5. MULTI-PHASE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CHAPTER 5
Multi-Phase Development Plan*

Introduction
Once residents and community stakeholders had a chance to offer opinions regarding scenarios for each site, the consultant team was tasked with condensing and analyzing the scenarios with the view towards consolidating them into a coherent, phased multi-year program. This program must satisfy the Housing Authority’s goals of outlining a series of redevelopment and rehabilitation strategies for its entire multi-site inventory that is affordable and sustainable; and preserves, improves and modernizes Charlottesville’s 376 public housing units. Layered on top of this primary objective, were other priorities:

- There is a community-wide need for affordable housing that exceeds the current CRHA inventory, as demonstrated in the Market Analysis Report, and by the TJPDC Report on Affordable Housing, dated January 19, 2007. To the extent feasible within the available grant programs, tax credits and capital funds, affordable housing inventory should be expanded to provide housing for a greater percentage of the total number of families who need it.
- Many of CRHA’s sites represent concentrated zones of poverty within the larger demographics of Charlottesville. The goal of deconcentrating poverty by replacing public housing sites with mixed-income, mixed-use sites (with public housing included in the mix) would, if done appropriately, serve to re-connect public housing sites to their surrounding neighborhoods and bring down the current physical and social isolation. Mixed-use would also offer opportunities for retail and services within walking distance of public housing residents, providing places to shop and places to obtain permanent employment.
- The City of Charlottesville has been diligently planning for the growth and development of its neighborhoods. Planning for CRHA’s public housing sites should respect and support the goals and objectives identified in the City’s 2006 Comprehensive Plan; and for those sites that sit on or adjacent to commercial corridors, the principles of the 2003 Corridor Study should be adhered to and implemented.

Relocation
One of the principles of The Resident Bill of Rights is that relocation for the purposes of redevelopment or rehabilitation shall be of limited duration, with a limit of 12 months for any temporary relocation required as part of the redevelopment process. Therefore, one of the first challenges to any multi-phase redevelopment strategy is to find relocation resources to accommodate large numbers of families during the redevelopment (or even the rehabilitation) of a site. There are many options for relocation of residents, including closing the waiting list and letting natural attrition occur, using permanent Housing Choice Vouchers, obtaining and using temporary relocation vouchers, and building new housing on vacant parcels to provide a permanent relocation resource. We refer to this last option as “finding the open squares.”

Natural Attrition
Natural attrition at CRHA’s sites has been reported by staff to be as high as 25% per year. To place this in perspective, a site like Westhaven, with 126 units of public housing could expect to see turnover of 30 to 32 units per year. If the Housing Authority simply did not re-fill vacant units, it could theoretically open-up relocation resources for existing residents within its own inventory and open-up sites to rehabilitation or redevelopment. The problems with trying to use this strategy by itself are self-evident in the fact that natural attrition is dependent on the decisions and circumstances of individual residents, and therefore can’t be relied upon to vacate entire sites or project phases within reasonable timeframes. Closing the waiting list will also temporarily exacerbate the shortage of affordable housing options in Charlottesville. That being said, it can be used in conjunction with other relocation measures.

Housing Choice Vouchers
The Housing Authority currently lacks the financial resources to fully fund its Housing Choice Voucher program, with approximately 80 unfunded vouchers out of a total inventory of 371. Over the next year, the Housing Authority will be implementing a program to address this situation, and hopes through a combination of negotiation with local landlords to reduce “Fair Market Rent” payments, streamlining of program management, and “re-benchmarking” its program subsidy from HUD to fully fund the program and thereby have the resources to be able to bring utilization rates up from less than 80% to 90% or higher. Until this occurs, however, Housing Choice Vouchers can play only a limited role in the overall relocation strategy.

Temporary Relocation Vouchers
When a Housing Authority files an approved redevelopment plan with HUD it can ask for temporary relocation vouchers. Unlike permanent vouchers, temporary relocation vouchers come with additional subsidy to support the vouchers. Because of this, they could be an effective measure to fill a relocation gap and enable project phases to move ahead within reasonable timeframes. Temporary relocation has been limited to 12 month’s duration due to the provisions of the Residents’ Bill of Rights.

Finding the Open Squares
Probably the most effective relocation strategy involves having open land available on which to build early phases of public or mixed-income housing. These “Open Squares” are like the open square in the puzzle shown below. The “open squares” allow breathing room to permit new housing to be constructed in early program phases without the displacement caused by temporary relocation.

*Also referred to in text as “Scenario 5”
CRHA is fortunate to have open squares in the form of open land on public housing sites (like the ballfield on the south end of the South First Street site, or the open land at the perimeter areas of Sixth Street SE). It also owns a parking lot on Garrett Street, commonly referred to as the Levy site.

