

**1977 REPORT OF THE VIRGINIA HOUSING
STUDY COMMISSION**

**REPORTED TO
THE GOVERNOR
AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



House Document No. 23

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1978**



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Virginia Housing Study Commission

THE HON ALAN A. DIAMONSTEIN, CHAIRMAN.
 MR TIFFANY H. ARMSTRONG
 THE HON PETER K. BABALAS
 THE HON WYATT B. OURRETT, JR.
 THE HON CLIVE L. DUVAL, JR.
 MR ROY H. ELROD
 MR BEVERLY H. MIDDLETON
 THE HON LEWIS W. PARKER, JR.
 THE HON FORD C. QUILLÉN
 THE HON ROBERT L. WASHINGTON
 THE HON LAWRENCE DOUGLAS WILDER

117 SOUTH STREET
 SUITE 202
 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219
 TELEPHONE (804) 781-7101

January, 1978

TO: The Governor of Virginia
 and
 Members of the General Assembly of Virginia

Pursuant to the directions of the 1977 Virginia General Assembly,
 I respectfully submit the 1977 Annual Report of the Virginia Housing
 Study Commission.

This report and its recommendations reflect the comprehensive
 research the Commission has conducted concerning the areas most criti-
 cally affecting the housing needs in Virginia.

Respectfully,

Alan A. Diamonstein
 Chairman

AAD/bel

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA HOUSING STUDY COMMISSION

The Honorable Alan A. Diamonstein
Chairman
49th House of Delegates District

The Honorable Peter K. Babalas
5th Senatorial District

The Honorable Wyatt B. Durette, Jr.
18th House of Delegates District

The Honorable Clive L. DuVal, 2d
32nd Senatorial District

The Honorable Lewis W. Parker, Jr.
29th House of Delegates District

The Honorable Ford C. Quillen
1st House of Delegates District

The Honorable Robert E. Washington
39th House of Delegates District

The Honorable Lawrence D. Wilder
9th Senatorial District

Governor's Appointees

Mr. Tiffany H. Armstrong
Richmond, Virginia

Mr. Roy H. Elrod
Triangle, Virginia

Mr. Beverly R. Middleton
Virginia Beach, Virginia

PREFACE

One of the primary endeavors of the Virginia Housing Study Commission is to seek through the recommendation of legislation and administrative suggestion, conditions conducive to the provision of housing in the Commonwealth of Virginia primarily for the low and moderate income citizens.

Throughout the year, the Virginia Housing Study Commission has conducted extensive public hearings and research involving the topics and specific recommendations made within this report.

The 1976 General Assembly through Senate Joint Resolution 127, requested the Commission to investigate fire prevention and safety in State-owned buildings in addition to local review and enforcement of fire safety standards in these buildings. After receiving testimony from numerous local fire departments, the Commission supports the introduction of legislation as outlined within the Report.

In addition to this mandated study, the Commission conducted an extensive study in areas such as energy conservation and housing development authorities. The 1976 Report to the Governor specifically mentioned these topics as warranting further study.

Finally, this Report includes recommendations and suggestions that have resulted from input at the public hearings from agencies, organizations and individual citizens.

Therefore, the Commission unanimously makes the following recommendations:

ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS

The Commission received numerous requests for the adoption of standards into the building code which would mandate energy conservation design and construction in buildings and structures throughout Virginia.

During their public hearings held in August of 1977, the State Board of Housing received similar testimony and responded by adopting the 1977 BOCA Basic Energy Conservation Code which became effective on October 1, 1977 and is applicable to all structures designed under the BOCA Basic Building Code. These provisions supplement the insulation factors which became applicable to single family dwellings on February 7, 1976.

The building code is applicable only to the construction of new buildings and structures. Therefore, all buildings and structures erected prior to the adoption of the current energy standards are not regulated by any code. Most of these structures both residential and commercial were constructed when energy was inexpensive and energy standards were nonexistent. The result is that the vast majority of Virginia's existing building stock is subpar in energy efficiency compared to that in new construction.

Testimony before the Commission indicated that there is a good possibility of forthcoming federal mandates to promulgate energy standards for existing structures.

The Commission recommends

***THAT LEGISLATION BE ENACTED GRANTING THE STATE BOARD OF HOUSING THE NECESSARY AUTHORITY TO PROMULGATE ENERGY STANDARDS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS SHOULD FEDERAL MANDATES REQUIRE SUCH ACTION AS A QUALIFICATION FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS.**

UNIFORM STATEWIDE BUILDING CODE

Testimony was received at every public hearing regarding provisions of the Uniform Statewide Building Code. This testimony ranged from licensing procedures to code enforcement.

The Commission, after soliciting input from the State Board of Housing who is charged with implementing and administering regulatory legislation relating to housing, makes the following recommendations concerning each of the following areas:

The Uniform Application of Building Code Standards

The educational programs and training programs of the State Board of Housing have proven invaluable to helping alleviate many of the problems associated with the administration and enforcement of the Building Code. However, testimony presented, indicates that more must be done.

