
New Directions

Issue Number 9

<http://www.arlingtonnewdirections.org>

Winter 2003

Arlington New Directions Coalition
524 N. Jackson Street • Arlington • Virginia • 22201
703 • 243 • 5775

Death and Taxes

ANDC Opinion

This is not another rant about the “Death Tax”. We cannot undo the fiscally irresponsible and, we would add, unjust actions of Richmond or Washington in seeking repeal of this over-hyped “burden”. But we can, we hope, speak with some effect about local taxes, the real estate property tax in particular.

We gear up for another budget cycle. In this edition we include budget-oriented articles by the Chair of The Concerned Parents for Arlington Adult Services and by the Executive Director of The Reading Connection, an Arlington-based nonprofit.

Many will attend the March 25th Budget and the March 27 tax rate hearings [schedule on page 11]. The stories we have heard and will hear at the budget hearing are wrenching. Despite our community’s overall affluence, there is great need. We must decide if we are serious about the County Vision adopted by the Board last year [<http://www.co.arlington.va.us/cbo/initiatives/vision.htm>], and we can’t delude ourselves that Richmond will help us.

Read Carol Skelly’s piece about the crisis in housing and services for adults with mental retardation and developmental disabilities. She notes that the County will find temporary placement for those in crisis. This means “elderly parents, who have taken care of their disabled child all of their lives must die before their children are placed in residential care.” (Sometimes we pay taxes so others can die in peace.) And, Chistian Dorsey notes that there are many under-funded human services needs. He questions whether our need assessment methods are up to the task.

There is always a big crowd for the budget hearing. But those committed to our values and the Vision must finish the task at the tax rate hearing, which is, in comparison, sparsely attended. In

Continued on page 11

Contents

- 2.....Local Heroes: Saving the Gates
- 2.....Correction
- 3.....Better Assessment of Need Required for Under-Funded Human Services
- 3.....Report from the Tenant Forum
- 4.....Living Wage Campaign Update
- 4.....The Fight to Save Oakridge Apartments
- 5.....Juvenile Justice in Arlington: Locking Up Too Many Kids at Too High a Price
- 5.....Redevelopment of Columbia Heights Apts. — An Analysis

Arlington’s Crisis in Housing for the Developmentally Disabled

By Carol Skelly
Chairman, Concerned Parents for Arlington Adult Services (CPAAS)

[Quick summary: Arlington has taken several positive steps recently to alleviate the crisis in residential care for its citizens with MR/DD, but has stopped short of removing people from its ever-expanding waiting list. Deferring action in the hope that the State will come to the rescue is not consistent with the local community’s commitment to the developmentally disabled, nor is it a pragmatic solution to the problem, given the State’s current budget difficulties. It is time to develop a strategic plan, backed by the necessary local dollars, to address this need.]

Arlington’s shortage of housing and services for adults with mental retardation and developmental disabilities (MR/DD) has reached crisis proportions. Department of Human Services staff have identified 23 adults with MR/DD who are vulnerable to homelessness, usually because of the age or health of their caregiver family members. On average, four adults per year lose their homes. While the County generally finds at least temporary placement for those in crisis, the upshot is that elderly parents, who have taken care of their disabled children all of their lives, must die before their children are placed in residential care. In addition, 10 Arlingtonians who have been recommended for release from State institutions are waiting for homes in the community.

The Need for Residential Support

The need for MR/DD housing supports is rising rapidly for several reasons. First, medical technology is saving an ever-increasing number of fragile infants who have lifelong cognitive impairments. The number of students requiring special education in our schools is growing and the incidence of developmental disabilities, especially autism, is also rising. In addition, people with developmental disabilities are living longer. Downs syndrome, for example, often results in heart problems that are more easily treated than in the past, resulting in longer life expectancy.

Many adults with developmental disabilities require daily supervision and some need round-the-clock care. At a time when the incidence is rising, families on average have less capacity to meet this need. Families are smaller than they were a generation ago and extended families are less likely to live near one another. Also, with more women in the workforce, there are fewer full-time caregivers in the home. These trends are often cited in connection with the crisis in care for the elderly, but they pose even greater problems relative to the developmentally disabled.

Continued on page 6

Local Heroes: Saving the Gates

By John M. Welsh
Director, Multifamily Housing, AHC Inc.

Arlington has a high quality of life, and its close proximity to Washington has made it desirable for both homebuyers and real estate investors. As a result of the investment boom, developers have razed older apartment buildings and converted others to luxury rates. The outcome has been that Arlington County has lost 5,000 units of affordable housing for low- and moderate-income families in the last two years. The Gates of Arlington was about to become the next statistic, another disappointing loss of affordable housing. However, the prospect of losing the Gates, 465 units located on North Glebe Road, motivated local government officials, housing advocates, and a local developer to save this affordable housing resource. It was a unique, community effort.

Bidding for the Gates began in late 2001. A top Washington developer/builder had the property under contract. Because of the historic designation, size, and other issues, the developer requested financial support from the county, despite plans to dislocate most of the residents. The county rejected that bidder and would not support their bid for the Gates. Other suitors followed; most were prominent local developers, but a few were large real estate investment trusts (REITs), well-financed owners with the resources to simply pay cash for multi-million dollar properties.

AHC learned of the possible sale of the Gates in April, 2002. AHC met with County staff to discuss our desire to acquire the Gates, preserving the property as affordable housing and planning for future renovations. We also learned that the County Manager, at the request of Board Members Chris Zimmerman and Charles Monroe, had convened a Gates "working group," including County Board Members, staff, housing advocates, and local residents who are housing professionals. The working group met with prospective purchasers and evaluated those proposals, working with bidders to negotiate terms that would best sustain the Gates for low- and moderate-income families.

In the beginning of May, the bidding for the Gates grew more intense. While AHC had support from housing advocates and the County, the seller liked the simplicity of working with a REIT. The two REITs that were still bidding had lots of cash and could offer

the seller a very quick settlement, 30 days compared to our 90 days. We were fortunate that the seller realized the benefits, for himself and the residents, of agreeing to sell to us. To that end, AHC had three things working in its favor.

First, the County government was committed to the Gates' residents. The County took the unusual step of specifying its goals for the Gates in a letter to the seller. This powerful acknowledgement of support differentiated AHC from our richer competitors. Moreover, the seller recognized the benefit of working with a buyer who had County support.

Second, we offered the highest price. We knew from the seller what the other bidders were offering. After numerous offers and counteroffers during the course of two days in late May, we had a breakthrough. The discussion turned from price to other deal terms. We had the right offer and moved on to finalize the settlement date. Within a few days, we had a signed purchase contract, gaining site control of the property.

