling it "distribution" is just Orwellian doublespeak.
I support development of committed affordable units close to transportation corridors--it is crucial to build more CAFs along Lee Highway, Orange/Silver lines, Columbia Pike, and Crystal City...

Should not be limited by transit corridors--not all poor people are without cars, and transit can be made to extend deeper into other areas. Why is Arlington Blvd not a transit corridor? Definitely agree AH goals and tools to achieve them must be included in all sector plans, etc. Goals should be more specific as to where within a transit corridor CAFs are added--should be dispersed evenly throughout, not clumped together as the map shows it currently is.

Affordable housing needs to be evenly distributed within the county--the plan is for too much of it in South Arlington. Already 3 South Arlington elementary schools meet the civil rights definition of segregated.

Arlington has lost much of it's affordable housing, resulting in a loss of the diversity we have valued. Everything must be done to stem the loss and to place affordable housing throughout the county near public transportation.

(I first said I agree but offered comments and the form didn't accept that. So it flipped back to the start and I'll try again.) To make these policies work, we need to (a) expand transit services north of Washington Blvd. and west of Glebe Road to make more small-scale multi-family buildings more accessible, and (b) be willing to change land-use policies and plans to allow small (up to 4 stories) multi-family units along Lee Hwy and other arterials.

There is a disproportionate amount of "orange" in S. Arlington.

We are at maximum capacity for our schools and have very little room to build more. Until you can come up with a plan to build additional schools in lock-step with new housing, the plan makes no sense.

I think there needs to be a DIRECT tie between these goals and elementary school districts when it comes to the placement of additional CAFS. There should be no additional CAFS placed in districts that have more than double the county average of free and reduced lunch students (currently that average is 30%). Schools like Carlin Springs, Randolph and Barcroft cannot absorb any higher percentages of students in need, and while CAFS do not cause the problems of school poverty, they are contributing to it by adding more families in need to districts that are already overwhelmed by it. You can see that in the student performance at these schools. Housing policy needs to consider how to reduce the poverty in these schools.

There need to be more guidelines to prevent too large a concentration of affordable housing in any given area. The west end of Columbia Pike is almost exclusively affordable housing, and the majority of new CAFs are being placed there because it's an easy answer. This makes the area exclusively low income rather than diverse, which should be the goal.

It is important to preserve communities.

To my understanding, there is no mandated set aside for affordable units in every new housing development. Incentives do not seem to have worked well so it is time for requirements.

columbia pike and ballston are overburdened with affordable housing. so any more needs to go somewhere else

Affordable housing should be more evenly spread across all of Arlington, not concentrated so heavily in South Arlington. Among other things, affordable housing has an adverse effect on the availability of nearby on-street parking since builders do not have to have as much on-site parking if they have affordable housing units, putting more of a burden on our neighborhood streets to accommodate the overflow.

Again, preserving MARKs where they currently exist does NOTHING to address the existing disparity, and does not make Arlington a more inclusive or diverse community. What you have, and what you'll have more of, are a handful of neighborhoods, and neighborhood schools, with disproportionately high
rates of disadvantaged students. And conversely, an increasing number of schools that have none. What kind of citizens will our children become if they are never exposed to people unlike themselves? Just because something has been a certain way for as long as one can remember does not make it right. The County can and should do better, and this Plan could be an important step in the right direction, if it acknowledges this basic fact. If we can't begin to address this, in our 26 square miles, largely populated with individuals who identify as "progressive," what hope is there for anyone?

This form of forced wealth redistribution is not what voters have asked for and have not been given a direct vote on the actual costs that they will have to pay.

To what policy does the question refer. I see no policy that will spread CAF throughout Arlington, and especially north of Lee highway. HUD and recent Supreme Court rulings require an even spread of CAF throughout Arlington County. Otherwise, disadvantaged county residents can be shown to be presumptively impacted in a negative way. No further proof is required. OH, CAF in the first ten blocks north of Rt 50 does not qualify as an even distribution throughout North Arlington. Clearly, too much CAF exists on Columbia Pike..and especially west Columbia Pike and these residents of CAF are being disadvantaged per HUD and Supreme Court. Set goals (oh, that is right, there are already goals in a 2011 plan) and meet them.

The policies above not only address the great and growing need for affordable housing in Arlington County, they also support recognize the importance of affordable housing to our economy.

Arlington County should stop subsidizing housing and let the market run its course. As a taxpayer, I don't like paying my neighbor's rent in addition to my own.

Purple in South Arlington, let's talk Lee Highway.

These goals go unenforced and are therefore meaningless. They are just words. In reality what is happening is a high concentration of affordable housing along the Pike corridor which burdens our schools with overcrowding and a injects a disproportionate percentage of children categorized as receiving "free or reduced" meals. As evidenced by the streetcar derailment earlier this year we also see decade long commitments to capital infrastructure abandoned. It seems like the only thing we can really rely on is to have more affordable housing concentrated in our neighborhoods without the commensurate investments in infrastructure and schools to mitigate the strain. I am ALL for affordable housing, but the Pike has done and continues to do its fare share. It is time to look to neighborhoods north of Wilson Blvd. to locate new, multi-family affordable housing units. I hear there is land across from Marymount University that currently is home to the North Arlington salt dome. Consider allocating a few of the 7 acres for other County goals such as affordable housing.

but believe that more corridors need to be set up in order to disperse useful affordable housing further. This has a chicken and egg quality where existing corridors get overloaded, so this is tied to useful transportation being extended.

