



2022-23 CHATHAM COUNTY LEGISLATIVE GOALS

Orange indicates goals on NCACC's final adopted list

SUPPORT NC PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION (Dan) **(NCACC #2 Priority Goal)**

GOAL: The General Assembly should seek additional revenue sources, including a statewide bond referendum and expanded lottery proceeds, and changes to the Needs-Based Public School Capital Fund, to equitably address statewide public school and community college capital challenges.

BACKGROUND: Chatham County supports Any and all revenue sources that would support new construction and renovation of school facilities. New school construction is a significant capital expense for counties and could impact property tax rates as the county sees increased population growth.

REQUEST: Promote legislation that would revise the Needs-Based Public School Capital Fund that will allow more equitable access to counties to take advantage of the funds include:

- Allowing Needs-Based Public School Capital Funds to be used for renovations and improvements in addition to new construction.
-
- Eliminate the five-year prohibition of receiving funds from the Public School Building Capital Fund if a county receives a grant from the Needs-Based Public School Capital Fund by repealing G.S. 115C-546.2(f).

REMOVE RURAL BROADBAND BARRIERS (Dan) **(NCACC #1 Priority Goal)**

GOAL: Remove barriers that prevent counties from initiating and/or providing assistance for projects and services that would deliver broadband services to citizens, which includes:

- Removing barriers that prevent counties from obtaining funds for broadband projects;
- Removing restrictions that prevent providers from entering markets that are poorly covered by other providers;
- Increasing state funding, grants and loans to ensure all that inadequately served and unserved rural areas are targeted for broadband service; and
- Allowing local governments to be active partners in broadband initiatives, including allowing them, if willing, to lease county assets to broadband providers or to provide public broadband services themselves when necessary.

BACKGROUND: The benefits of high speed broadband access to all residents, regardless of location, have been well covered by media, advocacy groups and various sources, including the FCC and the White House. This need has been

made clearer by the impacts of the COVID pandemic. Broadband is vital to economic development, job training, education, health and safety. Current laws do not allow a competitive environment. They provide definitive areas which specific providers can serve and make it difficult or impossible for other providers to exist in those areas.

With territories held hostage by the large telecom providers and laws currently in place, the large telecom companies restrict access to this valuable resource and foster an environment where we are unable to determine who truly is not being served. The FCC now acknowledges that the telecom company service reports, which are required to the FCC every year, have been misleading. They also acknowledge that basing service rates on census blocks has incorrectly led them to misstate the percentage of coverage and are now considering ways to get a better understanding of real service levels. An easy solution would be to have the telecoms report all addresses served and the speed of service. The FCC could collect all addresses from all counties and use GIS matching efforts to:

1. Determine more precisely what the mapping of coverage really shows on specific address points;
2. Determine more precisely the percentage of homes with 'adequate' speeds; and
3. Using the above efforts, the FCC could then target funding to the middle and last mile needs more surgically.

REQUEST: Promote legislation that would remove these barriers and restrictions and put in place the support that will provide access to high-speed broadband to everyone in a highly competitive state. This means:

- Allowing local governments to be active partners in broadband projects serving the public, including allowing public facilities to serve as broadband hubs and providing some level of matching funds.
- Extending and increasing state funding for broadband efforts in rural areas that are unserved or under-served by broadband.
- Remove territorial locks that allow providers to pick who they will and who they will not serve.
- Promote FCC changes to the service reporting provided by telecoms to require precise addresses served with service details, mapping of the service addresses and targeted funding and requirement of telecom deployment to those targets.

REDEFINE OR REPLACE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TIERS (Bryan)

(NCACC General Government Goal #5)

GOAL: Redefine the current usage of the state's economic development tier system for distribution of non-economic development funds OR replace it with a system that recognizes the vast wealth disparities within counties.

BACKGROUND: In December 2015, the Program Evaluation Division of the General Assembly released a report calling for the dissolution of the economic development tier system. The report summarized various ways that these tiers have not been effectively used to get non-economic development funds to the most distressed counties. However, the General Assembly has failed to act on this report and continues to use the current economic tiers for various grants and programs.