The third factor in our successful bid to buy the Gates was strong community support and participation, especially from several housing professionals who live in Arlington. I am convinced that, despite the county's financial and political support, and our offer, the deal would not have happened if not for the effort of four local people; they were our aces, and winning hand.

However, before telling you of their contributions, let me give you some background into the project financing. The existing financing would dictate every decision, every consideration because of the substantial legal restrictions controlling it. As we moved from summer to fall, we were still pouring over legal issues; this nearly exhausted the seller's patience, and almost killed the deal.

In early 2002, the seller, Hall Financial in Texas, refinanced their mortgage on the Gates using a loan that was then transferred to a Real Estate Mortgage Investment Conduit (REMIC). A REMIC is a complex structure where loans are pooled and sold to investors as mortgage-backed securities. Because these are tax-driven vehicles, there are significant restrictions on modifications

Continued on page 9

Correction

We would like to make the following corrections to Andi Cullins' article on patterns of discipline in Arlington Public Schools in issue number 8.

The data used in the article is attributed to a report of the Minority Affairs Advisory Committee. The material was, however, taken from a draft and not a report of the full committee. Further, only the raw data in the report is the product of APS. Any application or analysis of the data was provided by an individual member of the committee.

Finally, in paragraph #1 we erroneously stated that there was an over-representation in disciplinary actions for Hispanic students. This is incorrect. Over-representation was limited to African-American students in all but one category.

New Directions is the newsletter of the Arlington New Directions Coalition (ANDC). ANDC reports on local news and presents formal ANDC positions. *New Directions* also publishes articles and opinion pieces consistent with ANDC's mission and values concerning critical public issues in Arlington County.

For more information about contributing an article or opinion piece to *New Directions*, contact Mary Rouleau at: (703) 527-1063 or lmaryr@comcast.net

Editorial Board

Jack Cornman, Carlos Luna, Charlie Rinker, and Mary Rouleau.

Better Assessment of Need Required for Under-Funded Human Services

By Christian Dorsey

Executive Director, The Reading Connection

As the Arlington County Board considers and adopts a budget for fiscal year 2004, it must do so amid the backdrop of a County Board election. If last year is any indication, there will again be pressure on the Board to reduce the real-estate tax rate. The Board's rate cut did not reduce budgeted services in 2003, yet that should not be the sole litmus test for determining whether reducing real estate taxes is a sound idea. For example, the Board should also examine whether current levels of funding for human services are sufficient given the rising rate of need in our community.

The County Manager has projected a net \$9 million fund balance at the end of FY 2004. Traditionally, the County Manager budgets conservatively, so we can reasonably expect a FY surplus of a few million more. Arlington has preferred to use those funds for one-time projects like capital improvements—a practice that is fiscally prudent. Yet there are consequences to budgeting in this manner, and one of them is that human services needs go unmet or inadequately funded.

An area where this is evident is in funding for the homeless and those at risk of homelessness. Our problem is that we budget attention to the needs of homeless families based on numbers that reveal only a small piece of the puzzle. In determining how many homeless live in Arlington, the County relies on point-in-time counts performed at shelters and on the street at the beginning of last year. No allowance is made for those turned away from shelters, those living temporarily in motels or with friends, or those who were simply missed.

These "point-in-time" counts are a good beginning, but cannot be the end of our assessment of homelessness in Arlington. To illustrate how flawed our process is, Arlington estimates that there is virtually no unmet need when it comes to sheltering families with children, yet the waiting and turn away lists at our local shelters tell quite a different story.

This is just one example in a long list of under-funded human services needs. We can do a better job of improving the quality of life and self-sufficiency of in-crisis individuals if we:

- Accurately count and track those in need
- Gauge the expected outcomes of a yearly budget authorization in meeting that need
- Use state and federal fund increases to increase expected outcomes and not to reduce local funding
- Free up surpluses from the general fund to bridge the gaps in care

In Northern Virginia, only the City of Alexandria has more children in poverty than Arlington County. We can and must do better. It will not be easy to find the money and tools to solve all our community problems. However, as the County takes this annual opportunity, through the budget process, to commit to values and principles, it should be open with the community about how far we still have to go.

The Reading Connection, based in Arlington, provides services to homeless and near-homeless children. Christian can be reached at cedorsey@juno.com or 703-528-8317.

Report from the Tenant Forum

On October 26, 2002, ANDC and several co-sponsors including Buyers and Renters Arlington Voice (BRAVO), Arlington Interfaith Council (AIC), and Freddie Mac held a Forum "Challenges and Problems Facing Arlington's Low and Moderate Income Tenants" at the Arlington Mill Community Center. With the decrease in apartment availability in Arlington County, especially in the area of affordable rental housing, these organizations and others thought that it would be helpful to hold a community forum about the situation.

Purposes of the Forum:

1. *To listen* to tenants' experiences, concerns, questions and suggestions;
2. *To provide information* from professionals on the issues;
3. *To educate the general public* about procedures and resources with regard to renting, tenants' rights and developments in the area.
4. *To make recommendations; and*
5. *To encourage ongoing, open and constructive dialogue* among residents, community leaders, politicians, and housing professionals.

The Tenant Panel

ANDC President Charlie Rinker began the forum with some background demographics regarding the housing situation in Ar-

lington. He noted that Arlington County has the most diversity in Northern Virginia, and that tenants make up fifty-six percent (56%) of the total Arlington population. Two tenants, Antonio and Ida, provided stories and comments that generated lively contributions from members of the community, experts in the field, and county officials and employees.

Antonio reported that he had been evicted (displaced by re-development) three times, the first two times with only 30 days' notice. He and his family were traumatized by the events. The first time he didn't know his rights; his furniture and other belongings were put out on the curb, where they were stolen off the street. The family had a newborn infant at the time. They wound up by the river, homeless, with no knowledge of where to go. His children are still afraid when someone knocks on the door unexpectedly. The second eviction notice was extended to 120 days. **BUGATA** (Buckingham and Gates of Arlington) and **BRAVO** intervened and he and his family were able to stay in a motel (but only to sleep). He paid half of the costs. He never received his deposit back from the second landlord. He has stayed in Arlington because of the school system, so that his children will get a good education. Thousands of renters in Arlington have experienced similar situations. Antonio wants the County to take the problems more seriously and to stop the injustice.

Living Wage Campaign Update

A coalition of union, religious and community activists has come together in Arlington to campaign for a living wage in our county. Living wage ordinances have passed in more than 100 cities and counties nationwide. In general, they require companies that get service contracts from local governments to pay workers a “living wage”—a pay rate tailored to each city or county, but enough to lift a family out of poverty. Living wage ordinances make sense because they can improve the quality of services—workers have higher morale and fewer turnovers—and because they send the message that taxpayers will not tolerate their money being used to exacerbate poverty in their communities.