While the county's goals are commendable, south arlington is bearing the heaviest burden. If we believe in fair housing within arlington then it should be ALL of arlington. Lee highway should have a much heavier emphasis in order to give the children the opportunity to attend north arlington schools. They deserve that.

The Plan and Implementation Framework do not adequately give county staff the tools to promote a geographic distribution of affordable housing throughout the county.

The proposed policies will keep the CAFs in a few concentrated areas. This is poor public policy. It's impacting people's home values and our schools. There should be no more CAFs on Columbia Pike. 1. distribution of MARKs based on past historical wrong...policy should be to preserve and create MARKs Countywide. 2. Purple in map above is not proper, CAF should be placed strategically in area served by transit and lacking AH first. 3. Increase planning and AHIF use to create CAFs where development is occurring (Change state law to require on site AH).
Affordable housing is too concentrated in Columbia Pike and it isn't fair to lower income families.

Arlington has an affordable housing crisis. We must act now. The AH Study has explored all practicable options. We cannot afford the negative economic consequences of additional study.

Question 2) Based on existing County planning efforts, location of existing market affordable units and access to transit, the County has forecasted where new committed affordable housing could be potentially located (see above map). Do you think that this is a reasonable forecast for the distribution of affordable housing?

The following comments were submitted in response to Question 2:

There appear to be little if any cultural diversity in the north. Southern Arlington continues to be stuck holding the bag when the Board has the ability to make better and smarter changes.

2040 is too far out to allow current students to benefit from better distribution of CAFs across the county.

Please send a copy of the Clarendon Sector Plan for the Urban Village to E Tyna Coles, 2605 N. Tillmore St. Arlington, VA 22207

In terms of the relative proportions that's a fine balance. I'm not at all convinced of the absolute numbers. Disconnected from the cost to the county the numbers look like fiction. A move from mostly MARKs to mostly CAF (other than elderly / disabled) looks like a mistake that hurts our schools.

I believe more effort needs to be made to tie the distribution to all the school districts of the county. But only if there is a commitment to make it happen.

I am guessing that the 11% in Lee Highway-Falls Church will be elderly / aging in place, but would support an apartment type dwelling in my own area to reach the goal.

Good luck, everyone is in favor of affordable housing in someone else's neighborhood, not in their neighborhood.

Geographic Distribution is a must. It is a tool that the county can use to further socioeconomic and racial integration. Housing policy is school policy, and we must use this opportunity to ensure every child's prospect for economic mobility.

Drop the program.

Much more needs to be done to distribute housing throughout the county. Policy can lead the way toward a more diverse county. The loss of MARKs and concentration of AH in the proposed numbers I've seen tells me there is more opportunity for equaling out of opportunity for the people in AH. Concentration such as we have seen in some schools in South Arlington is not providing the mobility that I know Arlington can strive for. There will always be casual labor but do you want to have a drop out rate at schools at all? I would like to see a renewed commitment to diversity reflected in the Goals. I think the mandate is there and I know that this is an opportunity provide the state and larger with a model for how it can be done, yes even in VA.

We have historically been at 9%, now down to 5% so yes, do support slow increase but please put seniors and disabled as a priority.

Missing Glebe corridor. Lee-Highway is far below where it should be. Go further north on Washington Blvd. Looks like only the south of R-B corridor can have buildings. Utilize the spaces near the metro stations for mixed housing.

I have no problem with the relative proportion, and if it were market affordable I would shrug. CAF on a large scale is a bad decision; too many people live in housing directly supported by the county with...
those absolute numbers. Rephrasing, the percentage numbers for 2040 look fine and burden the various segments of the county in a roughly equitable way; the absolute numbers appear to be drawn from a hat without regard for the costs to the county.

The percentage differences between the different areas are way to large. They also need to be directly connected to school population issues.

There would seem to be more opportunity for development along Lee Highway and opportunity to re-purpose space in Crystal City (Jefferson Davis Corridor). Forecast does not seem reasonable and does not seem balanced. Again, heavy focus on Columbia Pike, but transportation there relies on a patchwork of buses that (1) requires Metro to coordinate with the County, and (2) has not, to my knowledge, been similarly forecast with respect to the increased ridership that affordable housing would bring. Likewise, with out advance complementary metro rail forecasting, how could you possibly consider adding that much AH to the RB metro corridor, when it's already a mess during commuting hours?

The distribution in the pie charts looks like it would be reasonable. However, it the definition of the regions maintain the historic biases. In order to have an appropriate balance, a new transportation hub needs to be created, specifically feeding East Falls Church metro drawing from new commercial centers along Yorktown blvd, Williamsburg blvd. If this area were broken out of the "other" category and weighted appropriately then the distribution would help break down the historic economic and racial segregation lines in the county. With out a concerted effort, I don't believe the forecast above will come to pass.

Only by expanding the goals to corridors along potential (rather than existing) high-frequency transit corridors can the County hope to meet existing affordable housing goals. The affordable housing stock along Lee Highway must be massively expanded, with re-zoning and expanded transit service the key tools to do so.

This is a terrible survey question. Asking if we agree on a forecast is asking if we agree on a fact, it's not an opinion. How in the world should survey-takers know, whether or not these forecasts are accurate ("reasonable"). Perhaps you are asking if we think these forecasts are "desirable"? If so, I do not think the depicted outcome is desireable, because it reduces the proportion of income diversity in most neighborhoods ("remainder of the County")

While I am for the distribution of affordable housing throughout the county, I am concerned that the map might represent a loss of current MARKS in Columbia Pike and the rest of the county. I feel preservation is essential. If this is not the case and then I certainly agree with a more balanced distribution throughout the county.

