



Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing and Economic Development

Honorable Mark D. Boughton, Chairman
Mayor of Danbury

Interim Report

April 30, 2008

Executive Summary

Pursuant to Public Act 07-4, the Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing and Economic Development herewith files this interim report on its activities through Feb. 1, 2008.

The Commission has taken three major steps to date. It has:

1. Decided on a process for reviewing key housing issues identified by the statute.
2. Reviewed the state's housing situation and challenges that require solutions.
3. Organized into subcommittees to recommend (a) additional incentives to help municipalities create housing under the HOMEConnecticut statute, (b) streamlined methods of financing affordable housing creation, and (c) removal of regulatory and administrative bottlenecks that slow or derail housing creation.

This interim report summarizes background on the HOMEConnecticut statute, the work of the Blue Ribbon Commission and offers an "Additional Incentives" recommendation.

Current Environment for Housing and HOMEConnecticut Statute

1. The Office of Policy and Management has received letters seeking support from more than two dozen municipalities and regional planning organizations seeking technical assistance and planning grants to create Incentive Housing Zones for mixed-income housing.
2. The state's housing situation remains dire. Housing prices remain very high in Connecticut, little new housing is being produced and data indicate that there is not enough affordable and available housing for the state's low and very low income households. National Low Income Housing Coalition tabulations of 2005 American Community Survey data indicate 97,006 of 402,247 renter households in Connecticut spend more than 50% of their income on housing.¹ Most – more than 93,000 households – also earn 50% of the area median income or less. Meanwhile, Donald Klepper-Smith, chairman of Gov. Rell's council of economic advisors, reports that the percentage of owner and renter households that earn 80% of median income or less and spend more than 30% of that income on housing rose to 26% in 2006 from 19% in 2004.² Housing prices flattened but

¹ "Congressional District Profiles." National Low Income Housing Coalition. January 2007.

<<http://nlihc.org/doc/cdpCT.pdf>>

² Klepper-Smith, Don. "Updated Perspectives on the Need for Affordable Housing within Connecticut." Study commissioned by the Partnership for Strong Communities. January 2008.

- continued increasing in 2007, rising 1.45%³ while the latest Out of Reach report from the National Low Income Housing Coalition indicates that the cost to rent an apartment in the state continues to rise.⁴
3. Connecticut faces serious demographic changes that threaten its economic future, with the loss of young workforce and families leaving public and private sector employers without sufficient, skilled labor.^{5,6}
 4. Neighboring states are moving ahead with housing creation affordable to workers and young families, threatening to draw additional jobs and workers out of Connecticut. Massachusetts was the first to adopt an incentive-based affordable housing program, upon which HOMEConnecticut is based. In addition, the Regional Plan Association is working with seven New York counties -- Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Putnam and Dutchess – to pass enabling legislation in the state’s legislature. Similarly, New Jersey Future, a public policy non-profit, is working with a steering committee to develop an incentive program for presentation to its legislature.

INTERIM RECOMMENDATION

The Commission recommends the establishment of a mechanism for providing necessary additional state assistance to municipalities that develop Incentive Housing Zones through the HOMEConnecticut statute. The additional incentives would be for cities and towns, in the form of one-time capital grants, which create HOMEConnecticut housing zones. The additional incentives should be provided to directly enhance the development of such housing or further the state’s responsible growth agenda or other related vital state policy goals.

Background

The Commission’s Creation and Charge

The Blue Ribbon Commission was created in June 2007 upon passage of Public Act 07-4, which included provisions for the Connecticut Housing Program for Economic Growth (the HOMEConnecticut program). The new statute, which is designed to address the rapidly rising cost of housing across the state and correct a shortage of modest rental units and starter homes by increasing the supply of housing affordable to the state’s workers, families, young professionals and elderly residents, includes the following provisions:

a. Zone Creation: Incentive Housing Zones (IHZ) are enacted by a municipality’s zoning commission, and then approved by the State Office of Policy and Management (OPM). The town’s zoning commission must establish the IHZ as an overlay zone. Overlay zones rest on top of existing zones and usually impose additional requirements or restrictions intended to protect the area’s unique characteristics. The town may establish multiple IHZs, but each zone may cover no more than 10% of the town’s total