Arlington activists were inspired to begin the campaign by the victory of our neighbors in Alexandria. In June 2000, after a spirited campaign, the Alexandria City Council passed a living wage ordinance. Since then, members of the city council led the successful effort to squash attempts at the state level aimed at preventing localities from passing living wage ordinances, and two more cities in Virginia (Richmond and Charlottesville) have enacted their own living wage ordinances.

The living wage movement has definitely had a political impact. But its most important impact has been on the lives of hun-

dreds of working men and women—parking attendants, janitors, security guards—who are now making a decent wage.

One of these workers is Temesgen Hagos, a parking lot attendant in Old Town Alexandria, who emigrated from Ethiopia so his four daughters could have a better life in the United States. Before the city council passed the living wage ordinance, Hagos earned \$6.54 an hour at his job at the city garage. He had to take a second job to make ends meet. In addition to basic living expenses, he was paying college tuition for all four daughters. “So that my daughters could study full time and better themselves, I did not want them to work,” he says. But on his low wages, the family’s financial situation became untenable. All four young women quit school and went to work full time. “My dream could not come true of coming to the United States and sending my children to school so that they could become useful citizens,” he says.

After passage of the living wage ordinance, Hagos’ hourly wage jumped to \$9.93 an hour. (Today, for contracts initiated or renewed in the year between July 2002 and June 2003, the living wage rate is \$10.69 an hour.) Hagos quit his second job. His children are back in school full time. They all eat dinner together almost every night. “Everyone in my family is happy

Clearly, these higher wages translate into better lives for workers in Alexandria. But there’s more to it than that. As Makonen Habtemarian, another parking lot worker, put it: “There’s a big difference, but it’s not all in terms of dollars and cents.” After his wages were boosted, he also quit his second job. “Now I’m only working one job, and the main thing is I get to have time with my wife and my children,” he told the New York Times in a July 2001 article. “Sometimes I go to the theater or a concert. These things give some meaning to life.”

Activists in Alexandria proved that unions, community activists and people of faith could take on some powerful adversaries and pass a law that both improves the quality of services to residents and the lives of hard-working people. It can be done in Arlington, too. Members of the campaign are circulating petitions in support of the living wage. To help in this effort or for more information about the Arlington Living Wage campaign, contact Keith Willis [willisk@seiu.org] or Mary Rouleau [lmaryr@comcast.net] call at: 703-527-1063.



The Fight to Save Oakridge Apartments

By Susannah Pickney, Oakridge Tenant

Oakridge Apartments stands as one of the last vestiges of low-income housing in the Courthouse neighborhood and plans for its destruction have resulted in a community united to protect affordable housing, if not the buildings themselves. The current garden-style buildings that make up the complex sit on a shady block of North Troy Street between 13th and 14th Streets, catty-cornered to the County police station. Sandwiched between high-rise condominiums and office buildings, the Oakridge’s old-growth oak trees planted between and around the buildings make the grounds of the last pieces of open, green space in the area.

The developer, Gables Residential, has proposed a 16-story, 398-unit luxury apartment building that requires a zoning change. The plan also requests bonus density from the County to provide

33 units of “affordable housing.” Gables proposes charging \$1500 a month for the market-rate units, and approximately \$1000 per month for the “affordable” units, based on the 60% median income range established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

This proposal has been met with heavy resistance not only from Oakridge residents, but also adjacent condo owners, the civic association RAFOM, and other advocacy groups. It also gained media attention with sympathetic articles in *The Washington Post* and *El Tiempo Latino*, and a brief segment on Fox News. Chris Zimmerman, County Board Chairman at the time, made statements to the press that a building of this size provides no benefit to the community, especially without a one-to-one replacement of the 55 affordable units standing to be lost. Affordable housing proponents hope other members of the Board will view the project similarly if it reaches a final County vote, or better that the proposal never

Continued on page 7

Juvenile Justice in Arlington: Locking Up Too Many Kids at Too High a Price

By James S. Turpin, CAE
Chair, Northern Virginia Juvenile Detention Commission

Few people are aware that in the last ten years, Arlington County utilization of juvenile detention has more than doubled. The costs and impact of this trend are taking a real toll in terms of both money and people.

The Northern Virginia Juvenile Detention Center is a regional facility serving the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts in the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church and Arlington County. The facility has 70 beds- 52 pre-trial and another 18 for those who have been adjudicated. Each jurisdiction appoints members to a regional commission who oversee the institution.

The Virginia juvenile detention system is unique because of its level of local control and autonomy. In most states, the entire juvenile justice system is administered by the state. To reduce the state's role and costs, Virginia's local governments operate their

own facilities, usually on a regional basis. According to the Code of Virginia, the state is required to pay 50% of the costs. However, the support actually received from the state has been declining. Last year, the state contributed 33% of the cost of operations of the center. With the current state budget situation, there is the likelihood that this number will again be reduced. Some even support the state simply turning all of the costs over to the local governments.

The remainder of the funding for the Center comes from the three local governments and is based on a jurisdiction's three-year utilization of child-care days; each jurisdiction's share of the budget is determined by its utilization of child-care days.

One youth staying one day equals one child-care day. For the last budget period, the Detention Home had a total of 21,900 pre-dispositional (pre-trial) child-care days (365 days x 60 beds) and 3650 post-dispositional child-care days (365 days x 10 beds) available for the three jurisdictions. (Due to a state code change that took place on July 1, 2002 allowing more youth to be held on a

Continued on page 7

Redevelopment of Columbia Heights Apts. — An Analysis

By Charles Rinker

Most affordable housing supporters (including me) supported the 109-unit Columbia Heights Apts. redevelopment project approved by the County Board on 2/8/03. The project met several community-identified goals that were incorporated into the approved plan. The Columbia Heights Apts. (to be renamed "the Monroe Apts." in honor of deceased Board member Charles Monroe) provides a good example of a project where (on the one hand) a community committee was pro-active in creating a much better project than that initially proposed by the developer, while (on the other hand) one that could have been even better if County Board members and staff had better understood the developer benefits and measured the benefits to the community in comparison to the benefits to the private for-profit developer. The project also provides insight into the residential development process as practiced in Arlington and how even relatively community-friendly developers use the system to get more than their fair share of benefits.