Of all of the sites in CRHA’s portfolio, Levy remains one which because it is undeveloped and because of its location offers the greatest opportunities for a variety of alternative uses. Many options have been reviewed by CRHA over the years for the open land at Levy. As part of this planning process, the planning team examined scenarios that included:

- selling the parcel,
- making it available for private development
- developing senior housing (either independent living or assisted living)
- developing a mixed-use project that would include residential and commercial uses
- developing low-rise, high density housing (either mixed income or all public housing)

All of these alternatives remain viable options as the market, finance, and housing strategies evolve over the next 5 to 10 years. For illustrative purposes, including both site development and pro-forma analysis, we have shown a low-rise, high density public housing scenario, because it offers the larger multi-phase development plan a Phase 1 relocation resource; however, should other relocation resources be identified (eg, additional Housing Choice Vouchers, on-site consolidation due to increased vacancy rates, or increasing public housing density on other sites, or a tolerance for more temporary relocation vouchers with longer than 12 month relocation periods) the other alternative scenarios for Levy can easily occur.

Subsequent to the December 2009 Draft Plan presentation, the CRHA Board began substantive negotiations with the owner of an adjacent former auto service station on the southwest corner of Avon and Garrett Streets (parcel shown in yellow on Levy site plan). The acquisition of this parcel opens up possibilities for a mixed-use and mixed income redevelopment of the Levy site. As the plan for this site moves forward, the CRHA Board has committed to work closely with the residents of the Belmont neighborhood and the School District to ensure that the development of this parcel meets overall CRHA goals, is respectful of the Belmont neighborhood and is mindful of the potential impact on the School District).
Phase 1
36 Units of Public Housing on Levy Avenue

Construction
• Build 36 new public housing (ACC) units on Levy Avenue
• Build new community meeting room (550 net square feet)

Relocation
• Relocate 32 families from Westhaven to new Levy Avenue units
• Allow natural annual attrition throughout CRHA’s inventory (assume 31 units). Relocate 31 Westhaven families into these units to clear space for Phase 2 without refilling from waiting list
• Relocate up to 7 Westhaven families to temporary relocation vouchers
• Relocate 4 non-elderly disabled residents from Crescent Halls to new Levy Avenue units

Demolition
• Demolish 70 Westhaven units

Partnership and Acquisition
• Partner with developer to acquire three commercial parcels along W. Main Street adjacent to Westhaven
• Prepare for Westhaven Phase I

*Note: see previous page for further description of master plan recommendations for the Levy Avenue site.
Community center is assumed to have 2 stories (4,000 net square feet per floor). A third floor could be added to accommodate CRHA’s central offices. This additional space has not been factored into preliminary financing plan summary.

Phase 2
58 Unit Mixed Income Phase, Westhaven I

Construction
• Build 40 new public housing (ACC) units on Westhaven Site
• Build 11 new LIHTC mixed-income units on Westhaven Site
• Build 7 new market-rate rental units on Westhaven Site
• Build new community meeting center (approximately 8,000 net square feet)*

Relocation
• Relocate 7 families from temporary relocation vouchers to new Phase I Westhaven units
• Relocate 29 families from old Westhaven units to new Phase I Westhaven units
• Relocate 4 non-elderly disabled residents from Crescent Halls to new Westhaven Phase I units
• Relocate up to 27 Westhaven residents to Vouchers

Demolition
• Demolish the remainder of existing Westhaven buildings (56 units)

*Community center is assumed to have 2 stories (4,000 net square feet per floor). A third floor could be added to accommodate CRHA’s central offices. This additional space has not been factored into preliminary financing plan summary.
Phase 3
58 Unit Mixed Income Phase, Westhaven II

Construction
- Build 40 new public housing (ACC) units on south side of Hardy Drive
- Build 11 mixed-income LIHTC units
- Build 7 market-rate units

Relocation
- Relocate 27 families from vouchers to new Phase II Westhaven units
- Relocate 4 non-elderly disabled residents from Crescent Halls to new Westhaven Phase II ACC units
- Relocate 9 residents from South 1st Street to new Westhaven Phase II ACC units

Demolition
- Demolish commercial buildings on West Main for Westhaven Phase III
Phase 4a
64 Unit Mixed Income/Mixed Use Phase, Westhaven III

Construction
• Build 10 new public housing (ACC) units on remainder of Westhaven Site and off-site parcels
• Build 28 mixed-income LIHTC units
• Build 26 market-rate rentals

Relocation
• Relocate 6 families from old South 1st Street units to new Phase III Westhaven
• Relocate 4 non-elderly disabled from Crescent Halls to new Westhaven Phase II ACC units

Demolition
• Begin demolition of 12 existing ACC units at north end of South 1st Street
Sketch of proposed central open space at Westhaven.
16 non-elderly disabled residents have been relocated to family sites as of the start of Phase 4a. This relocation opens up space at Crescent Halls for phased rehabilitation to begin. It also allows the building to reorient its focus to senior housing, and allows remaining disabled residents to be moved to lower floors to make fire rescue easier.