Chatham County serves as a key example of why the current tier designations are grossly unfair. The western part of the county, including Siler City, remains a very economically distressed area, even though the eastern part of the county is considered to be fairly wealthy. Over the years, the county and the western area, including Siler City, have missed out on funding that would greatly help this area take major steps toward economic recovery. As a case in point, Siler City received \$4 million of a \$8.87 million requested of the Golden LEAF Foundation to run water lines to the CAM Megasite in Siler City, but the tier designation prevented the town from getting additional funds for wastewater lines to the megasite. ***See Attachment A for more information.***

Resulting from the request of multiple member governments, Triangle J Council of Governments (TJCOG) conducted an analysis of the hidden distress in Tier 3 counties. The TJCOG white paper, [link](#) here, conducts an analysis of the issue and offers several alternative recommendations. These recommendations include:

- The creation of an exception rule for municipalities significantly located within low-income census tracts;
- The adoption of new indicators of economic distress;

- The redesign of the tier system to operate as a census tract-based index updated every five years;
- The release of multiple indices of economic distress.

Some state funding programs have been amended, allowing for Tier 3 communities to apply for grant opportunities. Chatham County appreciates movement in this direction. Until a more permanent resolution can be reached, we ask that the state continue along these lines, which will grant access to critical funding opportunities to many communities in most need, but otherwise limited by the designation of the counties they happen to be geographically tied to.

REQUEST: We ask that the tier system structure recognizes the far-ranging economic differences that exist within counties, addressing distress that is hidden with the existing tier system structure. Triangle J Council of Governments issued a white paper identifying reasonable and responsible options for consideration relative to this request.

PROTECT THE PROPERTY TAX BASE FROM FURTHER EROSIONS & EXCLUSIONS (Bryan) (NCACC #5 Priority Goal)

GOAL: Recognize and oppose any legislation that would further erode the tax base of counties and potentially add to administrative costs.

BACKGROUND: Over the years, substantial legislation has been introduced and passed that has applied property tax exemptions, exclusions and deferments to specific property types. The trend to exempt or exclude more property types is on the rise. This has gradually shifted the tax burden to a shrinking group of individuals. The 23 different property types that have received reductions, deferments, or full exemptions often continue to receive the same level of county-funded services. One recent example is the “builders’ inventory exemption,” which allows a builder to exempt the value of the dwelling improvement until the property is sold, when the exemption expires. This exemption reduced Chatham County’s 2021 tax base by more than \$19 million in assessed value, which pushes the burden to other taxpayers, especially homeowners. This impact is exacerbated in light of expansive residential development that further burdens local tax dollars for the construction of new schools, emergency response and other such facilities and the expansion of critical services. These exemptions greatly impair local government’s ability to responsibly plan for and effectively respond to the needs of the people it serves. Another example is the new “brownfields exemption.” A secondary issue is the unfunded mandate aspect of these changes in the property tax system. Each new exemption, exclusion or deferment can be very complex to implement, often requiring additional staff resources, software and other costs.

REQUEST: Oppose further assaults on the property base through exemptions, exclusions and deferments that continue to shift the tax burden to homeowners of all income levels and create administrative costs for counties.

IMPROVE WATER QUALITY IN THE STATE (Dan) (Related to NCACC Environmental Goal #3)

GOAL: Improve water quality in the state.

BACKGROUND: Downstream water treatment facilities continue to face challenges as upstream industries and municipalities discharge contaminants into the water supply that requires additional cost to treat the water for consumption.

REQUEST: Expand or clarify existing laws that regulate industries directing hazardous chemicals or emerging contaminants to their wastewater stream, especially when the wastewater stream impacts the quality of life, the environment, or results in property loss/devaluation of neighboring or downstream communities. (Intent is to pay for treatment of public water or testing/treatment of private wells.)

PROTECT LOCAL CONTROL OF PLANNING, PERMITTING & INSPECTION FUNCTIONS (Dan) (Related to NCACC Environmental Goals #7)

GOAL: Recognize and oppose additional legislation imposing state control over local land use, permitting and inspection functions.