Background: The Approved Redevelopment Plan

Silverwood Associates (SA) is a for-profit developer that redeveloped the 134-unit Marbella Apts. in Ft. Myer Heights in 1999, the 110-unit Patrick Henry Apts. near Seven Corners in 2001, and the 172-unit Quebec Apts. on Columbia Pike in 2002 — with low-income housing tax credits, and Affordable Housing Investment Fund (AHIF) loans from the County. SA has a contract to buy the 152-unit Columbia Heights Apts. in Columbia Heights West. Current rents range from \$609 to \$740 for 1BR's and from \$704 to \$850 for 2BR's — serving households at 40% and 50% of area median income (AMI). A tenant survey reveals that 51% of the households earn below 40% of AMI, 10% earn between 41% and 50%, 12% earn between 51% and 60%, 19% earn between 61% and 80%, and 8% earn over 80%. 64% of the households are Hispanic, 31% are Asian, 2% are African-American and 3% are Caucasian. 51% of the households earn too little to afford the minimum proposed rents; and 45% of the units are overcrowded.

The SA plan approved on 2/8/03 will demolish 43 apartments and build 96 new condominium units, 10 of which will be affordable to households earning 60% of AMI (\$43,500 for a family of 2 and \$54,400 for a family of 4) — one of the community's goals to get some homeownership units. Some of the 27% of the tenant households that earn too much money to qualify for the renovated rental units should be able to purchase some of these condos. The condominium portion of the project will come before the County Board this summer.

Silverwood plans to substantially rehabilitate the remaining 109 apartment units. The approved plan has 75% of the units at rents that serve 60% AMI or below, and 25% at rents that serve 50% or below, with the County putting up \$3,200,000 in AHIF dollars. (Rents at 60% of AMI will be \$825 for 1BR's, \$990 for 2BR's and \$1,200 for 3BR's.) In addition, the County will seek project-based Section 8 rental assistance for 25% of the units, and will provide County Housing Grants as rental assistance to the lower income households as well. These approved parts of the plan meet another community goal — to minimize displacement of current residents.

In past SA projects only 33-38% of existing residents at time of purchase were actually living in the property after rehabilitation. The community thought that developers could do better, but understood that increasing retention would take a lot of personal communication with residents, as well as a lot of assistance by persons trusted by the tenants. So, at the community's urging, SA agreed to commit \$40,000 to pay an entity selected by the tenants association and SA to pro-actively assist households become knowledgeable about and access to rental assistance they will need to remain at the property. The selected entity's bilingual staff will be advocates of existing residents and accompany them as needed and requested to access provided rental assistance.

Background: The SA Development Costs and Financing

For persons who want community-friendly development that protects economic and cultural diversity and produces smart growth, it is absolutely critical that we "follow the money". To ig-

Continued on page 10
page 5

The analogy of care for aging family members is helpful in understanding the human dimension of this issue. Many families are familiar with the physical, emotional, and financial costs of providing care for aging parents. These issues are much the same for developmentally disabled children, except that they are *life-long*, instead of *life cycle*, in duration. And unlike an aging parent, a child is not likely to have built up a financial nest egg. Despite these obstacles, parents whose children have MR/DD typically make whatever sacrifices are necessary to make their children's lives healthy and happy. So it seems especially cruel that these same parents are left to wonder what will become of their children when they die.

Issues with State Funding

Arlington, like many other jurisdictions, has traditionally regarded funding for MR/DD housing supports as a state responsibility. This is a legacy from the preceding generation, which was the first to see persons housed in state institutions return to their local communities to live. Since that time, the assumption has been that the State would continue to provide funding under the Medicaid Waiver program, which relies on both state and federal funding. "Waiver" means that the Medicaid coverage that would pay for institutional care is "waived" and replaced with support for community-based care.

Unfortunately, Virginia ranks among the lowest states in the country in funding for MR/DD services; while 12th in per capita income, it is 45th or lower in per capita spending. Under its current budget constraints, the State is not providing any new Medicaid Waiver housing slots. Thus, while the need is growing, the number served has remained the same—hence, the burgeoning waiting lists.

In addition to the dearth of new housing slots, there are two other critical gaps in the support provided by the State. The first is that not all individuals who need housing support qualify because the functional criteria for eligibility are quite low. For example, someone who is unable to prepare food qualifies, but someone who can prepare food, but not manage money or medical appointments, may not. Fifty-six persons, including 23 at high risk of losing their caregivers, are waiting for residential placements in Arlington. Only 33 of the 56 are eligible for the residential Medicaid Waiver.

The second problem with State funding is that reimbursement rates do not cover local salary costs. Virginia's reimbursement rates have not risen since 1991 and entry-level wages for group home workers now average about \$2 per hour below the State average for nurses aides. The result is that the local nonprofit agencies that provide residential services cannot hire and keep staff; according to the Arc of Northern Virginia, turn-over rates in some regional group homes average 150 percent, raising serious health and safety questions. Some local agencies say they cannot serve new clients even if the State approves more Medicaid Waiver slots, because of their inability to provide staffing.

Arlington's Contribution

Arlington provides housing to 95 adults in local residential programs, of whom 58 receive funding from the State. The number served has risen by only one during the past three years, largely due to the State's limited funding of new Medicaid Waiver slots.

The County spent \$942,000 in local funds in FY 2002, or one percent of the total DHS \$75,846,618 budget, for housing support costs not covered by the State or other sources. Arlington has been unwilling to fund new slots, but has maintained its commitment to current clients by covering part of the rising costs incurred by non-profit service providers. Despite this commitment, a cross-jurisdictional comparison shows that Arlington spends about 40 percent fewer local dollars per capita (based on total population) on all MR/DD services than does Fairfax (\$19.07 Arlington, \$32.00 Fairfax). Arlington's local per capita expenditures exceed Alexandria's \$14.40.

Arlington made a major step forward this fall when the County Board approved a \$7.6 million supportive affordable housing fund, setting aside special federal dollars under the LPACAP (Local Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plan) program to increase housing stock for persons with disabilities, including those with MR/DD. The investment fund will provide "bricks and mortar," but will not resolve the crisis in MR/DD housing unless accompanied by a significant increase in annual funding. This is because the largest cost component is not the building structure, but the support and services of the staff providing care.

Whose Responsibility?

The current system, in which the State and County each try to shift the ultimate financial responsibility onto the other, is not serving anyone well and, indeed, has resulted in a "compassion gap" vis-à-vis Arlington's most vulnerable citizens. The State's record of low funding levels is patently abysmal, and local elected officials, County staff, human services advocates, and families must maintain maximum pressure on the State to provide more funding, including legal action if such a course would be constructive.