³ “Monthly Home Sales Stats from The Warren Group,” The Warren Group, 23 April 2008. <http://www.homeconnecticut.org/images/stories/pdf/warren_group_ct_stats_2006-08.pdf>

⁴ “Out of Reach 2007-2008: Connecticut” National Low Income Housing Coalition. April 2008. <<http://nlihc.org/oor/oor2008/data.cfm?getstate=on&state=CT>>

⁵ “Benchmarking Growth In Demand-Driven Labor Markets – 2006.” Connecticut Department of Labor. December 2006. <<http://www.ctdol.state.ct.us/lmi/pubs/benchmarking.pdf>>

⁶ Coelen, S. and Joseph B. Berger. “New England 2020” 2006. <http://www.nmefdn.org/uploads/NE_2020_FR.pdf>

land area, and all the zones and subzones together can cover no more than 25% of that area.

b. Densities: Housing created within the zone must meet threshold densities:

- six units per acre for single-family detached homes,
- 10 units per acre for duplex or townhouses, and
- 20 units per acre for multifamily housing.

Municipalities can require higher densities if they wish. These densities must represent a 25% increase in the allowed density within the zone. Even if an area is already zoned to allow the densities called for in this program, the municipality can still enact a zone if density is increased by 25%. These densities are only for land that can be feasibly developed into residential and mixed-use property (i.e., developable land).

Towns with population of 5,000 or less can apply to the Secretary of OPM for a waiver so they can meet lower density requirements if they can demonstrate that the proposed IHZ lacks the existing, substantial infrastructure needed to support housing at the higher minimum densities.

Towns can ask the Secretary to waive the density requirements, and he/she may do so if (1) the town, one of its agencies, a land or housing trust, or a nonprofit housing organization owns or controls the land in the proposed IHZ; (2) the proposed regulations require all of the units to be affordable and provide a mechanism to enforce that requirement, and (3) the proposed IHZ satisfies the bill's other requirements

c. Affordability: At least 20% of the units in each development within the IHZ must be affordable to people earning no more than 80% of the area's median household income (AMI), and using no more than 30% of their annual income for housing expenditure. These affordable units must remain that way for at least 30 years, by imposing deeds, covenants, or other restrictions. The housing developer may impose more stringent affordability requirements. The Incentive Housing Zone regulations must designate these developments as permitted uses and allow them as a matter of right. As such, the zoning commission may deny them only if they do not meet the requirements specified in the regulations.

d. Design: The IHZ's regulations may include design standards to insure that a proposed new development complements existing buildings and structures and the zone's housing plan. These design standards must be submitted to the OPM Secretary for approval. The standards cannot increase development costs to the point where low- and moderate-income people cannot afford the units reserved for them. The Secretary may disapprove a proposed IHZ if the standards could have this effect. This is the only reason why he/she may disapprove the standards.

e. State Payments to Municipalities: The legislation allocates \$4 million in FY 2008 to this program for payments to municipalities, technical assistance and OPM's administration of the program. For a municipality to receive state incentive payments, it must create an overlay zone meeting the requirements of this act, submit an application to OPM, and have it approved as an Incentive Housing Zone. If these requirements are met, the municipality is eligible for the following payments:

- *Planning Grants for Towns:* Within available funding, the bill authorizes OPM to make grants to towns for planning IHZs, drafting implementing regulations and design standards, and reviewing and revising applicable subdivision regulations. Towns can also use the grants to prepare the information they must submit to the Secretary when applying for eligibility.
- *Zone Adoption Grants:* Within available funding, OPM shall pay municipalities \$2,000 for each unit that can be built on developable land in the zone based on the bill's minimum as-of-right densities. A build-out analysis to determine the number of possible units is part of the municipality's application for approval of the IHZ.
- *Building Permit Grants:* Within available funding, OPM shall make payments to municipalities for each building permit they issue for housing within the IHZ. Municipalities shall receive \$2,000 for each multifamily, duplex or townhouse unit, and \$5,000 for each single-family detached unit. Units developed specifically for older persons under federal or state law do not qualify for these grants.