BACKGROUND: Over the years, substantial legislations has been introduced and passed that has eroded local control over land use, permitting and inspections functions. Such legislation has several broad negative impacts:

- **Limiting the voice of local voters in determining what their community looks like, its environmental projections and how it is managed:** Local voters may want greater stream buffers or common sense regulation of oil and gas exploration. Yet, state legislation has taken aim at reducing local control over these issues. Increasingly legislation deters us from regulating high-impact or risky land uses, creates confusion between local and state agencies and adds more confusion to land use regulations.
For example, in June 2018, we amended our Subdivision Regulations to address state legislative mandates that: reduced developers' financial guarantees; limited projects requiring environmental impact statements; limited riparian buffer regulations; required an expedited review process for smaller subdivisions; and expanded the definition of agricultural use or agritourism to cover activities totally unrelated to agriculture. Also, we can no longer apply the county's recreation fee to smaller subdivisions, even though their residents often use county parks due to limited amenities in their community.
- **Forcing unfunded mandates on localities in terms of increased staffing, inefficient processes and software costs.** A bill passed in 2018 mandates that building inspections be done within two business days of a request. This mandate does not consider that inspectors may be out for required training, vacation or illness. Nor does it consider that some inspections are of highly complex projects requiring many hours of work. Local governments already are challenged to find qualified inspectors to fill positions, especially in fast-growing counties. The same legislation also increased local governments' burdens for records maintenance, staff administrative time and major revisions to our online permitting management software. In the end, we may have to increase permitting fees, which could deter the development that the General Assembly hopes to encourage.

REQUEST: Oppose further reduction in local control over land use, permitting and inspection functions.

CLARIFY SALES TAX COUNTY ASSIGNMENT (Dan) (Related to NCACC Tax & Finance Goal #1)

GOAL: Amend state sales tax legislation to require accurate county assignment of sales tax location for delivered goods so that the correct county is identified and receives the revenue it deserves.

BACKGROUND: Chatham County and several other counties continue to lose sales tax revenue due to vendors not properly designating the county location for delivery of goods. Sometimes, a vendor will use only the five-digit zip code, instead of the nine-digit zip code. In Chatham County, this means that very often the wrong county is credited for taxes when, in fact, the destination of the delivery is inside our county. We lose out on revenue and the buyer often pays the higher sales tax rates of surrounding counties. We have worked diligently over the past two years to educate homebuilders and residents about this problem. We are starting to see some improvements, but retailers should be required to correctly assign sales taxes. *See Attachment B for specific impact on Chatham County.*

REQUEST: Introduce legislation to encourage the Department of Revenue to take actions to correct this problem.

INCREASE FUNDING FOR HOME & COMMUNITY CARE BLOCK GRANT (Carolyn)

(Related to NCACC Priority Goal #4)

GOAL: Increase the recurring state funding for the Home & Community Care Block Grant (HCCBG) by \$8 million, as recommended by the NC Senior Tar Heel Legislature, and maintain integrity of funding source to support local decision-making.

BACKGROUND: Additional funds for the HCCBG are needed to help address the service needs of our growing senior population. The Chatham County Council on Aging currently has 18 vulnerable elderly residents waiting for in-home aide personal care and 13 for Meals on Wheels. HCCBG is especially important to a vulnerable non-Medicaid poor and near-poor senior population. Recent Chatham figures show more than nearly half of HCCBG clients (45%) report incomes at or below the poverty level. HCCBG is designed to allow counties to decide how best to use available funds based on local needs, rather than having this decision made by the state.

REQUEST:

- Increase recurring funds by \$8 million, as recommended by the NC Senior Tar Heel Legislature and proposed in House Bill 335 of 2019-20 Session.
- Continue the policy from early 1990s of allowing local discretion in determining best use of available HCCBG funds to identify and address the most pressing needs. Oppose legislative efforts to earmark funds for specific services, as happened in 2017.

INCREASE FUNDING FOR SENIOR CENTER GENERAL PURPOSE FUNDS (Carolyn)

(Related to NCACC Priority Goal #4) See Attachments C & D

GOAL: Increase state funding for the Senior Center General Purpose fund by at least \$750,000, as recommended by the NC Senior Tar Heel Legislature.

BACKGROUND: The North Carolina Senior Center General Purpose Fund has remained stagnant at \$1,265,316 for a number of years. In fact, the last and possibly only increase for this fund source since it was established in 1998 was in FY 2008. The fund supports senior centers across North Carolina. Those achieving “Center of Excellence” status, as Chatham’s centers, receive a slightly larger share of funds. In the past year, the Chatham County Council on Aging received \$19,500 combined for our two centers (\$1,648 less than previous year), with a required 25% local match. Our two centers were among the 169 statewide (up from 163) to receive a portion of this funding, which helps with programming and general operations. It can also be used to help renovate and maintain senior center facilities.