One of the major road blocks to achieving uniformity in Virginia is that certain elements of the construction industry, such as demolition, and condemnation of unsafe structures are regulated at the local level and are statutorily excluded from the provisions of the Uniform Statewide Building Code. The result of these local regulations has been a vast lack of uniformity of local ordinances concerning these areas.

The Commission recommends

*THAT TO ALLEVIATE THE CONFUSION AND MISINTERPRETATION SURROUNDING THE APPLICABILITY AND SCOPE OF THE UNIFORM STATEWIDE BUILDING CODE, LEGISLATION BE ENACTED TO AMEND THE CODE OF VIRGINIA (§§36-97(7), 36-97(4) §36-99) TO REFLECT THE TRADITIONAL DEFINITION OF "BUILDING REGULATIONS" AND "CONSTRUCTION" WHICH ENCOMPASSES ALL PHASES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Local Licensing of Contractors and Tradesmen

Testimony was heard regarding the examination and licensing of contractors and their tradesmen by the localities.

Under the present law, the governing body of every county, city or town may adopt ordinances requiring those contractors not subject to the provisions of the Virginia Contractors' Registration Law to be examined and to furnish evidence of their qualifications to perform the type of trade they engage in.

Several opinions have been issued by the Office of the Attorney General which state that the authority to examine and license those tradesmen working for contractors is limited, insofar as no authority has been expressly granted to the localities. Despite these rulings, evidence indicates that the majority of localities continue to require licensing and examination. In fact, evidence indicates that some jurisdictions continue to require State registered contractors' tradesmen to submit to local examination and licensure.

Procedures and standards vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. The lack of reciprocity, in many cases even between neighboring jurisdictions, results in delays in obtaining the necessary permits and eliminates the competitive bidding process because of increases in construction costs.

As a result, the Commission wishes to encourage the development of a statewide program that will establish uniform standards. Such a program would reduce the cost of housing caused by delays and the lack of competitive bidding.

The Commission recommends

*THAT A RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY BE ADOPTED CLARIFYING THE AUTHORITY LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES HAVE WITH RESPECT TO EXAMINATION AND LICENSURE OF CONTRACTORS.

AND FURTHERMORE,

*THAT LEGISLATION BE ENACTED EMPOWERING LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES TO EXAMINE AND LICENSE TRADESMEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH UNIFORM STANDARDS TO BE ADOPTED AND PROMULGATED BY THE STATE BOARD OF HOUSING.

Continued Education and Training of Building Officials

As previously mentioned, the continued education and training of building officials, inspectors and others directly affected by the administration and enforcement of the building code has proven highly successful.

As the program developed and improved so, too, did program interest and participation. At present, a statewide network through which information is disseminated has been developed. This network increases the uniformity of enforcement. A by-product of these programs, for example, has been the prompt acceptance of new materials and methods of construction, which is vital to the maintenance of a performance-oriented code and assists in permitting structures to be built at the least possible cost consistent with recognized standards of health and safety.

Participation in the program has been hampered in many instances, however, because of a lack of funding.

The Commission recommends

*THAT LEGISLATION BE ENACTED AMENDING THE CODE OF VIRGINIA (§36-105) TO REQUIRE THAT ONE PERCENT OF ALL PERMIT FEES COLLECTED BY LOCALITIES BE PLACED IN ESCROW TO ASSIST WITH THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF BUILDING OFFICIALS AND THOSE AFFECTED BY THE UNIFORM STATEWIDE BUILDING CODE.

FIRE SAFETY AND INSPECTION OF STATE-OWNED BUILDINGS

The 1976 Session of the General Assembly through Senate Joint Resolution 127 required the Commission to study the problem of Fire Safety and inspections in State-owned buildings.

The Uniform Statewide Building Code prescribes standards for the construction of buildings which includes fire safety for residents of the Commonwealth. However, State-owned buildings are specifically exempt from the provisions of the code.

Evidence presented to the Commission indicates that under the present statutes local building and fire safety officials do not have the authority and in many cases the opportunity, to review construction plans of State-owned buildings. Additionally, these local officials do not have the authority to enter State-owned buildings to make routine fire safety inspections. These inspections are essential since local fire departments are responsible for fire protection of the buildings.

The Commission heard testimony regarding four basic areas of concern.

1. A need to correct fire safety deficiencies in State-owned buildings not subject to the Uniform Statewide Building Code.

The Commission members were in unanimous agreement that where there existed a fire safety deficiency in State-owned buildings, that deficiency should be corrected. The Commission in taking this position recognizes that any building is subject to deterioration and that corrections are mandatory if the inhabitants of that structure are to be safe.