But a strong case can be made that Arlington County should assume the primary responsibility for management and funding of MR/DD residential needs. The notion that the State alone should pay is a throwback to an era when it was assumed that people with developmental disabilities belonged in State institutions. Expressions of our community's values continually stress the importance of each individual, and of integrating those with disabilities into our neighborhoods and workforce. If we want to keep our citizens with developmental disabilities living and working in Arlington, then it is time for the County to take the leading role.

In addition to the community's value system, funding priorities should recognize that the County's revenues are rising while the State's are falling. Thus, as a purely practical matter, it is not realistic to expect that the State will resolve this issue in the near future.

The Search for Solutions

The search for solutions should put the County in the driver's seat while, at the same time, acknowledging that there are limits to the County's resources. Encouraging steps have already been taken. County staff has recently completed a case review of those waiting for services, including an update of their eligibility for Medicaid Waiver. A non-profit agency, Community Residences, will also establish two intermediate care facilities (ICF's) in Arlington later this year, with the support of County staff. These are group homes that meet the stringent requirements for State institu-

Continued from page 6

tions and thus qualify directly for Medicaid funding without using up scarce Medicaid Waiver slots. Such facilities are only appropriate for clients with very high needs and thus have limited application, but they are a creative means of expanding services at minimum local cost.

Also, as previously mentioned, the County has instituted a supportive affordable housing investment fund to benefit all disability groups, which includes a needs assessment study. A key goal of the study is to identify innovative and cost-effective delivery models that can leverage funds from a variety of public and private sources.

Building on these efforts, the County Board should initiate a

Continued from page 5

post-dispositional basis at the local level, the number of post-dispositional beds was increased to 18 and the number of pre-dispositional beds was reduced to 52.)

Arlington County's utilization has more than doubled over a period of ten years. For the most recent three-year period (FY 00-02), the child-care days for Arlington averaged 41,089 (61.47% of local utilization), thus Arlington's share for the FY 03 budget is 61.47% of the local contribution. This trend appears to be accelerating- for December, 2002; Arlington's utilization rate was 75%.

What does this mean, just in terms of the budget? For the FY 03 Arlington County budget, the costs of juvenile detention represented the second largest increase (second only to correctional healthcare at the adult detention facility). But this only represents part of the story. The human costs are even higher.

Several factors appear to contribute to this increase. During the late 1980's, there was an increase in the birthrate in both Arlington and Alexandria (as reported by the Northern Virginia Planning District). This generation is now becoming "at risk youth".

In addition, the changing demographics of Arlington County appear to be playing a role. It should be noted that many believe there is an over-representation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system. In discussion with detention staff, it is evident that the parents of these youth are at a disadvantage negotiating a multi-faceted legal/social system along with a lack of understanding of the availability of legal and social assistance. Language barriers, education, and a general distrust of governmental agencies further

Continued from page 4

reaches this point.

The Oakridge residents represent a diverse group of Arlington citizens, from graduate students to seniors, whose rents average \$600 per month. Having been informed that they will receive the County's minimum relocation payment of \$600 when asked to move, tenants face a rental market with average costs nearly double what they pay now for a comparable one-bedroom unit. Many Oakridge residents are low-income households, seniors living on fixed incomes, or families with small children, but the developer has thus far refused to consider any relocation settlement greater than that required by the County.

So far, the mixture of community protest and concerns over the building's size and design has caused several delays in the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) process. The two most recent

multi-year plan to place those in greatest need *before* their caregivers die or become disabled, so that the caregivers can both participate in the transition and be reassured about its outcome. A pro-active County plan should involve families in both placement and funding decisions, including connecting families with estate planning services so that available assets can be utilized for the future care of their loved ones. And finally, but perhaps most important, the County's plan must address the urgent need of nonprofit service providers for higher reimbursement rates so that they can pay competitive wages; otherwise, clients with funding may well find themselves with no place to go. *The author gratefully acknowledges contributions of information and statistics from the staff of the Arlington County Department of Human Services. She can be reached at tskelly152@aol.com or 703-522-2007.*

complicate the issue. Due to these factors, we may well see the increase of detention increasing because the parents do not know where to turn for assistance prior to their child becoming involved in the juvenile justice system.

In addition to race and economic status, the educational system also comes into play. Most (virtually all) of the children held at the juvenile detention center have been diagnosed with special educational needs. When the schools fail to address these needs, this can lead to frustration and increasing anti-social behavior on the part of the young people.

While Arlington appears to be a relatively safe community, that is not the case for all of our citizens- particularly our young people. As part of the educational program for the youth, the Center published a newspaper (similar to a school newspaper) done entirely by the residents. One story was especially troubling. A fourteen year old from Arlington wrote that in many ways he was happy to be back in detention because it was safe and people cared. This is a sad commentary on our community that someone so young wanted to be incarcerated in order to feel safe.

Quite simply, Arlington's utilization of detention is the result of choices we have made and continue to make as a community and a judiciary with regards to the justice system. There is a cost- both monetary and human- that is incurred every time a child is sent to detention. This cost has both near and long term consequences.

For additional information, please contact James S. Turpin, CAE, turkop@worldnet.att.net or 703-248-6988.

SPRC meetings were heavily attended by neighborhood residents who were unanimous in their opposition to the project. No additional meetings have occurred since early December, and sources say the developer is reassessing the project. Significant delays of this sort are costly to developers and the neighborhood continues to hope Gables will withdraw its contract purchase and construction proposal. If and when this occurs, interested parties must explore alternatives such as refurbishing the existing structures.

Oakridge, its residents and the Courthouse community hope to serve as a county-level civic lesson: that a united community can steer development trends more effectively than the General Land Use Plan, business as usual, or deep-pocketed interest groups. Stay tuned for more.

For more information, contact Susannah at: shpinc@yahoo.com or 703-351-8175.

Ida: “An affordable place shouldn’t have to be a horrible place.” Ida addressed safety and security issues facing low-income tenants. Leases often are offered only on a month-to-month basis. Many landlords’ attitudes are “If you don’t like it, you can go.” Apartment complexes are not very well kept. Tenants fear retribution if they speak up. They don’t know their rights and responsibilities. It’s hard to know what maintenance should be when a building is almost falling down. Ida has often done her own repairs. Landlords fix only small things.

Ida suggested a need for major attitude changes in the situation. We should talk about quality of life for human beings who need a place to live as well as to sleep and eat. When attitudes change toward people, living situations will also improve. It is important to educate and train people in their rights as well as in responsibilities. The County should be more pro-active in this area.