**Phase 4b**

**Start of Multi-year Phased Rehab of Crescent Halls**

**Construction**

+ Begin multi-year phased rehabilitation of Crescent Halls, to consist of blocks of 21 units (3 vertical stacks) at a time in 5 sub-phases.
+ Begin rehab of lobby floor level, including new entry on Monticello Avenue.
Phase 5
45 Unit Mixed Income Phase and 8 Home-Ownership Units at South 1st Street

Construction
- Build 25 new ACC units at South 1st Street
- Build 20 new LIHTC units at South 1st Street
- Build 8 new home-ownership units at parcel across from South 1st Street
- Renovate existing South 1st Street Community Center
- Rehabilitate 21 units at Crescent Halls (Phase 2)

Relocation
- Relocate 4 non-elderly disabled from Crescent Halls to new South 1st Street Phase I ACC units
- Relocate 21 families from old South 1st Street units into new South 1st Street units
- Relocate 22 South 1st Street families to temporary relocation vouchers

Demolition
- Demolish remaining 46 existing ACC units at South 1st Street

Phase 6
45 Unit Mixed Income Phase at South 1st Street

Construction
- Build 25 new ACC units at South 1st Street
- Build 20 new LIHTC units at South 1st Street
- Build new park/open space and trail system along creek
- Rehabilitate 21 units at Crescent Halls (Phase 3)

Relocation
- Relocate 22 families off vouchers and into new South 1st Street units
- Relocate 3 non-elderly disabled from Crescent Halls into new South 1st Street disabled units
- Relocate 25 families from 6th Street SE to temporary relocation vouchers

Demolition
- Begin selective demolition at 6th Street SE
Phase 7a
40 new and rehabbed ACC units at Sixth St. SE

Construction
• Build 15 new public housing (ACC) units on 6th Street SE site (including new community room of 600 net square feet)
• Renovate 25 existing public Housing (ACC) units at 6th St SE site
• Rehabilitate 21 units at Crescent Halls (Phase 4)

Relocation
• Relocate 11 families from old Michie Drive units to new Sixth Street SE ACC units
• Relocate 4 non-elderly disabled from Crescent Halls to new Sixth Street SE ACC units
• Relocate 25 families off vouchers to new or rehabbed units at 6th Street SE
• Relocate 12 Michie Drive families into temporary relocation vouchers.

Demolition
• Demolish 23 existing ACC units at Michie Drive
**Phase 7b**

**26 new ACC units at Michie Drive**

**Construction**
- Build 26 new public housing (ACC) units on Michie Drive site
- Build new community room (400 net square feet), playground and community garden

**Relocation**
- Relocate 14 Madison Avenue families to new Michie Drive ACC units
- Relocate 12 families off vouchers to new units at Michie Drive
- Relocate 4 families at Madison Avenue to temporary relocation vouchers

**Demolition**
- Begin demolition of 18 existing ACC units at Madison Avenue
Phase 8a
46 new mixed-income units at Madison Ave

Construction
- Build 20 new public housing (ACC) units on Madison Avenue site
- Build 26 new LIHTC mixed-income units at Madison Avenue site
- Build new community Center (700 net square feet), playground, and trail connections and Madison Avenue site.
- Complete final phase of Crescent Halls Rehab (remaining 19 units)

Relocation
- Fill 4 new ACC units at Madison Avenue with families on temporary relocation vouchers
- Relocate 16 Riverside Avenue families to new Madison Avenue units.

Demolition
- Begin demolition of 16 existing ACC units at Riverside Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 8a</th>
<th>South St</th>
<th>Westhaven</th>
<th>6th St. St</th>
<th>Mathis Dr</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>Levy Av.</th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Cmty. Halls</th>
<th>ACC (Total)</th>
<th>Units (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC (Exis)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC (Dem.)</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-103</td>
<td>-346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC (New)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Own.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC (By site)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 8b
25 new mixed-income units at Riverside Avenue
Rehab and Sell 4 Single Houses

Construction
- Build 11 new public housing (ACC) units on Riverside Avenue site
- Build 14 new LIHTC mixed-income units on Riverside Avenue Site
- Build new community room (550 net square feet), playground and basketball court and Riverside Avenue.

Relocation
- Fill 5 new ACC units at Riverside with families currently living in single houses
- Fill 6 new ACC units at Riverside with families from CRHA waiting list

Home-Ownership
- Rehab and sell 4 single houses as affordable home-ownership
  (Ridge, Hinton, Elsom, and Monticello)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 8b</th>
<th>South 1st</th>
<th>Westhaven</th>
<th>6th St. St</th>
<th>Meche Dr</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>Levy Av.</th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Crew. Hths</th>
<th>ACC (Total)</th>
<th>Units (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC (Existing)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC (Demo.)</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC (new)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfHC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Own.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC (by site)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Charlottesville Master Plan