f. Technical Assistance Grants for Nonprofit Housing or Development Organizations: Within available funds, the bill authorizes the Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development to make grants to nonprofit housing assistance or development organizations to develop the technical capacity to plan and implement housing developments within the IHZs.

g. Affordable Housing Land Use Appeals Procedure: Under this act, developers creating housing under the IHZ regulations cannot use the affordable housing land use appeals procedure (Connecticut General Statutes Sec. 8-30g) within the zone. However, the legislation allows affordable housing units built within IHZs to count toward the number of affordable units applying to a municipality's 10% goal under Sec. 8-30g, if the units meet other requirements of Sec. 8-30g.

Because Governor Rell and the General Assembly acknowledged that barriers to housing creation exist and incentives and other changes are needed in order to remove them, they included in the legislation the creation of a 12-member Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing and Economic Development to study affordable housing and how its availability or shortage affects economic growth.

By statute, the members include the OPM secretary, Department of Economic and Community Development commissioner, the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA) chairman, the State Treasurer, or their respective designees. The Governor appointed two members, one whom she designated as the Commission's chairperson. Each legislative leader appointed one member. Members of the commission include representatives of large and small towns, realtors, planners, developers, and housing policy and regional planning organizations. (A list of members is included in the Appendix).

The Commission's charge is to study and report on the state's short- and long-term housing needs and how they affect growth. Specifically, it was asked to evaluate:

- the amount of housing needed to support economic development and growth in the short- and long-term;
- the regulatory and economic barriers limiting the extent to which developers can produce affordable housing;

- the regions where the affordable housing needs are greatest;
- the number of IHZs needed to create enough single- and multi-family housing to accommodate the creation of at least 20,000 new jobs annually; and
- ways to encourage towns to adopt an IHZ including compensating them for educating the school children residing in the zones.

The study must also evaluate:

- establishing uniform standards for financing multifamily housing;
- expanding loan guarantees;
- improving the use of the housing programs operated by state agencies and quasi-public authorities;
- using mortgage insurance and other credit enhancements provided by CHFA and others to significantly expand public and private housing financing;
- enhancing the existing affordable housing and historic preservation tax credits to promote housing renovation; and
- coordinating financing to increase the use of federal housing tax credits.

The Commission was asked to submit its findings and recommendations to the governor and the legislature. Its interim report was due February 1, 2008 and its final report, June 30, 2008. The commission terminates when it submits its final report or January 1, 2009, whichever is sooner.

The Commission's Work To Date

The Commission organized in November 2007 after appointments were made. Chaired by Danbury Mayor Mark Boughton, the Commission has studied the state's overall housing situation and then organized into subcommittees and charted courses of investigation by them consistent with the Commission's legislative charge.

The housing situation remains a serious problem, and the HOMEConnecticut statute was passed and the Commission created for the following reasons:

- Housing prices have increased 70% between 2000 and 2007,⁷ having risen 1.45% in 2007 even as they have fallen in most other states (see footnote 3).
- Supply remains low – Connecticut was 48th in 2006 and 49th in 2007⁸ in housing units built per capita – and what is being built is 55+ luxury housing and 4-, 5- and 6-BR single family homes, not the affordable rentals and starter homes young workers and families need. The state has lost nearly 15,000 studio and one-bedroom units from 2000 to 2006 while four-, five- and six-bedroom homes have increased by 31,000.⁹

⁷ "Growth in Connecticut Median Single-Family Housing Prices vs. Personal Income 2000-2007." Data from the Warren Group and U.S. Department of Commerce. Analysis undertaken by the Partnership for Strong Communities for the HOMEConnecticut Campaign.

<http://www.homeconnecticut.org/images/stories/pdf/cthsqprice_v_income_2000-2007.pdf>

⁸ "Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits." U.S. Census Bureau. 24 April 2008.

<<http://www.census.gov/const/www/C40/table2.html#annual>>.