The Expert Panel

Daniel Figg, from A-SPAN, provided information about housing grants, Section 8 rentals, APAH and AHC. Roadblocks: a limited number of properties will not accept housing grants. Section 8 has a waiting list, and few properties are willing to accept Section 8 renters. Mr. Figg knows of only 14 out of 150 large managed properties willing to accept Section 8 terms and renters. Of the 14 that do accept Section 8 renters, some may apply the same credit rating standards as for market rate renters, and may still apply minimum income requirements - especially difficult for permanently disabled renters. The Arlington County Housing Information Center has a bilingual staff and gives out listings of complexes with affordable units [703-228-3765]

Bill Ross is the Chair of **Tenant-Landlord Commission** in Arlington that has nine members - 3 tenants, 3 landlords, and 3 public interest representatives. The role of the Commission is to balance tenant/landlord issues. The Commission deals mainly with tenant complaints. The Commission works with issues regarding maintenance, legislative matters, rent increases, and relocation guidelines to protect tenant interests. **BRAVO** has helped to bring issues to the Commission. However, there are legal limits, which means that the Commission often can do little other than to put pressure on landlords to improve their maintenance of properties.

Bennett Downey, **Legal Services of Northern Virginia**, works primarily with housing and consumer issues and can help with questions regarding tenants’ legal rights. LSNV serves those who are income eligible and those over the age of 60, regardless of income. He is available on Wednesday afternoons at the Department of Housing Services, 1916 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 200. He said that tenants are under a great deal of pressure due to a lack of affordable housing, and that private landlords often take advantage of tenants.

Melodie Barron, **Division Chief of Alexandria’s Landlord-Tenant Relations Board**, active in housing programs for almost twenty years, said that the number of affordable units in Alexandria has also been decreasing rapidly. Alexandria is now more aggressive in funding affordable housing, and is making serious commitments to changes in housing policy. It is now funding rental housing and non-profit development, and has made significant financial changes to reduce the negative impact of the rental situation.

Question and Discussion Periods

There were questions and issues raised after each panel, including:

- Questions/issues regarding the 120 day notice of eviction;
- Procedures/issues involved in qualifying for an apartment;
- Whether and how tenants can withhold rent if owners do not maintain property;
- Issues surrounding code enforcement, heating/AC systems and bug infestation;
- The County’s Housing Grants program and the Section 8 process;
- The correlation between the affordable housing crisis, low wages and the need for a Living Wage ordinance; and
- The number and status of the homeless

Summary of Issues and Questions

Sylvia Brennan, attorney for **Alexandria Office of Legal Services of Northern Virginia**, provided a summary of the presentations and discussions, and placed some issues in perspective as challenges to be addressed by Arlington County. She indicated that we are in a real crisis, which impacts greatly on low-income renters in Arlington. Sylvia also applauded the involvement of tenants in the presentations. It is important, she said, to hear the human aspect of the situation, the impact of housing on jobs, education, and childcare programs.

Major issues to be considered:

- Virginia is largely a property owners’ state
- The vast majority of laws regarding housing are pro-landlord.
- Virginia has no rent control to cap rent increases
- Property costs are extremely high now

Major questions to be asked:

- Where do we go from here?
- How do we deal with the high level of property values?
- How can we impact affordable financing?
- How do we deal with immigration and minority issues?
- How can we make changes that will bring more landlords into greater involvement with housing concerns and programs for the low and very low-income tenants of Arlington County?

Recommendations

- We need to address attitude issues more creatively in terms of human factors in basic to approaches in dealing with housing issues.
- We should work toward changes in housing laws. For example, HUD should adjust assistance based on increases in fair market values.
- We need to educate tenants and homeowners as to rights and responsibilities so that services and procedures will move more quickly. Arlington County staff should do more in this area.
- The availability of Spanish speaking staff in the County and community and professional organizations should be increased. Translation of materials is important for all

Continued from page 8

- ethnic groups.
- Today's forum should be a wakeup call to community organizations. Community groups should engage more people in the community, and increase outreach to local communities.
- Professional service organizations and community organizations should work more closely with the County and state government to impact and make improvements in the housing situation in Arlington.
- Specific areas of concern in which the County Board and

staff can be pro-active include:

- voluntary rent guidelines
- changes in local ordinances, zoning restrictions regarding density
- providing the Tenant-Landlord Commission with a "no retaliation" law that has teeth in it
- the large percentage of Hispanic residents in Arlington (18%) need better representation in addressing these areas
- the underserved disabled and people with mental disabilities

Continued from page 2

to the loan, and a wide variety of legal and business requirements for participants in the process.

G.E. Capital, GMAC, FannieMae, and Freddie Mac are significant players in the REMIC arena. While these firms are integral to the REMIC process, there is a whole support structure of asset management companies, attorneys and bond rating agencies with strict compliance measures and legal requirements to ensure the sanctity of the REMIC pool. Thus, assuming one of these loans can be an arduous process because the lender must ensure that the new owner has equal capacity and finances to the current owner.

Besides having the County loan, the team of lawyers and advocates had to make AHC look comparable to the seller who owns five times more units than we do. To make this happen, we had to educate the lender and their advisors that AHC had the financial sophistication and resources to assume this complex REMIC loan. We educated them in nonprofit accounting and our typical financing approach, municipal finance, compared to what they are most familiar, conventional financing.

The exhaustive legal work for both the business side (document review, opinions, organizational filings) and real estate side (survey, insurance, contract) took weeks to complete. Because REMIC loans do not allow for secondary debt (mortgages), we had to structure the County loan to AHC to function as equity. Coordinating with the REMIC attorney how to structure \$16 million loan as equity took skill and patience, but it also took a desire on part of the attorney to work with us to make the transaction progress. That's where we found our first, and perhaps most unexpected, ace.

The REMIC loan's representative, GEMSA (formerly G.E. Capital), is based in Houston, but their attorney is located in Washington. This may not seem like anything special, but he also happens to live in Arlington. He knows about the affordable housing crisis here; he also knows the community. The magnitude of the issues and the numerous due-or-die deadlines would have likely overwhelmed lesser counsel, killing the deal. His determination and patience was essential in finally closing the transaction.

Our second ace was Charlie Rinker, who was closely involved from the beginning. His affordable housing achievements are legion. He was a tireless meeting convener, and suggested numerous ideas to improve our chances of REMIC approval. Charlie

always remembered that the residents at the Gates were primary, and fought to have a local purchaser who would not displace the residents. He and other members of Arlington New Directions supported AHC, knowing that we would better serve the families living at the Gates.

ANDC member Van Varick was our financing expert and third ace. Working on Structured Finance at Freddie Mac, Van was wholly familiar with REMIC transactions. His participation on key conference calls helped to assure the lender, their attorney, the Wall Street rating agencies, and various REMIC bondholders that AHC's assumption of the REMIC loan was viable and would present no issues for them. His list of contacts and familiarity with the loan assumption process prepared the next reviewers in line to be prepared for our proposal.