#### Preliminary Financing Plan Summary - Scenario 5

| Task | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | 2033 | 2034 | 2035 | 2036 | 2037 | 2038 | 2039 | 2040 | 2041 | 2042 | 2043 | 2044 | 2045 | 2046 | 2047 | 2048 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| **Total Sources** | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 | 558,400 |
| **Relocation** | 148,000 | 134,000 | 80,000 | 20,000 | 382,000 | 39,000 | 94,000 | 100,000 | 104,000 | 60,000 | 779,000 |
| **Soft Costs - Commercial** | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 | 611,274 |
| **CRHA Tax-Exempt Capital Funds Financing** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total Market Rate Rental Units** | 0% | 11% | 19% | 18% | 28% | 40% | 19% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **HOPE VI** | 2,367,286 | 3,468,654 | 3,446,574 | 8,117,486 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 | 17,400,000 |
| **Soft Costs - Housing** | 1,728,950 | 2,512,410 | 2,552,174 | 2,409,645 | 480,000 | 9,684,084 | 1,748,470 | 2,470,441 | 2,493,711 | 2,973,137 | 3,413,721 | 22,783,563 |
| **Homeownership Sources** | 1,560,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **On-Site Infrastructure** | 650,000 | 1,538,611 | 1,538,611 | 1,697,778 | 5,425,000 | 1,370,000 | 1,370,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 | 8,165,000 |
| **LIHTC Units** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total Rental Units** | 36 | 100% | 58 | 100% | 58 | 100% | 64 | 100% | 103 | 100% | 45 | 100% | 45 | 100% | 66 | 100% | 103 | 100% | 45 | 100% | 45 | 100% | 66 | 100% |
| **Total Development Costs Per Unit** | 218,494 | 214,172 | 218,759 | 313,622 | 200,000 | 56,268 | 255,904 | 258,140 | 212,085 | 245,341 | 207,513 |
| **Number of Relocations (1 move)** | 74 | 67 | 63 | 53 | 50 | 52 | 25 | 46 | 83 | 34 | 229 |

---

**Note:**
- The table above represents the preliminary financing plan summary for Scenario 5 of the Charlottesville Master Plan. It outlines the sources of funding, their allocation, and the resulting total development costs per unit. The table also includes the number of relocation moves and the total number of rental units over the specified years. The plan accommodates various types of units, including HOPE VI, LIHTC, and homeownership units, with specific funding mechanisms such as tax-exempt capital funds and soft costs. The financing plan aims to ensure a balanced distribution of costs over the plan's duration. **Building a Multi-Year Development Plan**
Notes on Financial Sources and Uses Chart

1) Levy and Westhaven have been determined to be strong candidates for a HOPE VI or similar HUD revitalization program. A HOPE VI grant of $22 million, the maximum amount allowed under the 2010 application round, has been assumed.

2) All acquisition for Westhaven would be as part of the third phase of that project. All acquisition cost projections are estimates; appraisals have not been prepared.

3) Westhaven Phase 3 includes 20,000 SF of ground floor retail space. Retail component would likely have to be owned and financed separately from the residential in a condominium structure. Current market for speculative retail development is difficult, and delays in financing retail would delay implementation of residential as the components are in the same structures. Retail loan underwriting based on rough estimates and further market analysis is required. Section 108 or other low cost City financing could allow retail to lower rents and attract tenants.

4) Relocation costs are based upon $2,000 per move and are related to the theoretical relocation numbers listed in the Chapter 5 multi-phase plan.

5) Housing authority administrative costs and community and supportive service costs have been included as standard components of HOPE VI Revitalizations. Community Supportive Service costs have not been estimated for the non-HOPE VI phases due to the fact that HOPE VI can be used to fund CSS programs. Continuing CSS beyond the limits of a HOPE VI or other, similar grant would require a combination of obtaining support from partner organizations, subsidizing the program out of CRHA operating funds, and obtaining other federal or local grants (see Appendix F for further discussion of options for CSS).

6) HOPE VI funds per phase are based on current HUD TDC and PH replacement unit requirements, with the exception of Westhaven 3, where additional funding is shown due to acquisition costs. The Westhaven unit mix or the allocation of acquisition costs would need to be changed to meet current HOPE VI funding requirements.

7) FHLB AHP funds are projected at $9,000 per unit. The AHP amounts shown fall within the range of past awards, but these are competitive funds and securing funding for every component may be difficult and CRHA is advised to discuss the projects with FHLB lenders and potentially target the funds to certain projects.

8) Further market analysis of the for-sale market is required. At the assumed $250,000 sales price, HOPE VI subordinate loans to home buyers averaging $65,000 would enable the homes to be sold to families between 70% Area Median Income and 80% AMI.

9) Equity pricing is projected to increase moderately during the redevelopment period.

10) Further market analysis of Westhaven is needed to determine appropriate non-Public Housing rental mix on a per phase basis.