⁹ "2000 Decennial Census: Bedrooms - Housing Units," and "2006 American Community Survey: Bedrooms – Housing Units." U.S. Census Bureau. 24 April 2008.

<http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en&_ts=>

- The University of New Hampshire's Carsey Institute reports that Connecticut lost 30.1% of its 25-34-year-old population from 1990 to 2006 – from 583,882 down to 404,181 – a higher percentage than any other state in the nation.¹⁰
- Households earning median income are unable to qualify for median sales price homes in 142 of 169 municipalities.¹¹
- The number of households considered “burdened” by their housing situation – those earning 80% or less of the state median income and spending 30% or more of that income on housing – has jumped from 19% in 2004 to 26% in 2006. (see footnote 2)
- 72% of the new jobs projected through 2014 will pay \$40,000 or less, while an income of \$69,000 will be needed to buy the median sales price home (see footnote 2).
- Businesses, municipalities, healthcare and academic institutions all report significant difficulty filling positions with skilled workers.¹²

To deal with these problems, the Commission created three subcommittees to consider:

1. Additional incentives to help municipalities create housing under the HOMEConnecticut statute;
2. Streamlined methods of financing affordable housing creation; and,
3. Removal of regulatory and administrative bottlenecks that slow or derail housing creation.

It was clear to the Commission that municipalities might need additional help, beyond the technical assistance/planning grants and zoning/building permit incentive payments. It was also apparent that, to ensure that developers/builders could easily respond to market conditions, government-financing programs have to be as accessible as possible. Finally, it made sense to have a subcommittee determine whether procedures, regulations and statutes coincide and coordinate well with efforts to create housing and, if not, whether changes could be made to safeguard their original intent while still facilitating housing creation.

The subcommittees have met and the recommendation of the Additional Incentives subcommittee is summarized below. The work of the other subcommittees to date is as follows:

- Finance Subcommittee: The panel is chaired by Deputy State Treasurer Howard Rifkin and includes developer Steve Darley, Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce President Anthony Rescigno, Interim Executive Director John Craford and Michael Ward of CHFA, Diane Randall of the Partnership for Strong Communities and Pat Spring of the CT Housing Coalition.

The subcommittee's charge is to review and recommend streamlined financing methods for developers and builders of affordable and mixed-income housing.

¹⁰ Gittell, Ross. “The Declining Young Adult Population in New England” University of New Hampshire Carsey Institute. Winter 2007. <http://www.carseyinstitute.unh.edu/documents/NHYoungAdults_final.pdf>

¹¹ “Affordability in Connecticut, 2007.” Partnership for Strong Communities for the HOMEConnecticut Campaign. 24 April 2008.

<http://www.homeconnecticut.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=111&Itemid=1>

¹² “2007 Survey of Connecticut Businesses,” Connecticut Business and Industry Association, Blum Shapiro. 6 Sept 2007. <http://www.cbia.com/newsroom/surveys/2007/BlumShapiro_07.pdf>

The subcommittee has laid out an ambitious work plan that will see it review the need for affordable housing across the entire spectrum of constituencies, household types and income levels; determine how much of that need can be served by the market and how much requires government financing and other forms of subsidy; explain how housing production relates to economic growth and how current market conditions – including the subprime mortgage crisis and the credit crunch – affect demand and supply; examine and explain existing financing sources, how they work, and the groups they target; explain how/why financing mechanisms work or don't work for different projects; suggest how funds can be leveraged more effectively; review case studies of particular types of housing projects to determine how they were financed; use information collected to suggest improvements to current system that would allow it to work more efficiently and effectively; identify gaps in the system and explain how these gaps could be filled to make the financing system more efficient and effective; brief the entire Blue Ribbon Commission on recommendations.

- Regulatory/Policy Coordination Subcommittee: The panel is chaired by DECD Commissioner Joan McDonald (and her designee Rick Robbins) and includes Diane Randall, Mark Foreman of the CT Association of Realtors, and developer Liz Verna.

The subcommittee's charge is to review and recommend streamlined state agency procedures and needed changes in statutes, regulations and zoning procedures to make housing creation easier.