Our last ace, John Morland, helped on a personal level. As a member of the County's "working group," John reviewed project documents prepared by the very first prospective buyer. With the help of a mutual friend, John contacted the seller and developed a friendly relationship. As a housing professional himself, John was able to understand the seller's concerns about the potential loss of alternative potential sales if the AHC deal fell through. John was able to provide the seller assurance that the rather complicated financing proposal of AHC would actually work if the seller would be patient. Because of his relationship with the seller, we were alerted to emergencies that arose during the roller coaster ride over this past summer and fall. Some of his calls helped assuage the seller's concerns and kept him committed to our contract. We were also fortunate that the seller preferred to sell to an affordable housing buyer if such a sale could be arranged consistent with the seller's obligations to his partners.

The community involvement yielded a winning hand that sealed the deal for us. Without our four aces, we would likely have lost the deal and the residents could very well have been wholly displaced from the Gates.

In the end, the Gates community won. AHC Inc. purchased the property in partnership with Arlington County and FannieMae. We were successful because the county put forth a unique, substantial loan, and because local residents recognized the great need and community benefit to saving the Gates of Arlington. The property is under new management and has a new name, the Gates of Ballston, and the security of remaining affordable housing.

nore or glaze over the redevelopment numbers does not give one analyzing a project the information he/she needs to understand it. Moreover, the County Manager’s report to the Board and the staff reports to the Housing Commission very seldom outline the costs in enough detail to be understood by either the County Board members or the Commission members.

The total development cost for the purchase and redevelopment of the 109 rental units (taken from information in the County Manager’s report) is \$17,604,477 or about \$161,500 per unit:

Uses of Funds/Development Costs

- \$7,852,000 — price/cost to acquire the property (\$71,000 per unit to seller)
- \$6,658,875 — costs for renovations (hard const. costs, some related soft costs plus possibly demolition of the 43 units where the condominium is being built)
- \$1,493,602 — soft costs other than those included above and the developer’s fee
- \$1,600,000 — developer’s fee (\$14,680 per unit)
- \$17,604,477 — total uses of funds/development costs

The sources of funds for the purchase and redevelopment are as follows:

Sources of Funds (Assuming 9% Tax Credits)

- \$7,369,968 — conventional mortgage (Wacovia Bank)
- \$6,434,509 — low-income housing tax credit equity from investors
- \$3,200,000 — Arlington County AHIF residual receipts loan (\$29,360 per unit)
- \$600,000 — portion of developer’s fee deferred and paid from project cashflow
- \$17,604,477 — total sources of funds

The per unit purchase price is the highest seen to date along Columbia Pike for units in very bad condition. The Quebec Apts. had a purchase price of \$59,000 per unit when purchased two years ago. The Gates of Arlington Apts. (in the Buckingham area) was purchased in November, 2002 at \$75,000 per unit. Those familiar with these transactions say that Arlington’s real estate market is so “hot” that developers like SA go in and bid up the purchase price of a property in order to get an owner to sell, on the assumption that they can get a site plan approved and/or large amounts of County AHIF dollars to make the project work to their benefit and profit. Developers and property owners take advantage of the County’s affordable housing crisis and the reality that Arlington is a very strong rental market — by putting the County in a position to put up large amounts of dollars to “save” affordable housing that is no longer affordable after renovation (without deep subsidies) to existing households living in the properties. The developer’s fallback position (should the County not approve a site plan or provide the needed AHIF dollars) relies on the fact that they can always flip the purchase contract to another developer (like a real estate investment trust with a lot of cash) or redevelop the property to serve a higher income clientele. In at least three of the Arlington properties that SA owns, SA outbid non-profit developers who could have done the development at the same costs, but who are not inclined to put themselves in a position of brinkmanship with the County,

where they may have to flip the property or gentrify its occupancy.

Of the \$1,600,000 developer fee, \$1,000,000 will be paid to SA at loan closing (though perhaps as much as \$400,000 may need to be put for a period into project reserves), and \$600,000 will be “deferred” and paid out of project cashflow over the first 5-to-10 years either prior to or in equal amounts to the AHIF loan repayment. Since SA has indicated it will spend approx. \$700,000 of its own money in predevelopment costs (costs incurred before lender funds are available), once SA closes on its financing and gets its pre-development costs reimbursed plus its paid development fee, SA will have done the deal with no equity (none of its own money in the project).

SA manages the property for the life of its ownership and receives a property management fee. When the limited partners in the ownership entity (i.e., the tax credit investors) are no longer receiving their tax benefits, they will probably sell their partnership interests for the “exit taxes” that they will owe on the sale of their interests plus a modest profit — probably to SA as the general partner — and in the end SA is likely to become the full owner of the partnership interests and thus the property at its appreciated value. Quite a bonanza for a company and its principals that buy and renovate the property without putting any equity into it.

Other Benefits Which the County Should Have Extracted from the Developer

There are at least two other community benefits that the County Board and staff should have extracted from the developer:

First, a limit or cap on the annual rent increases the property owner can take in the years following year one, in order to retain real affordability for the initial resident households. That cap should be something like the lesser of the annual increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or 5% per year. The only requirement of the tax credits program is that the annual rent increases not be more than what a family can afford with 30% of its income at the 50% or 60% of AMI levels. SA said before the County Board that it intends to take the maximum rent increases it can under the program. With the rapid increase in AMI over the last few years, some resident households in other “affordable projects” have had to move because their incomes did not go up fast enough to afford the rent increases tagged to the AMI. This proposed rent increase cap is not onerous because the owner’s mortgage payments are fixed over the period of the financing, and because the mortgage payments portion is about 60% of the total monthly costs to the owner. Because the owner’s cost is subject to increase only on the operating portion of the costs (the remaining 40%), a CPI or 5% increase of rents will more than cover any increases in operating costs. Indeed operating expenses would have to increase by more than 12.5% for a 5% annual increase not to cover the increase in costs. Under a special circumstance, the owner could petition the County Manager to waive the rent increase cap if such were necessary; but in this situation, the rent increase would be subject to review by a public body before rent increases above the cap could be taken arbitrarily.