11) The selected plan for Riverside is a result of resident input. Deleting the acquisition parcel from the Riverside phase could result in the reduction of units from 25 to 16, and will likely result in a reduction in the funding gap of over $2 million ($1,000,000 from acquisition)
An Alternative Scenario for Riverside

After completion of the Multi-Phase Development Plan (also commonly known as Scenario 5) the consultant team re-evaluated the possible acquisition costs for the purchase of additional land at Riverside Avenue versus the number of added units (25 units vs. 16 at the present site). Depending on the final appraisal of the land, the additional 9 units at Riverside Avenue might not justify the acquisition costs. As such, we are showing an alternative "Sources and Uses" summary for Phase 9 to reflect a 16 unit rehabilitation of Riverside Avenue for the sake of comparison, (see site plan and sources and uses budget at right)
In March 2010 the CRHA Board of Directors requested that WRT study higher density options for three of the Housing Authority’s public housing sites: Westhaven, South 1st Street and Sixth Street SE. These higher density scenarios were labeled “Scenario 6”. As stated in Chapter Three, this request originated from a desire to push the master plan study toward several widely-held community goals:

- Increase the inventory of affordable housing in Charlottesville, in order to begin to address the unmet need for affordable housing in the City and region.
- Increase income mixing on public housing sites to close to the ideal of 1/3 ACC units (at or below 30% of AMI), 1/3 Low-Income Tax-Credit Eligible, non-ACC (between 30% and 60% of AMI), and 1/3 above 60% AMI up to market rate (traditionally referred to as the “workforce band”).
- Use the increased density and income mixing to also push for greater mixed-use (commercial, retail and residential) on CRHA’s public housing sites in order to better integrate the developments into their surrounding neighborhoods.

Alternative Scenario 6

WRT undertook this task with a view towards achieving the desired 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 mix and increasing density while still being mindful of the overall financial feasibility of the plan and the requirement of one-for-one replacement of public housing units. As a result, all three of the denser site plans adhere to a common set of assumptions:

- Dwelling unit densities are kept at or below density allowed as-of-right under the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Charlottesville. This stratagem keeps the overall approval timeline for each site to the minimum identified by Neighborhood Development Services staff (9 to12 months).
- Building construction classification remains primarily wood frame. Keeping the buildings primarily wood framed, as opposed to concrete or steel construction, reduces the cost premium for higher site density. This limits the height of proposed midrise buildings topping out at 5 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings topping out at 3 stories, and the mixed-use midrise buildings stepping in in a retail/ commercial/services podium under four stories of wood frame flats. The mixed-use buildings at Sixth Street SE and Westhaven and the two-story community center at Westhaven are the only new structures in either scenario that are envisioned to have elevators.

- Parking is all designed to be at-grade. This limits site development costs. Some design devices were employed to minimize the site impact of parking in specific locations:
  - A podium/ plaza deck is proposed above parking on grade at Sixth Street SE in order to restore lost open space to the plan and allow for access to upper stacked flat units from the common plaza level.
  - A tuck-under parking configuration was proposed at Westhaven to take advantage of the steep grade between Hardy Drive and West Main Street and reduce impervious surface coverage.

It should be noted that a preliminary “sources and uses” analysis of the additional costs for increased density, mixed-income and mixed use on CRHA’s public housing sites appears to show that the financial gap (the portion of the total project cost for which a funding source has not yet been identified) increases as a result of the higher density scenarios. This seems to be due to the fact that “market” rents in Charlottesville are not high enough to overcome the higher costs associated with building on a public housing site. These additional costs include Davis-Bacon wage rates, Section 3, and the additional associated reporting requirements. It is also an open question as to whether a market-rate buyer or tenant in Charlottesville would choose to pay top-rent at a mixed-income site when other alternatives exist in the City and surrounding region.

That being said, we support the goals of providing higher density, income mixing and mixed use in Charlottesville’s public housing. The additional costs simply present a challenge and may require a greater level of support from City, County, State or Non-profit partners.

A description of each alternative site scenario begins on page 81.
Westhaven

Westhaven’s overall unit count is proposed to increase from 180 in Scenario 5 to 255 in this plan (Scenario 6). The denser Westhaven scenario is envisioned to be built-out in four roughly equal phases with a total unit breakdown as follows:

- 100 new public housing (ACC) units
- 80 new LHXTC mixed-income units
- 75 new market-rate rental units

The increased site density at Westhaven was accomplished by providing additional stacked flats and making commensurate reductions in the number of duplex units. This raises the building height on site from an average of 2-1/2 stories to 3-1/2 stories.

The site would also contain a new 8,000 net square foot community center (on two floors), and new playground and community garden space to be located adjacent to the community center on a central open park space. In drawing this alternative scenario, WRT also took the opportunity to offer minor adjustments or alternatives in building placement:

- The community center was relocated farther north in this alternative site plan so that it now sits at the intersection of Hardy Drive and the “new” street. This places it roughly on axis with (and more visible from) the intersection at West Main Street,
- In response to a comment that was made during the Phase III open house meetings, WRT re-studied the site grading and determined that the street connection from Hardy Drive to Page Street could remain and still make the road connection to West Main Street. The primary road network through the site now meets in a four-way intersection in between the community center and the open space/park.
South 1st Street

South 1st Street’s overall unit count is proposed to increase from 98 in Scenario 5 to 116 in Scenario 6. This scenario is envisioned to be built out in two project phases with a total unit breakdown as follows:

- 40 new public housing (ACC) units
- 36 new LIHTC mixed-income units
- 32 new market-rate rental units
- 8 new affordable for-sale units

The on-site mix of building and unit types has been modified slightly to accommodate the higher density. Duplex buildings have been largely replaced by townhouses in longer rows. The number of three-story stacked flat clusters on site has increased from 6 to 23.