Everyone needs housing. Stop building expensive houses in neighborhoods that the county says is least affluent and build affordable ones.

No, this is unreasonable. The earlier plan set targets but had a huge caveat that affordable housing could be built anywhere there is an opportunity. So, that is exactly what happened and now it is concentrated in the west end of the Pike. This map shows you want to add more, after already exceeding prior targets. The 5k target in the Pike plan was allowed by local citizens because we expecting improvement in transit and economic development. I was not fan of the street car but it was something, and now we have nothing. And, the Shell and Arlington Mill still cannot fill their retail spots so all we are left with are dentists (who were not the preferred kind of tenant) and laundromats, dollar stores, fast food, title loans and calling centers. That is not the economic development we were promised when we approved the 5k numbers for affordable housing on the Pike. Part of the reason we don't have improved economic development is because the people immediately surrounding the retail stores are our poorest citizens with no money to spend. As long as that is the case there will NEVER be economic development along the western pike - stop adding to the problem. Also, how can the county
justifying the same number of affordable housing units as Rosyln Ballston as the Pike - there are two metro lines there! How can the county justify only 2200 units in the Crystal city area - metro is there! We have none of that on the Pike, yet we have to shoulder the same if not more number of people who need public transportation? This is completely lopsided and should not be approved.

We should aim for a much more geographic equivalence in how affordable housing is distributed.

BEFORE a final decision is made, I strongly suggest that the concerns raised about the impact on the community by Suzanne Smith Sundburg in the Letter to the Editor of the Arlington Sun Gazette of July 30, 2015 be explored and addressed.

I think the projections aren't taking into account the current densities of certain areas. Again, Columbia Pike shoulders a heavier burden than other neighborhoods. If you can't keep a more even and equal spread of the affordable housing, you need to come down on the targeted percentages. 22204 shouldn't have been unfairly burdened.

Transit doesn't matter. Run an ART bus. There are pockets of poverty that need to have luxury housing, but the county failed miserably by locating MORE poor people there. This is shameful and wrong and it creates a segregated community. Better to do nothing than to cause harm. I'd like to know the county's plan for integrating those neighborhoods by bringing in rich people.

Enough already! Time to approve and move in.

It's time to continue to move forward together move past racial ethnic and economic prejudices. Arlington's affordable housing is why so many of us whom call Arlington home is because AH paved the way for our families to live learn and continue to grow in its rich diversity

Keep affordable in current density area - do not continue to add density in areas where very little exists today.

I think the 46% is largely undefined in this presentation for distribution. Additionally, the Lee Highway Corridor should have a larger defined area in this depiction. Finally, nothing is done in this distribution to address the N/W corridor of the County.

See comments on previous question.

I like the equal distribution by 2040. Realistic? Doubtful, it'll be too late.

Yes since the experts are doing this.

If there is demand for transportation in other parts of the county, bus service will develop. South Arlington is already unable to handle the current demands on its infrastructure. The original demands were not realistic so adding to the only compounds the problems.

There is no analysis whatsoever as to impact on traffic or increased pressure on individual schools where the greatest percentages increase are identified.

It is focusing additional resources in areas already resource constrained (e.g., Buckingham) where the infrastructure (transportation, roads, schools, parklands) are already stretched thin. Again, there needs to be an assessment of existing infrastructure and the ability of that infrastructure to support this influx of additional residents.

Long-term trends suggest that it will be difficult to get sufficient production of affordable housing in 22202, 22207, and 22213.

"existing County planning efforts," The what? Lee Highway doesn't have a comprehensive plan, so of course the planning cannot see CAFs along that corridor. Get a plan for Lee Highway and suddenly the county will find more space there!

This chart needs more detail. "Rest of the county" seems like a very large segment almost on equal footing with Ballston corridor and Columbia Pike. This is not the case. More CAFs need to be dispersed north of Lee Highway. It is unsupportable to continually pile on CAFs on the metro corridor. CAFs should be more equitably distributed across the county.
It is patently absurd to plan housing policy when the units of analysis are geopolitical boundaries created hundreds of years ago. The appropriate unit of analysis for housing policy and other economic analyses are the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (and related units) created and maintained by the Federal government.

Although we need "low wage" workers in the county. There is no accomodation for medium wage earners (above the 60% AMI), which would provide local workers with the same benefits as those who are fortunate to earn more or earn less. Not to mention the increased tax revenue that would be realized for business and governent.

Find a way to generate "housing opportunities" throughout the county so affordable housing and the corresponding density that will go with it are evenly distributed among ALL residents of Arlington County since this plan will supposedly benefit us all.

Why are areas north of Lee Highway not potential locations for affordable housing in the future? Metrobuses run in these areas.

Again, strengthening transit in areas of the county other than just the metro corridors can lead to consideration of all areas for "aging" populations. Many of them could then potentially remain to the neighborhoods they reside in while receive services there too.

The forecast is not reasonable because you have not provided any serious explanation of the empirical/methodological basis for the forecast. This is not at all a serious presentation of this information. So it is not at all clear to me that the county even has such a basis for the forecast. These look like empty promises intended to sell a plan for distribution that is rife with huge loopholes that are so carefully worded that they strike me as intended to accommodate the wishes of affordable housing developers.

Strongly agree, we need to be especially committed to affordable housing along transit corridors.