2. A need to expand the staff or efforts of the State Fire Marshal to enforce fire safety regulations in the operation of State-owned buildings.

The Commission believes that such a need exists. There are presently some 7,000 State-owned buildings and some 12,717 non State-owned "public" buildings which the Fire Marshal's Office is responsible for. It is obvious that the frequency of inspections of these buildings is limited, considering present staffing of that Office. The Commission is of the opinion, however, that the solution to this problem is not a substantial increase in the personnel of the Fire Marshal's Office, but the utilization of local buildings and fire safety officials to advise the Fire Marshal of violations and potential safety hazards.

3. A need to grant local building and fire safety officials the opportunity to review plans for State Building Construction.

The Commission is of the opinion that there is a definite need for such an advisory review, provided that there is no cost to the State and such review would not unduly delay construction. The benefits of such an advisory review to the local fire safety officials would be distinctly helpful. The appropriateness of the building design for the fire zone involved, the coordination of public water supply for fire fighting and the determination of the assessability for local fire units are just a few

of the items local fire safety officials would acquire knowledge of if they were to review the plans and be able to make periodic safety checks in an advisory capacity.

4. A need to grant authority to local fire safety officials to enforce fire safety regulations in State-owned buildings.

Local officials know the capabilities of local fire fighting forces and can take these factors into consideration when making their advisory recommendations known to the Fire Marshal's Office. As previously noted, the utilization of the advice of local fire safety officials is an invaluable resource which can supplement the limited State inspection personnel.

The Commission recommends

*THAT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AMEND THE CODE OF VIRGINIA BY ADDING A SECTION NUMBERED 27-5.5. THAT WOULD ALLOW LOCAL FIRE SAFETY OFFICIALS TO:

- (A) REVIEW, COMMENT AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON PLANS AND WORKING SPECIFICATIONS OF RENOVATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE-OWNED BUILDINGS CONCERNING LOCAL FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS, (B) TO MAKE PERIODIC ADVISORY INSPECTIONS OF STATE-OWNED BUILDINGS SUBMITTING A LIST OF CORRECTIVE ACTIONS NECESSARY TO THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION.

THE VIRGINIA RESIDENTIAL LANDLORD-TENANT ACT

During the 1977 Session of the General Assembly, legislation was enacted dealing with the early termination of a rental agreement by Military Personnel.

However, Section (55-243.21:1) of the Virginia Code as enacted is somewhat ambiguous in as much as it requires the military tenant to include with his termination notice any liquidated damages due under Subsection B. Subsection B does not require the landlord to assess liquidated damages but gives the option of assessing damages in an amount not to exceed (1) and (2).

It appears, therefore, that in order to comply with the law as enacted, the military tenant must know the liquidated damages when he submits his termination notice. If the lease is silent as to the amount of liquidated damages the military tenant may find it impossible to comply with the statute.

The Commission is of the opinion that "housekeeping" legislation could quite capably eliminate the ambiguity.

The Commission recommends

*THAT LEGISLATION BE ENACTED TO REQUIRE THE MILITARY TENANT'S LEASE TO SPECIFY THE AMOUNT OF LIQUIDATED DAMAGES DUE THE LANDLORD IF EARLY TERMINATION OF THE LEASE IS JUSTIFIED.

REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITIES

In its 1976 Report to the Governor, the Commission recommended that they conduct an in-depth study of Virginia's Redevelopment and Housing Authorities.

The Commission makes the following recommendations as a result of that study in order that these authorities be even more productive and effective in rehabilitating and revitalizing our neighborhoods.

The Redefining of "Conservation Projects"

The Commission strongly supports the concept that effective rehabilitation and neighborhood revitalization are not only a benefit to Virginia economically, but are also invaluable contributions toward diminishing substandard housing and the housing shortage in general.

For proper development and improvement of areas, local redevelopment and housing authorities may undertake "spot clearing" of certain areas. In order to do this, it is mandatory under Section 32-49.1 of the Code that local governing bodies proclaim the area of the conservation project as blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating.

Testimony before the Commission indicates that many proud homeowners are justifiably fearful of eminent domain proceedings and the characterization that their neighborhood is "blighted and deteriorated."

Some cities, such as Baltimore, have had success in dealing with these situations by allowing local redevelopment and housing authorities to loan money and make grants in areas without having to define them as blighted or deteriorated. Furthermore, the enabling legislation precludes the use of eminent domain proceedings by the authority in these areas.

The Commission recommends

*THAT LEGISLATION BE ENACTED TO ALLOW REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITIES TO MAKE LOANS AND GRANTS IN AREAS WITHOUT HAVING TO DEFINE THEM AS DETERIORATING OR BLIGHTED, PROVIDED HOWEVER, THAT THE AUTHORITIES ARE PRECLUDED FROM USING EMINENT DOMAIN IN THESE AREAS.