Second, an agreement of the property owner to sell the property at a discounted price in the future to the tenants or a non-profit developer. The County, the tenants association and/or the non-profit housing corporation should be provided an option to pur-

chase the property at the end of the tax credit period and at the end of the extended affordability period, as well as a first right to purchase the property should the ownership entity decide to sell before the purchase option is exercised. The public purpose of the purchase option and first right is to preserve the property as affordable for a longer period, and (if purchased by a tenants association that represents the majority of the residents) to provide homeownership to the residents at affordable costs. The option and first right must be at a substantially below-market purchase price (or it is not realistic or affordable) and the terms suggested to the County Board were either the outstanding debt on the property plus the exit taxes of the partners in the ownership entity plus \$250,000; or at 50% of the appraised value of the property at the time that the option or first right is exercised. SA agreed to what it agreed to do in the Quebec Apts. — namely, to sell the property to a tenant association or a non-profit housing corporation at 90% of the appraised value at the time of sale. But a 90% arrangement puts the tenant association or a non-profit corporation in no better position than it is now to buy and develop the property as affordable. If the property were valued at \$25,000,000 in 30 years (about a 3% per year increase in value), the purchase price at 90% of value would be \$22,500,000 — hardly a bargain! One very good thing on this point did come out of the Board’s discussion. The Board decided to look at trying to develop a formula for future projects where the for-profit developer and the County, non-profit organization and/or tenants association might share in the property’s appreciation, and then be able to use that appreciation share to buy the property and keep it affordable and/or provide homeownership.

If we as a County are going to preserve our threatened affordable housing or build any new units, we must understand what the for-profit developers are doing and making; and if we do, we will be more aggressive and demanding on behalf of the Arlington community.

recent years, those in search of a tax cut have well out-numbered those supporting maintenance of the current rate. Frankly, many of the tax-cutters’ arguments have a lot more to do with the consequences of a “free market” than with taxes.

The Arlington County Taxpayers Association has its on-line petition activated and has been a constant presence at County Board hearings. One posting to the ACTA web asks if it is “time to end the ‘continued services budget’ and begin forcing the county to adjust to a ‘essential services budget’ that only funds what’s impractical to do individually, takes care of those that can’t take care of themselves and leaves the rest of us alone.”

Well, we’re a community we hope, not isolated islands. Arlington does have many residents who need our collective help. Our community’s continued services are essential.

We think our County tax system and budget should be progressive, equitable and adequate to pay for needed services. It should reflect our County’s vision statement, our community’s goals and be responsive to economic conditions.

The County Manager recommends that current tax rates be maintained. Real estate tax revenues will reflect the jump in residential assessments. But, according to him, these added revenues will help offset the decrease in state budget support, rising insurance costs (9/11 effect) and flat growth in other taxes (personal property taxes and sales). And let’s not forget that for those who itemize their federal taxes, local real estate taxes are a deductible item.

It’s fashionable to call for a tax reduction. And, indeed, the Board did cut the real estate tax last year. But we must remember that the County’s revenue mix options are limited by the state law that requires that the real estate tax rate be the same for residential and commercial properties. Thus, the Board would have to cut the tax rate for all properties if it cuts the rate for any.

We know that rising assessments can cause hardship. But, the County has both tax exemption and deferral programs for the low-income elderly and disabled. We need to make sure that those programs are adequate for needs and explore whether other such programs are needed. And, of course, we need to make sure that we get the most bang for our buck in our budget.

Finally, we also want to note our disappointment that the County has not adopted last year’s recommendation by the League of Women Voters that the County, as part of the Budget Calendar, sponsor a public education session on the budget at least 2 weeks before the budget hearing.

HOW TO FIND COUNTY BUDGET INFO:

- To find the County 2004 Proposed Budget & Index on the web: <http://www.co.arlington.va.us/dmf/fy04proposed/index.htm>
- For the County Manager’s Message: http://www.co.arlington.va.us/dmf/fy04proposed/cm_message.htm
- To Check for changes in the proposed Work Session Schedule: <http://www.co.arlington.va.us/cbo/meetings/budget.htm>
- To find key County Financial Documents: <http://www.co.arlington.va.us/dmf/index.htm>

FY 2004 PROPOSED BUDGET WORK SESSION SCHEDULE

(Meetings in County Board Room 307 unless noted otherwise)

Tuesday, February 25	9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	Budget Overview & County Board, County Attorney, Electoral Board, Commissioner of the Revenue and Treasurer
Monday, March 3	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	DPW, Ballston, Metro, Utility fund, DES
Tuesday, March 4	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	PRCR, JDR
Monday, March 10	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	DHS
Wednesday, March 12	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	School Board Presents Budget @ Education Center
Monday, March 17	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	hold
Tuesday, March 18	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	CPHD/CDBG, DED, Travel and Tourism
Wednesday, March 19	8:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.	Fire, Police and ECC
Tuesday, March 25	7:00 p.m.	Budget Public Hearing @ TJ Theatre
Thursday, March 27	7:00 p.m.	Tax Rates Public Hearing in County Board Room 307
Monday, March 31	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	DTS, Libraries, OSS
Tuesday, April 1	9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	GDC, Sheriff, Commonwealth Attorney, Circuit Court
Monday, April 7	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	County Manager, DMF, HR, Compensation and Pay-go
Tuesday, April 8	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Strategic Options
Tuesday, April 15	9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	Follow-up
Tuesday, April 15	7:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Follow-up – Wrap-up
Tuesday, April 22	9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	Wrap-up
Saturday, April 26	8:30 a.m.	County Board Adopts FY 2004 Budget @ Regular Meeting

Arlington New Directions Coalition
524 N. Jackson Street
Arlington, Virginia 22201

NON-PROFIT ORG.
US POSTAGE PAID
MERRIFIELD, VA
PERMIT No. 2398

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

***WE MOURN THESE SONS OF ARLINGTON
WE GIVE THANKS FOR THEIR LIVES AND WORK
SO DIFFERENT IN STYLE, SO ALIKE IN VALUES***



I tell you that our vision is driven by our values. They are what and who we are, and they are ever present. One of those values is the capacity and willingness to treat others ethically—to respect the dignity of those around us. It means to, but for a moment, step into the shoes of another, and see the world through that person's eyes. And when we act ethically, and understand that

perspective, we move from selfishness, to selflessness. Many times we find ourselves alone, and outside of what is safe and secure, for it takes courage to act ethically. What is courage, but sustained initiative, based on conviction.

-Charles P. Monroe



You can't just have anger. St. Augustine said hope has two lovely daughters, anger and courage. Anger at the way things are and courage to see they can be better. There's got to be that belief we can be better. We made a theme of that, and I think it resonated with people. And finally, I think it was very important that people identified the person as a regular person. ..You've gotta remember that if I keep

taking positions, I'll be involved in a lot of controversies, and there will be people who disagree. I'm never gonna be Mr. All-Time Popular. But I'm doing well with people, and I think it's because they appreciate it if you come back to communities and you're there and you don't seem to be stuck up or fancy.

-Paul David Wellstone