Need a more "even" distribution throughout the County, otherwise there will be absolutely NO diversity in the Arlington County Public School (APS) system. It is currently minimal at best in North Arlington and getting dangerously close to being exclusive!!!

Yes, I'm happy to see that in the long term (2040) there are plans to re-populate North Arlington with affordable housing, while at the same time expanding affordable housing in many parts of the county.

As in my previous response, I strongly believe that affordable housing should be equitably distributed throughout the county. Location should be correlated in particular with school capacity and availability of other services. Many of the areas of concentration in this map are among the most densely developed and expensive areas in the county, so cost and impact of increased density are also factors.

Does not take into account other needs for housing in those areas.

Without any information on the underlying basis of the forecast, I cannot assume that the forecast is reasonable.

You can distribute your affordable housing percentage to at least 28 percent in the green area and reduce your grey area which has been over populate from 2000 to 2015.

The future of Lee Highway surely can sustain a much higher proportion of affordable housing. R-B corridor has much more significant transit than any other corridor and therefore can sustain more than CP. J-D corridor's projected housing growth and direct access to METRO entitle it to a share at least equal to CP. How do you justify a higher %age in the I-395 area with no METRO than in JD or Lee Highway? Why don't all of the transit corridors have targets for sections within like CP? 60 years is too long of a commitment.

How can affordable housing be preserved (turning MARKS into CAFs) and have 13% decrease in affordable housing along Columbia Pike?
It is logical, but totally unfair to South Arlington. I'd like to see the county limit growth in South Arlington until the problems of school overcrowding can be solved. The worst SOL scores in the county are in South Arlington. By locating the majority of the affordable housing in South Arlington you create ghettos.

The Lee Highway-East Falls Corridor should continue to share in the distribution at 35%.

The targets for Crystal City/Pentagon City and the Lee Highway corridor are too low. In Crystal City/Pentagon City (which includes areas west of Jeff Davis Hwy), where thousands of new units are planned, developers should either include CAFs in new buildings or commit units in their older buildings in exchange for being allowed to build more. Along Lee Highway, a large number of smaller-scale projects should be ventured, especially around shopping nodes such as Lee/Glebe and Harrison St.

Where is the North Arlington affordable housing? Everything is being placed in the Columbia Pike corridor.

Stop shoving all the affordable housing in my area.

I believe that more should be done to distribute affordable housing evenly in the county. You seem to be using the fact that housing was more affordable in S. Arlington to justify further depressing the property values with more affordable housing than is being planned for N. Arlington.

Questionable transportation along Columbia Pike!

I think that the pie chart for 2040 looks terrific. I am skeptical of whether the forecast is "reasonable" or not. I would like to hear concrete plans about HOW the County plans to achieve this distribution. Because it is my understanding that APAH and the AHC are not really on board with the need for geographic distribution. How will the County incentivize/enforce geographic distribution when the developers/builders want to build as much housing as possible where it is cheapest, i.e., West Pike?

Washington Blvd., Lee Highway, Arlington Blvd. and the western half of Wilson Blvd. have good bus service, yet neither show much planned affordable housing, though Columbia Pike has lots. That's not an equal distribution and puts a disproportionate burden on nearby Columbia Pike residents.

R-B corridors and Jefferson Davis corridors have Metro, and should have higher proportional shares than Columbia Pike, which has buses and more buses. The Pike cannot handle the same density as the other two corridors. And why is SO MUCH AREA shaded along the Pike? Those areas, which are largely SFH neighborhoods, are not part of the sector plan, to my knowledge, and if this area is under consideration for zoning changes to accommodate additional density, you need to make that abundantly clear now. If the Pike can handle 22%, Lee Hwy can handle more than 10%.

This form of forced wealth redistribution is not what voters have asked for and have not been given a direct vote on the actual costs that they will have to pay.

Access to transit is important. But, it can't be the only factor in moving more CAF north of Lee Highway. So, move CAF north of Lee Highway and simultaneous develop additional transit. This distribution provided in the above pie charts will not pass the HUD and Supreme Court tests.

Units are projected across the county.

Arlington County should stop subsidizing housing and let the market run its course. As a tax payer, I don't like paying my neighbor's rent in addition to my own.

Once again, let's talk Lee Highway

No because these targets will not be met. The current goal to create/preserve as much stock as possible necessitates placing affordable housing where it is cheapest, as has already been evidenced by the current concentration of affordable housing south of Wilson Blvd. WE HAVE BEEN MORE THAN
### Geographic Distribution Survey Results

#### Comments

**PATIENT AND HAVE DONE OUR PART! IT IS TIME FOR OTHER NEIGHBORHOODS TO BE PART OF ARLINGTON'S HIGHLY-VALUED DIVERSITY - NOT JUST BENEFIT FROM IT!**

Lee highway corridor should still be higher.

There is a difference between a forecast and an aspirational goal. I strongly question the validity of the projections used to develop this breakdown. It seems to assume that MARKs will still exist in North Arlington and that CAFs can be developed along Lee Highway without a plan for doing so. It is also flawed because it too broadly projects AH stock by neighborhood, i.e. the very high concentration of CAFs on the West End of Columbia Pike vs. other parts of the corridor.

Arlington is a small area and the people who live in CAFs, contrary to popular belief, are cars. There is no reason to focus so heavily on Columbia Pike, especially the West end. Spread them around more.

Concentration of CAFs in relative proportion to area affluence is not considered. CAFs get the most bang for the buck in outcomes in area where they are integrated into a community with more resources.