The subcommittee agreed to collect previous efforts at identifying zoning, land-use, permitting and procedural barriers; construct an outline of the "process list" of actions and approvals required of developers/builders seeking to construct housing; hear from practitioners who work with the system, including professional planners; invite testimony by users of the development system to determine which barriers pose the greatest difficulty; determine which barriers can be removed or lowered and, in each case, how; determine the feasibility and likelihood of statutory, regulatory or administrative changes; recommend changes; and, brief the entire Blue Ribbon Commission on its recommendations.

Given the wide support for HOMEConnecticut from both the General Assembly and Governor's office, and from the array of housing, environmental, smart growth, business, academic, municipal and other organizations involved in its creation and advocacy – and given the success a similar statute has had in creating mixed-income housing in Massachusetts – fostering the work of the subcommittees through 2008 makes sense.

The Commission hopes that the subcommittees will not only answer the questions laid out in its charge, but also take a wider view of the housing development process so that future state policy includes housing development as a principal building block of the state's economy, and so that transportation, education, health, environmental and energy policy is not made without consideration of its relationship to housing policy.

Response to HOMEConnecticut – and Related Developments

HOMEConnecticut has yet to finance creation of housing in the state, but there appears to be significant interest. The Office of Policy and Management is in the process of creating a form for municipalities to apply for technical assistance/planning grants, and in hiring a professional to administer the HOMEConnecticut program. In the interim:

- The Office of Policy and Management has received 23 letters from municipalities in every region of the state requesting planning and technical assistance grants available under the statute that will be used to help them plan the creation of HOMEConnecticut incentive housing zones. Another three letters have been submitted by regional planning organizations. Diane Randall, an appointee to the Commission and Director of the Partnership for Strong Communities, which staffed the HOMEConnecticut campaign, said that another 10 municipalities are expected to apply in the next several weeks and as many as 50 cities and towns are expected to apply for planning grants by the end of the 2008 fiscal year.
- The state's housing situation, and particularly housing prices, have not experienced the same impacts as the rest of the nation over the last year. Home prices have not continued their previously steep ascent but, unlike most other states, they did not decline in 2007, rising 1.45% (see footnote 3). Monthly declines in December and January indicate that prices may decrease modestly into 2008 (see footnote 3), but it is impossible to predict how a slowing national housing market will impact Connecticut as a whole, the mini-markets in its many municipalities or communities, and affordability overall. Connecticut has seen low levels of housing production in recent years – 46th in units built per capita from 2000 to 2005 (see footnote 8) – and about 2/3 of the 72,000 subprime loans in Connecticut by the end of 2007 were confined to 15 cities¹³. While foreclosures in those cities could affect supply, prices and property values, it was less clear that the subprime problem would have any significant impact on the other 154 municipalities with relatively few subprime loans and even fewer that were delinquent at this juncture.
- Connecticut faces serious demographic challenges that will require cities and towns to move beyond the planning stage and create affordable options for workers, families, young professionals and elderly residents:
 1. Projections of an aging population and no-growth working age population portend a significant loss of state revenues.
 2. Nearly half of Connecticut's teachers are 50 years of age or older and will likely retire over the next 10-15 years, forcing many municipalities to compete for – and pay high premiums to attract – new replacements¹⁴.
 3. The state has lost a higher percentage of young workforce than any state in the nation.
 4. Increasingly more municipalities are facing budget pressures and having a harder time recruiting volunteer firefighters and other workers, supporting commercial bases and passing budgets, according to CCM.

¹³ Data from Connecticut Housing Finance Authority using proprietary LPI data.

¹⁴ "Active Teachers Evaluation." Data provided by the State of Connecticut Teachers Retirement Board to HOMEConnecticut. 8 April 2008.

- Connecticut faces competition for young worker population. Massachusetts, using a statute similar to HOMEConnecticut, has approved incentive housing zones in 20 municipalities and issued eligibility letters to another five municipalities. Many other towns are in various stages of the planning and approval process. The seven New York counties closest to Connecticut have filed legislation that would provide authorization and funding for a similar municipal incentive plan. New Jersey is also developing a municipal incentive program for presentation to its legislature.