Similar to Scenario 5, this Alternative Scenario 6 would also propose substantial rehabilitation of the existing community center and maintenance facility, and new playground and community garden space to be located adjacent to the community center on a central open park space fronting on South 1st Street and extending east towards the ravine and the creek. New nature trails along the ravine have been proposed as part of a future trail network envisioned to extend to Jordan Park on the south and towards Sixth St SE, the Ix Building property, Levy and the central business district on the north. (See section on ‘small area plans’ in Chapter 6).
Sixth Street SE

The proposed alternative scenario at Sixth Street SE represents the most radical departure from Scenario 5. Overall unit count is proposed to increase from 40 in Scenario 5 to 108 in Scenario 6. Like South 1st Street, this scenario is envisioned to be built out in two project phases with a total unit breakdown as follows:

- 40 new public housing (ACC) units
- 36 new LIHTC mixed-income units
- 32 new market-rate rental units

Of the three sites studied in this exercise, the on-site mix of building and unit types has changed most dramatically at Sixth Street SE. Where Scenario 5 had relied upon rehabilitation of existing townhouse buildings and the infill of new duplex buildings along Sixth St and two new townhouse buildings along Monticello Avenue, the alternate site plan has radically re-conceived the site with new unit types in mixed use structures (mid-rise flats over commercial / retail and services) traditional stacked flats and stacked flats accessed from a plaza deck.

This alternative scenario places the community space in the ground floor of the mixed-use building at the corner of Monticello Avenue and Sixth Street SE. Retail/commercial services would also be accommodated in the ground floor of this building (closest to Monticello Avenue).

The alternative site plan also allows for a through-connection from Bolling Avenue to the IX Building. This connection could allow in the future for a mixed use redevelopment of the northern portion of this site.

In response to a comment at the community meeting in December, the QCC garden has been proposed to remain at or near its present location, maintaining the relationship of the two garden spaces (the other being located across Monticello Avenue at Friendship Court). The height of the south wing of the proposed mixed-use building would be limited to no more than three stories in order to maintain a sun pocket for the garden.
## Building a Multi-Year Development Plan

### Charlottesville Master Plan

#### Preliminary Financing Plan Summary - Alternate Scenario 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 Rental</th>
<th>Phase 2 Rental</th>
<th>Phase 3 Rental</th>
<th>Phase 4 Rental</th>
<th>Phase 5A Rental</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Homeownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Breaks 1</td>
<td>Cost Breaks 2</td>
<td>Cost Breaks 3</td>
<td>Cost Breaks 4</td>
<td>Cost Breaks 5A</td>
<td>Homeownership</td>
<td>Homeownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>Weatherspoon</td>
<td>Weatherspoon</td>
<td>Weatherspoon</td>
<td>Weatherspoon</td>
<td>Cost Breaks 1</td>
<td>Cost Breaks 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources</td>
<td>5,400,000</td>
<td>2,313,739</td>
<td>3,469,470</td>
<td>3,676,053</td>
<td>7,581,710</td>
<td>3,086,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Funds</td>
<td>2,313,739</td>
<td>3,469,470</td>
<td>3,676,053</td>
<td>7,581,710</td>
<td>3,086,179</td>
<td>18,658,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity from PHA Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Guaranteed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA Title V Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB Fund</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Equity</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Resource Assumptions

- Total Sources: 18,658,000
- Total Costs: 17,817,901
- Total Net Benefits: 840,100

### Total Units

- Total Rental Units: 303
- Total Homeownership Units: 12

### Project-Based Section 8 Units

- Total: 0%
Comparison of Scenario 5 and Alternate Scenario 6

The major goal of Alternative Scenario 6 was to increase housing unit density on three targeted sites for the purpose of creating opportunities for mixed use and mixed income development. The Unit Mix chart at right compares unit count and income mixing from Scenario 5 to Scenario 6, showing how the number of units and the targeted income bands for the units increased from Scenario 5 to Scenario 6. It is important to note that the sources and uses charts for the two scenarios indicate that the financial “gap” (the portion of the total anticipated project cost for which a “source” of funds has not yet been identified) increased by $10 million with the increase in unit count and density on the Westhaven, South First Street and Sixth Street SE sites (see comparison of financial models chart at lower right). This increased gap is due to the disparity between the relatively high cost of building residential units on public housing sites and the income that can be generated from renting market rate units on these sites. For example, the consultant team has determined that a rent of $1500 to $1600/month for a two-bedroom apartment would be sufficient to leverage enough debt and equity to cover the funding gap due to increasing the unit density. An analysis of comparable market-rate projects in Charlottesville determined that the upper end of the rental market in Charlottesville is just over $1,300/month for a 2 bedroom unit. This makes increased density and the increase in market rate units depicted in Alternative Scenario 6 more of a funding challenge.