#### Question 3) Additional Comments

Improved, but still many things missing.

1. Integrate those bubble charts for past vs present vs future. You are mixing 60% and 80% so skewing presentations. Integrate the compressed GLUP. These maps help clarify and quantify when words cannot.

2. Footnote the plan PROPERLY. Plan and Framework list multiple statistics and then leave off who determined those perceptions. Statistics can be skewed depending upon questionnaire, who was actually asked, whether households are typically 1 person, 2 or family.

3. Missing options for homeowners to rent. For example, Arlington has punitive structure for business license over $10k worth of income and lower count of properties than rest of state. Pilot programs to expand definition of household to include 2 single parents with kids, or renting a room to a college student, or allowing flexibility for separating kitchens such as for an aging parent.

4. Plan and Framework completely skewed towards rentals 22k vs. only 2,700 for ownership. Penrose still has artists, non-profit workers, and single parents because they bought in many years ago. They can no longer buy those same properties. See long term impact for rentals vs. ownership via MIT 2008 master's thesis recently highlight on National Public Radio:
   
   http://www.academia.edu/8352751/The_Homeownership_Gap_How_the_Post-World_War_II_GI_Bill_Shaped_Modern_Day_Homeownership_Patterns_for_Black_and_White_Americans  
   
   Add in more ownership support, like Habitat for Humanity, Wounded Warriors, and Building Homes for Heroes. Missing history and impact of Fairlington. Ownership is more difficult per staff comments, but critical to long term diversity and not breaking Arl County budget with subsidies.

5. Parking not just about encouraging low AMI to utilize transit. Study referenced is from Seattle, which has already pushed out many lower income folks completely out of area. Also, study did not cover the Seattle debate on the buses with shifting to more limited hours to support traditional "rush hour". Remember that many 40% AMI work multiple jobs and overnight shifts when public transit is NOT OPERATIONAL.
   
   
   When "empty" space exists, rent out spots to commercial vehicles that are not allowed at many rental properties, such as cabs or work trucks. When county building, build in heavier floor plates and higher roof for strategic ART bus storage.  


Remember that universal design not just about ppl in wheelchairs, but millennials who break their foot.
or leg when riding a bike, or a parent with a stroller, or older person who shuffles from arthritis. Many of zoning and Col Pike Form Based Code (FBC) items shunt accessibility to back or side of building.

7. Green goals and direct support are critical to retain. Incentivize, not just "educate". Habitat for Humanity is great program to follow. They insulate every nook and cranny with future resident volunteer efforts. Long run, residents have lower energy bills and are more comfortable. Look to Germany and other countries for models that are truly world-class.

The effort to distribute affordable housing across the county is a good try, and the proportions look reasonable. Committing the county to pick this many winners and losers (~22,000) directly is unwise. What happens when you put 5000 CAFs on west pike and run out of money/political will to do the rest of the distribution? Citizens other than in CAFs will correctly see the county, and not the market, as the cause of any side effects from the CAF housing. If the county goes down this path it should ensure that growth in CAFs (not market affordable) is constrained in the same proportions from now to 2040.

Tie distribution to schools and make it equitable. This is not done here.

With the loss of 13500 affordable housing units since 2000, it is clear that Arlington County must dedicate a larger portion of its budget to underwrite the cost of building or preserving affordable units, particularly for families with incomes below 30% of AMI who are the most difficult to help. Additional funding is necessary to support the affordable housing master plan and to help create a vibrant community that includes families of all incomes, ethnicities and cultural heritages.

Overall integration as well as affordable housing needs to be the goal. If not, historic real estate barriers will continue a virtual red-lining of the county. As the recent Supreme court ruling up held, the effect of housing policy not just that they are non-discriminatory on their face need to be considered to eliminate historic biases.

Please release much more aggressive goals. The Arlington NIMBYs will fight hard to water down whatever is done here. Re-zone for higher density father away from the relevant "corridor", i.e. 8 blocks from the Orange line, not two. Abolish the zoning policies that allow for tear-down/McMansions, and show leadership to turn more of these lots into low-rise apartments (with no parking minimums). Higher density throughout the County, and better transit along both existing and potential low-income housing corridors are the keys here.

That’s it? Just two questions? With one of them ambiguously written: ("Is this forecast 'reasonable'?"). Are you going to use these two questions to justify any and all policies you assert to achieve these goals? If so, that’s terrible and a sham.

Preserve the units we have. As we create new CAFs, increase the term of affordability beyond 60 years. Get 40 and 50 percent AMI along with 60 percent. Do not increase caps on bonus density and height. When bonus is asked for it should not be granted for cash contributions. Either on site or as close as possible (if there is no residential in the project) should be required. All current residents of affordable units should be allowed to return to new units at their old rents whenever a project takes advantage of any affordable housing bonus.

Know that we all serve the same God and He wants all of His children to have food, clothes and SHELTER!!! So make it happen. Build more affordable houses here in this great county called Arlington!! Thank you!

This is very bad urban planning and policy. And, there are no tools to implement this already misguided plan. I see nothing here that will change the prior policy - which was to build affordable housing where ever and when ever possible on the cheap. Never mind that those kids have to go to the worst performing schools in the county. I grew up in urban poverty in Chicago - do you have any idea how it feels to be failing at school when you are 9 because you have to help raise your little sisters because your parents work 3 jobs? And all your friends are failing too and the teachers are so busy trying to help all your failing friends that in the no one gets help? Do you have any idea what that does to your
self esteem and confidence to thrive in school, get a better education so you don’t end up broke like your parents. Same thing is happening here. The only way I got out of poverty was the military because I had no other opportunities. And turns out I was smart after all. Stop this plan. Everyone needs a home they can afford, but build these CAFs in the better part of town. Those wealthy kids up in Jamestown or where ever can just lean that we don’t bite.