INTERIM RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission was asked to file an interim report to the General Assembly. In asking the Additional Incentives subcommittee to consider whether additional incentives might be needed to encourage and assist municipalities in creating new mixed-income housing, the subcommittee first considered whether the additional incentives sought in the original legislation would be important to pursue:

- Reimbursement by the state of net additional school costs incurred by municipalities that created HOMEConnecticut Incentive Housing Zones.
- Project-based Rental Assistance Payments (RAP) to developers who seek to make up to 5% of the units in a HOMEConnecticut Incentive Housing Zone affordable to persons making 50% of the area median income, or less.

It was determined by the Additional Incentives subcommittee that the RAP incentive would likely be effective, but was not immediately needed to continue the momentum of HOMEConnecticut because municipalities and developers in the state are not yet ready to create housing under the program. The school cost reimbursement incentive remains an option for some municipalities in Connecticut that have high enrollments and do not project a decline. For others that project declining enrollment, the school cost reimbursement may not be as much of an incentive because they are less likely to see net additional school costs as a result of housing creation under the HOMEConnecticut program. In surveying municipalities and housing experts, it was determined that, for the time being, to continue the momentum of the HOMEConnecticut program and respond to the above challenges, the Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing and Economic Development recommends to Gov. Rell and the General Assembly that it:

Establish a framework for provision of additional incentives to cities and towns, in the form of one-time capital grants, which create HOMEConnecticut housing zones. The additional incentives would be provided to (a) directly enhance the development of such housing (e.g., infrastructure development/repair or site remediation necessary for the housing development to proceed), or to (b) further the state's responsible growth agenda or other related vital state policy goals (e.g., open space, historic or farmland preservation, TOD, etc.). The approval and size of the grants would be determined at the discretion of the Secretary of OPM at the time he/she approved applications from municipalities for the creation of HOMEConnecticut zones. By providing such grants, the state could begin to tie together key policy initiatives into a coordinated effort of:

- Helping towns create the housing options they need, expanding grand lists needed for new revenues, and providing the local patrons and municipal workers necessary to support local merchants and provide vital town services;

- Discouraging sprawl by providing municipalities with a way to expand their revenue bases where there is already infrastructure;
- Cleaning up and filling up vacant mills, factories and commercial properties by conversion to needed housing; and,
- Attracting and keeping the new workers necessary to attract business expansion and jobs in the state.

The Commission believes such additional incentives can take the form of one-time capital grants from either new or existing authorizations, recommended by the Secretary of OPM, and subject to the discretion of the Governor and the Bond Commission.

GOALS FOR FINAL REPORT

As outlined in the statute, the Commission will work through June 2008 on a final report that will include recommendations by its other two subcommittees to (1) streamline methods of financing affordable housing creation, and (2) remove regulatory and administrative bottlenecks that slow or derail housing creation.

The Commission's subcommittees will invite experts in land-use, finance, municipal government, environmental quality and other areas to provide input on improvements that can be made. Subcommittee meetings and plans are now being drafted.

APPENDIX

1. Members of Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing and Economic Development

Honorable Mark D. Boughton, Chairman
Mayor of Danbury
m.boughton@ci.danbury.ct.us

Honorable Denise Nappier
Treasurer of Connecticut
Howard G. Rifkin, Treasurer's Designate
Howard.Rifkin@ct.gov

Honorable Elizabeth C. Paterson
Mayor of Mansfield
Betsy_Paterson@hotmail.com

Robert L. Genuario
Secretary of Policy & Management
Robert.Genuario@ct.gov

Joan McDonald
Commissioner of Economic & Community Development
Joan.McDonald@po.state.ct.us

Rolan Joni Young, Esq.
Chair, Connecticut Housing Finance Authority
John K. Craford – CHFA Designate
EVP/Acting Interim Executive Director
John.Craford@chfa.org

Patricia Spring
Connecticut Housing Coalition
Pat@ct-housing.org

Mark Foreman
Connecticut Capital Mortgage & Real Estate
Mark@cornerstone-capital.com