Comparison of Unit Mix and Income Mix (Scenarios 5 and 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario 5</th>
<th>Scenario 5</th>
<th>Scenario 6</th>
<th>Change 5 to 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Units (ACE)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate Rental Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>+90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Homeownership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>+961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Financial Models (Scenarios 5 and 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario 5</th>
<th>Scenario 6</th>
<th>Change 5 to 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOPE VI or Choice Neighborhoods</td>
<td>$17.4 million</td>
<td>$23.9 million</td>
<td>+$6.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Debt</td>
<td>$11.7 million</td>
<td>$20.4 million</td>
<td>+$8.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity from 9% Tax Credits</td>
<td>$71.3 million</td>
<td>$80.6 million</td>
<td>+$9.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA SPARc Loan</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA AHP Funds</td>
<td>$3.6 million</td>
<td>$4.2 million</td>
<td>+$0.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Equity</td>
<td>$0.7 million</td>
<td>$0.7 million</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE VI Sub. Mortgage</td>
<td>$0.6 million</td>
<td>$0.6 million</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private NonHomebuyer Sources</td>
<td>$1.6 million</td>
<td>$1.6 million</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARc Homebuyer Sub. Mortgage</td>
<td>$0.2 million</td>
<td>$0.2 million</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identified Sources</td>
<td>$109.6 million</td>
<td>$134.7 million</td>
<td>+$25.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses</td>
<td>$115.8 million</td>
<td>$150.8 million</td>
<td>+$35.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap in Sources</td>
<td>$6.2 million</td>
<td>$16.2 million</td>
<td>+$10.0 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Plan Recommendations for Levy, Sixth St SE and Westhaven with 2006 Commercial Corridor Study Recommendations

In 2006 the City of Charlottesville commissioned Torti Gallas and Partners to perform a planning study, looking at key corridors within the City. The goal of the study was to establish urban design guidelines for major commercial corridors in order to capitalize on private investment within the City. These recommendations were incorporated into the City’s Zoning Code as a series of corridor zoning overlay districts. Of CRHA’s properties, the Levy Avenue and Sixth Street SE sites are within the Downtown Extended Corridor zone. The Westhaven site, while not itself within a corridor zone, sits adjacent to the West Main North Corridor. As such, parcels that may be acquired in order to make connections from Westhaven to West Main Street will be subject to Corridor zoning.

At Levy Avenue, the 2006 Corridor Study recommended “urbanizing” the intersection by orienting new construction in favor of the pedestrian. With the contemplated purchase of the parcel at the southwest corner of Avon Street and Garrett Streets, CRHA is now in a position to be a major player in the revitalization of this gateway intersection. The Corridor Study also recommended the construction of “live-work” lofts on CRHA’s parking lot at Levy. While this report did not make the same recommendation as the Corridor Study for this parcel, the live-work concept could still ultimately become a part of the mix for Levy, incorporated along with fewer public housing units. Alternatively, the site could be used as a temporary public housing relocation resource, reverting at a later date to another use or shifting its income mix over time as other public housing sites are redeveloped or rehabilitated.

At Sixth Street SE, the Corridor Study recommended that the site be redeveloped as a mixed-income community, but tied its redevelopment to the redevelopment of the Ix Building property to the west. An infill building was shown at the intersection of Sixth Street SE and Monticello Avenues, and a new courtyard of residential development that opens up to Bolling Avenue. In this Plan, Scenario 5 reinforces the street wall along both Monticello and Sixth Street SE with new infill townhouses and duplexes along the street frontage. Alternative Scenario 6 takes things several steps further by increasing housing density and unit mix on the site. The courtyard opposite Bolling Avenue is envisioned as a future connection to the north half of the Ix Building property. The proposed building at the corner of Monticello and Sixth St SE is set back at the corner in order to allow the QCC community garden to remain as a neighborhood amenity.

Image from the 2006 Commercial Corridor Study by Torti Gallas and Partners. The Levy site is outlined in red at top right, the Sixth Street SE site is highlighted in blue at bottom left.

Plan for the Levy Avenue site (orange), with the adjacent former auto service station parcel at the intersection of Levy Avenue and Avon Street (yellow). CRHA has begun substantive negotiations to acquire this parcel as part of a larger redevelopment plan for Levy Avenue.

Image from the 2006 Commercial Corridor Study by Torti Gallas and Partners. Sixth Street SE, Scenario 5. The infill housing proposed along Monticello Avenue and Sixth Street SE reflects some of the urban design recommendations called for in the 2006 Commercial Corridor Study.