I am a democrat, but I’m very put off about this housing policy. I can't imagine I’m alone. Please start listening to your constituents. I will start to look elsewhere for board representation. There is a lot of grumbling from middle class home owners with school age children. We will consider republicans.

Time to approve the master plan!
This plan is no better than the old plan. Fail again.
Please stay committed to clean, safe, affordable housing for our wonderful, diverse Arlington County.
Time to approve the master plan
Time to approve the master plan!
Time to approve the master plan! It's gone on for too long!
Affordable housing is part of the fabric that makes Arlington what it is. This has been home for my family through generations and hopefully generations to come by way of affordable housing for Me My children My mother Her mother and Hers dated back to 1940's. I stand in support of Affordable Housing throughout Arlington County.

I am concerned that this Study does not adequately address the housing needs of those members of our community below 60% of AMI.
This an excellent plan for improving the distribution of affordable housing in Arlington.

We need to not only consider the number of housing needs but also their impact on our schools, public services and traffic...to name a few. This study MUST be done looking at all areas of impact within our community and I am exceptionally concerned that this issue is being looked at in a very narrow, single issue lens - as this board continues to do. We must also look at housing needs within neighboring jurisdictions - we can't provide affordable housing to anyone BUT Arlington residents.

The draft AHMP loses sight of what should be a goal: the upward economic mobility of those living in affordable housing. By failing to address this as a goal and failing to even analyze school performance as it relates to the distribution of affordable housing, the draft plan misses the mark.

See comments on 1st question.

I live two blocks from Columbia Pike in a very diverse neighborhood. It is my observation that most lower-income families near me have a car. It is my opinion that access to public transportation should be only a secondary consideration when determining the location of affordable housing, and that it should be spread much more evenly throughout all the county, north, south, east and west.

As Arlington grows and becomes more expensive, I feel that low-income residents are going to be pushed out. I raised my children here and do not want to see this county become another upper income enclave.

Enough already! This has been researched, studied, shared, and discussed over and over and over again. It’s time to move forward with approval! It’s time to lead and educate those who are determined to divide Arlington county by spreading ignorance and fear. Racial and economic prejudice-- should have no place in a forward-thinking, inclusive community. Enough! Approve the Affordable Housing Master Plan already!

One of these days the affordable will not be in affodable housing--it will just be housing!

I think I have already expressed my concerns about unfair balance of resources, unrealistic goals of previous plans, and the current inability to deal with outdated infrastructure, and I hope that the current county government can address these issues before setting more untenable goals.
It seems that Arlington is highly motivated to increase affordable units within the community for the sake of increasing units. However, there is no analysis as to impact on traffic, school crowding, or cost for these proposals. Do Board members consider any real world impacts as to these plans or are they just trying to make themselves look good in the eyes of HUD or developers?

I see nowhere in the proposed policies that addresses an assessment of the other neighborhood infrastructure and its relative capacity to handle the proposed influx of students. While I support affordable housing, continuing to put it in the same areas will continue to overtax those infrastructures (e.g., schools, roads). The County must take a more comprehensive approach to infrastructure and capacity issues.

Not sure this survey actually provides any data-driven 'facts' as it seems to rely simply on 'forecasts' and long term predictions. In view of the worsening Federal & State political gridlock (most recent example being just a 3-month extension of Fed. Hwy Transportation Funding SO THAT CONGRESS CAN GET OUT OF TOWN FOR ITS AUGUST VACATION!) ... I doubt any plans for the future can be anything more than wishful thinking.

I strongly support this Housing Study and Plan for the future.... and I hope it will lead to CAFs spread throughout the County.

Ensuring that there is an adequate supply of affordable housing is an important issue for our county. I support geographic distribution along the lines of the policies contained in the draft master plan.

Provision of affordable housing is crucial to the long term success of any county.

In the light of long-term trends, the 17.7% supply goal undermines the credibility of the Affordable Housing Master Plan. Suggest a 9% goal.

The notion that more and more CAFs should be clustered along transit corridors is not supportable in the long term. You are creating ghettos by adhering to this policy. Let's see some CAFs north of Lee Highway.

It is patently absurd to plan housing policy when the units of analysis are geopolitical boundaries created hundreds of years ago. The appropriate unit of analysis for housing policy and other economic analyses are the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (and related units) created and maintained by the Federal government.

Please look at the current county "Starting salaries" for all levels of county workers to determine if there should be any accomodations for them as well. Lets make sure that the employees who provide great service also get a chance to recieve great service.

While I think the goal of distributing affordable housing throughout Arlington is ideal, transportation options, current single family zoning and other factors mean that some areas make more sense in the planning process than others. As we continue to plan, I would like to see options such as two family housing and "tiny houses" in some of the North Arlington single family areas where more density like apartments may not make sense.

Arlington County north of Lee Highway is the least dense part of the County and has the most open space. The County is proposing to take away open green space from the densest part of the County to make those parts even more dense. Will North Arlington become an enclave of wealth and open space while you cram more and more people into Central Arlington? I don't think that will play well in the long run. Also, why is it a "done deal" that we need this housing? If you don't build the housing then they will not come.