Anthony Rescigno
Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce
ARescigno@gnhcc.com

Stephen F. Darley
New Haven Construction Corp.
SDarley@newhavenconstruction.net

Diane Randall
Partnership for Strong Communities
Diane@ctpartnershiphousing.com

Elizabeth Verna
Verna Builders & Developers
Liz@vernabuilders.com

**Towns That Have Applied for TA/Planning Grants
Under HOMEConnecticut Statute (as of 4/30/08)**

Fairfield County

New Canaan
Westport
Stamford
Fairfield
Darien
Redding
Bethel
Bridgeport

New London County

New London
Montville

Hartford County

Manchester
East Hartford
New Britain

CRCOG

Bloomfield
Simsbury

Windham County

Chaplin
Stafford
Windham COG

New Haven County

Hamden
Wallingford
Oxford

Middlesex County

Old Saybrook
East Lyme

Litchfield County

Norfolk
NW COG



**State of Connecticut
Office of Policy and Management
Housing For Economic Growth Technical Assistance
Grant Application Form**

Name of Applicant: _____

Address of Applicant: _____

Name and Title of Authorized Official: _____

Name of Project Manager: _____

Telephone Number of Project Manager: _____

1. BUSINESS INFORMATION

1a. Federal Employer Identification Number: _____

1b. Grantee's Fiscal Year: From ____ To ____

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

2a. Provide the following:

- Project Title: _____
- Intended Use of Funds: _____
- Project Budget
 - Attach a line item income and expense budget for the project. Budget should delineate state funding from non-state funding.

3. LOCAL APPROVALS

3a. Submit a certified resolution adopted in the last 60 days by the Town's legislative body (or, in the case of a town where the town meeting is the legislative body, the Board of Selectmen):

- Authorizing submission of this grant application;
- Identifying the individual who can sign the grant application and administer the grant.

For additional information, please attach a separate sheet and include the corresponding number.

Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing and Economic Development
Interim Report – April 30, 2008

3b. Submit a certified resolution of the local zoning authority (1) endorsing the application for assistance; and (2) certifying that it will consider the creation of one or more housing incentive zones.

The certified resolutions should be signed by the City or Town Clerk and embossed with the corporate seal.

4. PROJECT PLAN

Submit a detailed project plan which describes (1) the proposed use of the grant funds; (2) the way in which the use of the funds will facilitate the creation of a housing incentive zone; and (3) a schedule for (a) the use of the funds; and (b) the establishment of the housing incentive zones.

5. SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION

My signature below, for and on behalf of _____, indicates
Name of Grantee
acceptance of the following and further certifies that:

1. I have the authority to submit this grant application;
2. I have read, understand, and will comply with the General Grant Conditions;
3. I understand that funding associated with this grant application is one-time in nature and that there is no obligation for additional funding from the Office of Policy and Management or the State of Connecticut;
4. I understand that should this grant application be approved, such state funds shall be expended no later than June 30, 2009;
5. I understand that requests to extend the grant end date shall be submitted in writing to the Office of Policy and Management no later than thirty (30) days before the grant end date of June 30, 2009;
6. I understand that unexpended funds shall be returned to the State of Connecticut within sixty (60) days of the grant end date;
7. I understand that if this organization meets the requirements of the State Single Audit Act, Sections 4-230 through 4-236, as amended, of the Connecticut General Statutes, the organization is required to submit a State Single Audit, at its own expense, no later than six (6) months after the end of the audit period. If this organization is not required to submit a State Single Audit, the organization is required to submit a final accounting of the grant expenditures within sixty (60) days of the grant end date; and

For additional information, please attach a separate sheet and include the corresponding number.

Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing and Economic Development
Interim Report – April 30, 2008

8. I hereby certify that the statements contained in the responses to this application and accompanying documents are true to the best of my knowledge and belief and that I know of no reason why the applicant cannot complete the project in accordance with the representations contained herein.

Authorized Official

Title

*Date: _____

* The application must be signed subsequent to the adoption of the resolution by the local legislative body.

For additional information, please attach a separate sheet and include the corresponding number.