Sixth Street SE, Alternative Scenario 6. The large mixed-use building on the corner of Monticello and Sixth St SE is pulled away from the corner in order to allow the QCC community garden to remain in its present location. The boulevard street shown in the middle of the site aligns with Bolling Avenue, and could someday allow for a connection to the Ix Building property as part of a larger redevelopment.
At Westhaven, the Corridor Study envisioned a connection of the West Main Street Corridor through the Westhaven site in order to re-connect the commercial corridor with the 10th and Page neighborhood to the north. The plan also envisioned the supermarket site along West Main Street as a potential physical linkage between Westhaven and West Main Street. Both Scenarios 5 and 6 respond to these recommendations by connecting Westhaven to West Main Street and 10th Street NW. The Corridor Study envisioned a grid of streets running through Westhaven to connect West Main to Page Street at several points, but constraints of grading and private property along Page Street led the consultant team to limit street connections to areas where they were both technically feasible and presented the greatest potential positive impact to Westhaven and to the surrounding neighborhoods. Scenario 5 shows a plan to eliminate the street connection of Hardy Drive to Page Street. Scenario 6 proposes keeping this street connection.
Sustainable “Green” Design

The units and sites in this master plan are all planned so that they will be eligible to meet the Enterprise Green Communities checklist or the US Green Building Council’s LEED program. These programs will meet the threshold criteria for HUD HOPE VI and other federal funding programs for redevelopment.

One of the significant challenges to incorporating sustainable “green” practices into the design and construction of affordable housing is the perception that it requires a series of expensive “add-ons” which increase the cost of the project significantly. While this can be true in the construction of large, suburban homes on green-field sites, this has not proven to be the case with multi-family affordable housing. Over the last three years WRT has been involved in certifying eleven affordable housing projects in the LEED for Homes program. Through this experience we have found that “green” design does not have to carry a substantial cost premium, and that programs like LEED and Enterprise Green Communities have inherent advantages for the design and construction of affordable housing:

• These programs reward the design and construction of modest-sized units in dense, walkable urban communities on sites that have been previously developed and contain links to existing utility infrastructure.
• For any new construction, both programs require enrollment in the Energy Star for Homes program. Building affordable Energy Star units reduces monthly heating, cooling and lighting costs, and therefore offers a tangible payback to tenants of Energy Star developments.
• The LEED for Homes program rewards projects that are designed and built with durable materials that by their design minimize potential damage from insects, weather, site drainage, and interior moisture and humidity. Durably designed buildings cost less to maintain and will last longer.

Rehabilitate or Build New?
One of the issues to be carefully weighed in any discussion of sustainable design is the issue of rehabilitation of existing buildings versus redevelopment and new construction. In many ways, the most sustainable approach is rehab, since the embodied energy in the existing buildings is mostly retained in a rehab scheme over a redevelopment. This is only one issue to consider, however, in the decision of whether to rehire and rehabilitate an existing project or build new, and must be evaluated against the ability to cost-effectively rehabilitate a building or unit in a way that provides the amenities of modern living and supports larger City-wide goals of creating fully-integrated mixed income neighborhoods.

Recycling During Demolition and Construction
Both demolition and construction phases should include a construction waste plan to divert recyclable materials such as glass, wood, paper, and metals. Concrete debris accumulated during demolition activities can often (with approval by the City engineering department) be reused as sub-base under new roads and building pads. This greatly reduces the amount of waste trucked off-site during that demolition phase. Other affordable housing development projects have demonstrated the construction waste stream diversion rates of 38% to 50% are achievable without excessive added cost.

Resident Health and Quality of Life
From the standpoint of improving the lives of public housing residents, there are three areas where the interests of “green” design and social justice intersect: reducing the cost of living through energy efficiency, improving resident health through better indoor air quality, and similar health benefits in the outdoor environment.

• Reducing the Cost of Living—The mandating of programs such as Energy Star in conjunction with LEED or Enterprise Green Communities in the rehab or construction of new housing will serve to reduce the cost of heating, cooling and lighting the units. Regardless of whether the housing authority or the residents are paying the utilities, the strategy of reducing utility costs pays benefits to quality of life either directly through reduced monthly utility bills, or through reduced cost of site operations, which can then be used to improve resident services and site maintenance.

• Better Indoor Air Quality—(Improving resident health through better indoor air quality) green design provides the following benefits:
  • The use of non-toxic pest control methods, such as termite shields, treating of wood framing with a water-based borate solution, sealing of gaps and cracks in floor slabs and keeping foundation plants 24” away from building walls (in lieu of toxic soil treatments).
  • Use of low VOC sealants and paints
  • Use of Green Label Plus carpeting,
  • Use of higher-grade air filters on furnace return grilles (HEPA filters)
  • Mandating a 1-week pre-occupancy unit flush-out. (Windows to be kept open for 8-hours per day for 5 continuous days with the furnaces on fan mode to expel dust and contaminants and replace stale air with outdoor air.

• Outdoor Environment
  • Installation of lockable bicycle storage on site (either exterior storage closets at each unit or common storage kiosks)
  • Reduce turf grass on site by 40% to 90% by adding areas of native drought-tolerant groundcover to replace lawn. This reduces the need for toxic chemical fertilizers and pesticides and also reduces lawn watering costs and mowing.
  • The utilization of alternative stormwater management techniques such as bio-swales, rain gardens and permeable asphalt paving can be used to increase infiltration and site permeability. These techniques can frequently be used to reduce or eliminate the need for stormwater detention ponds.
  • Mandating the use of Zero HCFC “R410a” refrigerant in AC condensers, R410a, sometimes known by its trade name “Puron” is becoming more widely available in lieu of the more common R22 refrigerants.