We simply need to look at the best way to distribute this housing across the board instead of relying on the "status quo" placement. Of course it makes sense to place AH in the transit corridors, but isn't it a better choice to create transit opportunities everywhere, thus making the entire county more connected and allowing people to live in all parts with little concern over whether they can get around or shop for the things they need. Although all AH doesn't create the same stressors on our...
infrastructure (schools for instance), many do and we need to consider that before we continue placing
more in the same locations.

I think this looks like a fair plan to spread affordable housing across Arlington and within corridors
where there is access to transit and the costs are not prohibited.

As somebody with advanced academic and professional experience in designing surveys, I must say
that this is one of the most poorly designed surveys I have ever seen.

This is critically important in order to ensure the next generation of families can live in Arlington
county. Otherwise, we will completely price out middle class families (teachers, police officers,
firefighters, recent college grads, etc.) and Arlington county will suffer for it.

AMI for the purposes of affordable housing should be determined by Adjust Gross Income (IRS 1040),
rather than allowing it to be determined solely by net income. We also need to incentivize people to
put money into pre-tax savings for retirement. That money should not count for earnings
determinations around affordable housing,

The so-called study should actually speak to some people that this actually currently affects. They are
living through it and can better shed light. Again, more than the South side should be addressed!
There are people in 22207 also in need.

I am an APS teacher. If I hadn't bought in Arlington 15 years ago I never would have been able to
afford housing today. PLEASE keep housing affordable for all!

Preserving and expanding affordable housing is a high priority issue for me as a resident and voter. I
really value the diversity of our schools and community, and think it's great that we pride ourselves on
providing a vibrant, equal opportunity community for everyone.

I am a big supporter of affordable housing, especially for seniors, families, and professionals. Our
diverse community is an asset in Arlington.

I am dismayed by the negative tone in neighbourhoods where affordable units have been successful
and school enrolment is increased as well. Owe cannot return to the all white schools of the past.
Arlington's diversity is not a hindrance nor burden on us.

I am deeply disappointed that the Housing Study ignores issues of cost, which are considerable, both in
terms of direct financial impact and in impact on other county services (schools, parks, public safety,
etc.) as well as the environmental impact of denser development implied by many of the
recommendations. Without a fair attempt to balance costs and benefits, and impacts on other
community concerns, the study is largely meaningless.

The plan presents reasonable goals. However, the affordable housing goals are not ends in themselves.
They need to be integrated and prioritized with other county goals and available revenue. I expect the
County board to do just that.

In the interest of transparency, you should provide absolute numbers addition to percentages.

Stop making Columbia Pike your preferred choice for affordable housing and even out affordable
housing throughout the county.

I think it's important to distribute affordable housing throughout the county. It's also important to
increase the amount of affordable housing currently available.

I want Arlington to continue to be an economically diverse county--

This plan fails to consider impacts on other matters of concern such as economic sustainability/vitality
of individual neighborhoods, poverty rates and performance of corresponding schools, types of CAFs
that would be most appropriate in a given area in light of that area's unique circumstances, etc. What
makes any of it enforceable?

More programs to support educational achievement for low income students need to be added in APS.
There needs to be an even distribution of affordable housing across the county. This plan doesn't even come close.

Thank you!

Affordable housing - both rental and owned - is crucial if Arlington wants to stay a vibrant community and not an enclave for the wealthy.

I am pleased with the county's effort in this area. I continue to disagree with the policy of allowing tear downs of moderate homes in order to build expensive homes. This policy takes out affordable housing for those in the middle socioeconomic range. I would like to see a policy to deal with some limits to the tear down and rebuild allowances.

Please consider affordable housing in all areas. Resources need to be spread across the county to avoid the existing "North and South" divide. It is crucial to keep affordable housing accessible in all areas of Arlington. If not, then what will the "Arlington Way" really be, except non-diverse and non-affordable. That would be sad and shameful. Let's be the leaders we say we are and keep our diversity.

Great information, great cause, but data is a little confusing and hard to figure out.

I fully support the board passing the housing study AS IS on September 19th! We cannot afford to delay any longer.

This is an important plan for maintaining our County's diversity and continuing to welcome long term rental households who are being stressed by rising real estate costs.

It is also important to focus more creative attention on preserving the MARKS that have survived in neighborhoods such as Westover.

With the full realization of this plan, we'll have around 12,000 new students for APS schools. Where are we going to put at least 12 new schools?

County staff have made public statements that better geographic distribution of housing is "impossible." So many things have been labeled impossible: putting a man on the moon, legalizing gay marriage, electing a black president. Arlington aspires to be a world class, inclusive community. The current state of affairs with respect to affordable housing segregates families in need to a few neighborhoods (Roslyn/Columbia Pike/etc.). This is an embarrassment to this County's otherwise progressive values, and potentially runs afoul of federal law. Please make efforts to change this. My children live in the Tuckahoe school district where only 4% of their classmates are eligible for free and reduced lunch. Everyone would benefit from schools like Tuckahoe, Taylor, Nottingham being MORE socioeconomically diverse.

Prevent an overabundance of affordable housing in any one area, and make sure it's distributed throughout the county. Don't be so tied to current primary transportation corridors when secondary routes can tie into those quickly.

Grateful for all of the excellent work that has gone into this plan. I look forward to seeing it accepted and implemented.

all of our schools, not just the North Arlington ones, could be top rated schools with more equitable distribution of affordable housing.

I would like to see affordable housing distributed more evenly across all of Arlington.