In 2017-18 General Assembly, legislators made a closed-door special allocations of \$671,000 to just seven aging agencies for various projects, rather than increasing funding statewide. This \$671,000 represents more than half of what was made available to all 163 centers in the state. We have not seen any official effort to identify needs across the state nor to invite other councils on aging to apply for additional funds.

REQUEST:

- Increase recurring funds for the State’s Senior Center General Purpose Fund by at least \$300,000.
- Ensure that any future special allocations are provided through an open needs-based application process where all agencies may apply.

INCREASE STATE FUNDING FOR ADULT PROTECTIVE & GUARDIANSHIP SERVICES (Carolyn)

(Related to NCACC Priority Goal #4)

GOAL: Increase state funding for Adult Protective Services and Guardianship Services through the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)

BACKGROUND: Increases in state funding would help mitigate the increased costs the county has faced. As an example, in the current fiscal year, Chatham County Social Services expects to receive just \$26,575 in state dollars to support all adult services programs.

REQUEST: Support legislation increasing state funding for these critical programs.

ASSURE ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, INCLUDING THAT FOR SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (Carolyn)

(Related to NCACC General Government Goal #2)

GOAL: Assure adequate funding to support general and medical transportation through the local coordinated system.

BACKGROUND: Department of Transportation funding to the Chatham County Council on Aging was reduced by half in Fiscal Year 2019-20 and is expected to be about the same next year—forcing the County to replace these funds. As the Chatham Council on Aging transitions from an independent non-profit to a county department, this allocation will be requested by the local transportation provider, Chatham Transit.

REQUEST: Support legislation increasing state funding for public transportation, especially to assure adequate access for older adults and persons with disabilities.

SUPPORT THE CREATION OF STATE HOUSING TAX CREDIT (Bryan)

(NCACC Tax and Finance Goal #4)

BACKGROUND: Much like the federal low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC), state housing tax credits are intended to generate private investment in affordable housing by providing a credit on taxes owed for investments in affordable housing. Currently about 23 states have a state tax credit program. An individual or organization may apply the credit against its own tax liability or sell the credit to raise equity that can be used to reduce project financing costs. Ultimately this approach is an additional, much needed, source of funding for affordable housing development, which is already done in various states across the country. This was proposed for North Carolina in 2021, *under S.B.588 which was filed on 4/6/2021 to go to the Senate Rules and Operations of The Senate Committee.*

In the various states across the country the affordable housing tax credit, they approach it differently since the rules are established at the state level. The program itself could vary widely with respect to the duration of the tax credit term, credit amounts, the share of the contribution against which the credit may be claimed, eligible activities and affordability requirements and more. Some states separate their tax credit program from the federal LIHTC, while others “piggyback” on the federal tax credit and automatically award the state credit to investors in the federal LIHTC to help fill gaps in development costs.

REQUEST: Establish this additional source of revenue that aligns with the federal tax credit program (LIHTC) and can support gaps in development costs. Ensure that rural areas can benefit from the state housing tax credit.

***See Attachment E for additional information and source material references**

DEVELOP LEGISLATION THAT PROVIDES LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY TO FACILITATE THE CREATION, PRESERVATION, OR SUPPORT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING WITHIN DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS AS DEFINED IN G.S. 160D-1001 AND G.S. 160D-1006 (Bryan)

(Related to NCACC Tax and Finance Goal #4)

BACKGROUND: No one tool can provide all the housing that is needed. One successful way to create additional units is by facilitating public-private partnerships that can lead to the development or preservation of affordable housing by way of providing development incentives, leveraging various funding sources, and aligning private interest with public goals. Development agreements¹ are tool that could allow for private developers and local governments to coordinate private and public interests during conditional rezonings or proposals for development within districts. Development agreements would contain not only the requirements set forth in approved local ordinances but could also depict any incentives, allowances, or flexibility within the regulatory purview of the local entity in question. The latest updates to 160D such as S.L.2021-180 (S.B 105), section 5.1.(a), amends G.S 160D-703 when it comes to municipalities including a "harmony requirement" if the development contains affordable housing units for families or individuals with incomes below eighty percent (80%) of the area median income. With the extent to which "harmony" can be required already a part of the language, it is essential to protect and affirm the limited abilities local governments have to facilitate this model. Development agreements allow for creative, community minded and customizable partnerships to produce sorely needed affordable units or support for those units. Implementing these permissions early could serve as a critical tool in the future that can help mitigate the unfortunate displacement and pricing out that occurs during community growth. It also means being considerate of the effective and efficient use of public and private resources.