This form of forced wealth redistribution is not what voters have asked for and have not been given a direct vote on the actual costs that they will have to pay.

Very tired of APAH stating some high percentage of CAF units that they manage in North Arlington when this really means no further north than about 8 blocks north of Route 50. This is demeaning to every Arlingtonian's intelligence. Also, if the APAH after school teaching efforts are succeeding, it is not obvious in the neighborhood elementary school test scores. Sections of Columbia Pike need immediate
financial help until more CAF can be built north of Lee Highway and overcrowding and educational and economic constraints can be better addressed for CAF residents. These residents need more than what they are receiving to thrive.

Arlington needs more affordable housing. Efforts to place a moratorium on building more AF in South Arlington or along Columbia Pike are misguided. We have lost a large number of AF units, and we need to create more without getting distracted by the north vs south issue. I feel strongly that we make bad decisions when we start talking about groups of people as numbers, instead of neighbors. Middle class and lower-income families should feel welcome at discussions about AF, but they have been left out of the dialogue in most of the meetings I’ve attended. If lower-performing schools need more resources, then let’s address that as a separate issue, but let’s not send a message to immigrant families or lower income families that their children are a problem! As you can tell, I reject the NIMBYism shown by many Arlingtonians. I say, Yes in my backyard!

This is important. Thanks for the opportunity to weigh in.

This important issue merits a reasoned discussion embracing our values, not inflammatory statements and exaggerated claims that mask the issue.

Arlington County should stop subsidizing housing and let the market run its course. As a tax payer, I don’t like paying my neighbor’s rent in addition to my own.

I live off of Columbia Pike, I love my neighborhood. But the county depends too much on those who won’t, or can’t speak up. Our county is segregated, there is so little affordable housing located in the Lee Hwyway. corridor. Excuses, transit corridor not as healthy, higher land prices in North Arlington, residents of N. Arl are more vocal of NOT wanting affordable hsg. in their area, my heavens the schools might be affected and our precious bundles won’t get into Harvard.

It is irresponsible to be so myopic as to focus simply on preserving and creating affordable housing. It does a disservice to all to concentrate affordable housing so disproportionately in certain areas (The Pike) simply because it is affordable. At a minimum, if these initiatives burden some neighborhoods more than others, at least have the sense to provide more investment and meaningful capital investment, not just some streetscaping and more buses.

Addressing NIMBY concerns (across the county, but especially in North Arlington) and ensuring adequate capacity for Columbia Pike mass transit will be key.

I'm not certain that the addition of children into the school system is being considered in this mix. If Arlington adds as many units as it is forecasting we could be adding up to 3000 new children. Which schools are going to absorb them? This simply MUST be co-addressed. The school system is already lagging school population increase by years and doing a completely inefficient job creating space and solutions (tearing down potentially useful spaces while being unable to come up with new... Building three brand new high schools while elementaries are getting trailers... Ugh.)

I have read that Arlington County is almost completely "built out"- something in the range of 83%. I support constructing affordable housing wherever possible even if this means that it will not be possible to build it some of the areas of the county.

It is my hope that this plan and implementation framework are modified to strengthen the tools given to County staff regarding transit corridor and single family neighborhoods. Promoting AH there is vital to the success of the plan. I’m also troubled by the lack of detail given to the development of AH on Lee Highway. Why can’t Arlington replicate AH efforts already used successfully on Columbia Pike? There are a lot of similarities between the corridors. Contrary to what’s been said by County staff, Columbia Pike backs up to large SFHs as well as has done a lot of AH efforts successfully. This is not an excuse to sit on our hands in that transit corridor. The county also needs much greater coordination with APS regarding this plan - a request for data is a start, but does not take student achievement and overcrowding problems seriously unless it is then used to improve the plan, and not just justify the
current draft. Many who have raised these concerns are strong AH supporters and advocates. We believe that without these changes, the plan will not effectively provide economic opportunity to those who need it and will ultimately put future AH efforts at risk.

Creation of CAFs must be prioritized in areas with the fewest public good is a public good just like a PARK, School, or firehouse, it must be spread across the county to allow access!

Figure out how to allow elderly on fixed income to age in place even if they own their home.

We need this so badly. Go for it!

It only makes sense to locate CAFs in parts of the county where there is available land and more affordable land. If that is in south Arlington, great! Do it! I strongly disagree with the CARD faction that is pushing -- exactly why, I don't clearly understand -- for some kind of ironclad guarantee to limit the amount of affordable housing in south Arlington.

This feels way too complex for the average, reasonably well-informed citizen to answer. I suspect that the survey will be hijacked by those with an agenda in support or against the plan. A better approach to getting true community sentiment would be the 21st Century Town Hall meeting so well used in Prince Georges County and in the District for planning.

http://www.publicengagementassociates.com/

Pls. adopt this master plan in Sept. It is a plan with goals, aspirational goals even, not a police or court order to be enforced. Such plans can reasonably be discussed and changed as the future unfolds.

Tha AHMP is a good plan to address the serious loss of affordable units. It is an opportunity to take charge of the direction we want the county to move to take care of all of its citizens, to do our part in reducing the ever growing income gaps, to maintain our inclusive, diverse population. It's a plan to be proud of.

I keep hearing about the urgency of building more schools. Having affordable housing in Arlington is even more urgent if you are being forced out of your housing.

Opposition to this plan is driven in part by fear of others—race, socio-economic, and culture. Strong leadership is required to expose this prejudice for what it is.