REQUEST:

- Create legislation that clearly allows local governments to facilitate public-private partnerships via voluntary development agreements to encourage the creation or preservation of affordable housing.
- Create a clear definition for "voluntary" development agreements
- Create clear parameters for policymakers and land use officials to effectively navigate the zoning and rezoning processes while creating a development agreement with private partners.
- Protect development agreements created voluntarily.

***See Attachment E for additional information and source material references**

ADDITIONAL CHATHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS ISSUES (Dr. Jackson)

[See Attachment E](#)

Siler City:

A Tier 1 Community in a Tier 3 County



While Chatham County’s remains classified as a Tier 3 county, the vast majority of our county is NOT a Tier 3 world. Siler City and much of western Chatham would never qualify as Tier 3 by most standards.

- If Siler City were a county, it would **rank 98th** in median household income.
- Siler City only had 69 new homes built from 2010 to 2015, compared to 504 in 2000-2009.
- More key statistics are noted below.

TIER 3 HURTS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A very small percentage of very wealthy people living in the fast-growing northeastern quadrant of Chatham County skew the overall picture. Siler City and other western communities have lost thousands of jobs in the past 10-15 years. They pay a big price for being forced into the Tier 3 category:

- **MEGASITES:** Chatham County has two of the largest industry-ready megasites in the state, including the CAM site next to Siler City. The county and Siler City have both committed almost \$1.15 million in funding to further prepare the CAM site. However, the Tier 3 ranking has already led to it receiving reduced funding from the Rural Infrastructure Authority to extend utilities.
- **State Incentives:** Tier 3 means that businesses interested in locating in the Siler City area will only qualify for Tier 3 state incentives, even though it is a Tier 1 community in bad need of business revitalization.

PAST BILLS THAT WOULD’VE MADE IT EVEN WORSE

S126: This bill would change distribution the Article 40 sales tax so it is based on economic tiers. For Chatham County, that would mean a loss of about \$500,000 for the current fiscal year. It also means lost revenue for the towns, including Siler City, which would lose an estimated \$60,000 per year, equal to 1.5 cents on the tax rate.

Chatham County and our towns already lose considerable sales tax revenue to surrounding counties.

S660: This bill revises economic tiers so that all of Chatham County is in a new “attainment group,” which further slashes potential state economic incentives for jobs created here. This would be devastating to our megasites and areas most in need of jobs.

Siler City Facts Tells the Story: A Tier 1 Community

	Siler City	State Average
Median Household Income	\$29,956	\$46,868
Per Capita Income	\$13,898	\$25,920
% of Persons Living in Poverty	26.3%	16.4%
Meantime Travel to Work	28.4 min.	23.9 min.
Average Weekly Wage All Industries	\$701.60 (countywide)	\$909.19

All are based on US Census Profiles 2011-15, except for average weekly wage from QCEW reports.



An Important Sales Tax Issue Affecting Chatham County Residents

***Make sure you are buying in Chatham and paying the correct sales tax
Save money and increase revenues for county services!***

Sales tax should be based on where the goods are **delivered**. Chatham’s sales tax rate of 6.75% is tied for **lowest** in North Carolina, so correct county designation is important and can save

Five of the eight border counties have HIGHER sales tax rates!

Vendors often use the **5-digit** zip code to identify the county, but much of Chatham is covered by zip codes that **cross over** from other counties



■ Areas where zip codes are shared with other

Which zip codes overlap into Chatham?

- 27330
- 27349
- 27355
- 27502
- 27514
- 27516
- 27517
- 27519
- 27523
- 27562
- 27713

What purchases can be affected?

- In-store purchases that you take home or have delivered to your home.
- Even stores located in Chatham can charge wrong sales tax
- Online purchases delivered to your

Why this matters to you:

- Paying correct sales tax may save money
 - 5 of 8 border counties have a higher sales tax rate and two are highest in the state
- Helping Chatham boost sales tax revenues will reduce the need to boost other taxes and fees.
- Bringing in our fair share of sales tax revenues will support:
 - Local schools
 - Law enforcement
 - Parks and recreation
 - Public libraries
 - Economic development

Sales Tax Calculation

	Correct	Incorrect
Price of item purchased	\$100.00	\$100.00
Sales tax	6.75	7.50
Total	\$106.75	\$107.50
Calculation:		
Sales tax/price (not total)	6.75/100	7.5/100
Sales Tax Rate	6.75%	7.50%

What you can do:

- Shop in Chatham County
- Know & use your 9-digit zip code when ordering
- If available, enter your county when ordering
- Make sure vendors are charging the correct sales tax rate of 6.75% and assigning it to Chatham County
- Tell vendors when they are charging the wrong rate

Importance of Senior Centers and Home and Community Services

- North Carolina and Chatham County are aging!
- In 2019, the state is estimated to have more people 60 and over than under 18 years, which is true for Chatham County today. In 2020, 49,899 people in Chatham were age 60 and older.
- In 2025, more than one in five North Carolinians will be 65 and older (22%). In Chatham, nearly a third or 32% in 2020.
- In the next two decades, the age group 85+ will be the fastest growing segment (114%) in NC. In Chatham, that age group is projected to grow 184%.
- About 27% of our State's population aged 65 and older live alone.
- 36% of these older adults have a disability.
- Nearly one-third have an income below 200% of the poverty level (less than \$24,280 for an individual, or \$32,920 for a couple).

NOTE: See ATTACHMENT D to review more of Chatham County's aging profile.

Senior Center General Purpose Funds

GOAL: Increase the amount of funding for the State's Senior Center General Purpose Fund by at least \$750,000 on a recurring basis. Increased funding for senior centers is also a priority of the NC Senior Tar Heel Legislature.

The State's Senior Center General Purpose Fund was established in 1998 to support and develop programming and general operations or to construct, renovate, or maintain senior center facilities. This Fund has remained stagnant at \$1.265 million for a number of years. In fact, its last and possibly only increase was in Fiscal Year 2008 with a non-recurring allocation of \$200,000. Centers achieving "Center of Excellence" status receive a slightly higher share of the funds. This ensures that funding is being well spent on readily identifiable programs and services and provides an incentive for centers that make investments to meet certification requirements. This year 169 senior centers or developing senior centers were funded.

While the pool of available funds has remained stagnant for 20 years, public expectations of senior centers have certainly not. Senior Centers provide access to vital services, help prevent loneliness and isolation, and promote good health and volunteerism.

With more centers each year, the money per center decreases.

For example, while Chatham's two centers have achieved "excellence" status, we've experienced a progressive decline in State support this year. Our two centers received a grand total of \$19,500 in Senior Center General Purpose funding to offer services and programs to a growing number of older adults.

Home and Community Care Block Grant (HCCBG)

GOAL: Increase the amount of state support for the Home and Community Care Block Grant by at least \$8 million in recurring funds and maintain the policy of allowing counties to determine how best to allocate their HCCBG funds locally to support a comprehensive and coordinated community-based system of services for seniors and their family caregivers. The NC Senior Tar Heel Legislature has also recommended an increase of \$8 million in recurring funds.

The basic goal of HCCBG, established in 1992, is to give counties greater local discretion in how best to keep their growing aging populations living safely in the community for as long as possible. Counties have done a good job of using the funds effectively. Most of the HCCBG funds go toward such vital services as In-home Aide Personal Care, Meals on Wheels, and Congregate Nutrition. Examples of other services in some counties include adult day health care, home improvement, and transportation. [Some recent Chatham figures show that the average age of our congregate nutrition population is 77 (with 39% aged 80+), while the average age for home-delivered meals recipients is 85 (61%, 85+) and for in-home aide is 79 (31% 85+.)]

Why is this important? Most older people want to remain living in their own homes—it also can save them and the government money. Unfortunately, statewide about 10,000 elderly are waiting for the vital services that HCCBG supports, especially in-home aide personal care and home-delivered meals (Meals on Wheels).

HCCBG especially helps non-Medicaid elderly who are socially and economically needy—those living alone, with low income, and in rural areas. Many report incomes at or below the poverty level but are not eligible for Medicaid. [Some recent Chatham figures show more than a third of HCCBG clients (38%) report incomes at or below the poverty level. The figure is 46% for those receiving home-delivered meals.]


In 2012, HCCBG served slightly more than 65,000 older adults (65,174)—in 2017, the number dropped to less than 61,000 (60,885)—a 7% decrease. In 2017, State support for the HCCBG was less than \$31.5 million [less than what was funded in 2012].

Chatham

Aging profile, 2020

Ages	2020		2040		% Change (2020-2040)
	#	%	#	%	
Total	76,597		102,200		33.4%
0-17	13,596	18%	16,355	16%	20.3%
18-44	20,829	27%	25,979	25%	24.7%
45-59	15,669	21%	17,703	17%	13.0%
60+	26,503	35%	42,163	41%	59.1%
65+	20,666	27%	35,403	35%	71.3%
85+	2,730	4%	7,746	8%	183.7%

Projected Growth by Age Groups (2020-2040)



Population 65 and Over

Race/Ethnicity	County	County(%)	NC	NC(%)
White alone	15,418	86.8%	1,332,628	78.9%
Black or African American alone	2,034	11.5%	283,548	16.8%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	0	0.0%	15,961	1.0%
Asian alone	224	1.3%	24,589	1.5%
Some other race	0	0.0%	16,617	1.0%
Two or more races	81	0.5%	14,621	0.9%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	294	1.7%	36,005	2.1%
White alone (Not Hispanic or Latino)	15,125	85.2%	1,312,196	77.7%

Background for Legislative Goals addressing Affordable Housing

- In no state, metropolitan area, or county in the U.S can a worker earning the federal or prevailing state or local minimum wage afford a two-bedroom rental home at fair market rent by working a standard 40-hour work week (NLIHC, 2022)
- To afford a two-bedroom apartment at minimum wage (\$7.25), a worker would have to complete 102 hours of work a week for 2-bedroom rental home or 86 hours a week for a 1-bedroom rental home at fair market rent; or earn \$18.46 an hour (NLIHC, 2022).
- 24% of Chatham County residents are renters (6,866 households).
- Chatham County has a gap of 2,325 affordable rental units needed to serve low-moderate income as of 2021 (AHAC 2021 Annual Report). In 2019, the gap was 1,995 (increased by 330).
- Growing communities tend to experience increasing land and housing prices which can price out people who rent or are hoping to buy homes, supporting tools that encourage the creation and preservation of affordable housing can spread the benefits of growth rather deepen preexisting socio-economic gaps and barriers (Grounded Solutions 2022).

Examples of State Housing Tax Credits

- *New Mexico* Mortgage Finance Authority provides a credit worth up to half the value of eligible donations for affordable developments
- *Illinois* Affordable Housing Tax Credit allows individuals or organizations to claim a tax credit on the basis of their donations to participating non-profit housing-developers. Donations may be in the form of cash, securities, personal property, or real estate, and may be aggregated to reach the minimum amount of \$10,000 to claim the credit.
- *Nebraska* established their state low-income housing tax credit in 2016 for owners of qualified affordable housing developments that receive the federal LIHTC. It is awarded over a six-year period, in an amount up to the federal LIHTC award to the property, and may be applied against state income tax, the premium tax for insurance companies, or the franchise tax for financial institutions.
- *Arkansas* – Developments that receive the federal LIHTC are eligible to receive a State Housing Tax Credit equal to 20 percent of the federal credit award.
- *Vermont* – State tax credit program has the same compliance and recapture period as the federal LIHTC program. State CAP is \$400,000

Sources

- National Low Income Housing Coalition – Out of Reach Report 2022 – North Carolina Profile <https://reports.nlihc.org/oor/north-carolina>
- National Housing Conference – Paycheck to Paycheck Database – Durham-Chapel Hill MSA - <https://nhc.org/paycheck-to-paycheck/metro-area/20500/occupations/13-2010,53-3052,47-2030,41-2010,13-1071,37-2011,25-1072,47-2180,25-2031,27-3042/>

Goal 1 Sources

- Local Housing Solutions: <https://localhousingolutions.org/housing-policy-library/state-tax-credits-for-affordable-housing/>
- Novogradac – Affordable Housing Resource Center: <https://www.novoco.com/resource-centers/affordable-housing-tax-credits/application-allocation/state-lihtc-program-descriptions#nc>
- Affordable Housing Finance - https://www.housingfinance.com/management-operations/using-state-tax-credits_o
- Congressional Research Services – An Introduction to the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit - <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/RS22389.pdf>

Goal 2 Sources:

- 2021 North Carolina Legislation – Planning and Zoning Law Bulletin – March 2022 – No.31
- G.S. 160D-1001

- G.S. 160D-1006
- G.S. 160D-703
- Inclusionary Housing Solutions – www.inclusionaryhousing.org