"Rehabilitation Districts"

There is a need to create a new classification of rehabilitation areas which would allow redevelopment and housing authorities to make loans and grants in areas adjacent to "conservation areas." Further, this new classification would allow for spot rehabilitation in areas that may have only one or two structures in need of rehabilitation.

The Commission recommends

*THAT LEGISLATION BE ENACTED ALLOWING LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES TO DESIGNATE AN AREA A "REHABILITATION DISTRICT" WHICH WOULD ALLOW REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITIES TO MAKE LOANS AND

GRANTS IN AREAS ADJACENT TO CONSERVATION DISTRICTS.
THE AUTHORITY WOULD BE PRECLUDED FROM USING EMINENT
DOMAIN PROCEEDINGS.

Operations in Adjoining Jurisdictions

The Commission is sympathetic to testimony presented by redevelopment and housing authorities that indicated that some cities are having extreme difficulty finding suitable locations within city limits for the location of new housing developments.

Sections 36-4 of the Virginia Code requires a process similar to a referendum in any locality to activate a redevelopment and housing authority. This requirement effectively closes the door on such activities in areas bordering cities. There are, however, a number of instances where a redevelopment and housing authority of a city might want to own, operate and manage housing outside its area of jurisdiction with the consent of the local jurisdiction involved.

The Commission recommends

*THAT LEGISLATION BE ENACTED ENABLING REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING
AUTHORITIES TO OPERATE, OWN, AND/OR MANAGE HOUSING
PROJECTS IN ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS, PROVIDED HOWEVER,
THAT JURISDICTION CONSENTS TO SUCH ACTIVITIES.

NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION

Testimony heard at the August public hearings indicates that many areas across the State are experiencing a decline in neighborhood viability. Many are characterized by dilapidated buildings, vacant store fronts, abandoned housing, and a host of similar ills. Housing conditions in almost every locality in Virginia range from excellent to dilapidated. In most cities housing conditions vary, with the worst conditions in the older parts of the city. Total blocks in many cities are often characterized by dilapidated housing units. The Study Commission views many of these dilapidated housing units as physical assets that have retained their social value. Given rehabilitation and other conservation efforts, many of these units can provide decent homes for residents of Virginia.

The Virginia Housing Study Commission strongly believes that the economic and social viability of neighborhoods depend on the desire of residents to remain and the willingness of financial institutions to make investments. Without these two conditions, it is almost impossible for government to succeed in upgrading the neighborhood housing market and encouraging private investment.

To this end, the Study Commission examined those programs aimed at neighborhood revitalization. These programs concern themselves, for the most part, with providing loans for housing improvement. The Commission is encouraged by the rehabilitation efforts of cities like Richmond. The Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority's rehabilitation program provides loan amounts at interest rates of 1, 3, and 6 percents. Similar programs of this type are being carried on throughout the State by local redevelopment and housing authorities.

At the state level, the Virginia Housing Development Authority should be commended on its rehabilitation program. In addition to providing loans for rehabilitation purposes, Virginia Housing is also providing loans for financing energy saving devices.

While the efforts of local public housing authorities and Virginia Housing Development Authority are encouraged, they should not be considered a panacea for deteriorating neighborhoods. Additional programs that provide a public as well as private commitment should be developed. In this connection, the Study Commission review several areas aimed at turning around declining neighborhoods.

Urban Homesteading

Urban homesteading is a method of reclaiming deteriorated, abandoned central city housing for residential use by deeding them to individuals who rehabilitate them. Occupant owners are allocated a specified period of time in which to bring their home up to housing code requirements. Following a period of required residency, the property is deeded to the homesteader.

The homesteading program is not aimed at getting homes for people but is a people program aimed at getting people for homes. Generally, the property is acquired by the locality for back taxes or by other legal means. Privately owned vacants may be deeded to the city in lieu of past due taxes or may be acquired through a sheriff sale. When no municipal liens exist, vacant structures are occasionally purchased directly from the owner.

The Commission is of the opinion that a program such as urban homesteading should be researched in terms of its application in Virginia.

The Commission recommends

*THAT DURING THAT UPCOMING YEAR RESEARCH BE CONDUCTED WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE OFFICE OF HOUSING TO DETERMINE THE APPLICATION OF URBAN HOMESTEADING IN VIRGINIA.

Housing Rehabilitation

The Commission believes that the rehabilitation of older homes is an important tool in neighborhood conservation and that areas across the State are continually losing habitable buildings through the process of deterioration.

Testimony received at several of the public hearings give indication that many jurisdictions are placing reliance on housing rehabilitation as a prime means of revitalizing neighborhoods. However, many individuals expressed some concerns regarding local housing maintenance codes that, in many instances, made housing rehabilitation too costly. The Commission examined this concern with the State Board of Housing and found that the State Building Code addresses the rehabilitation and/or renovation of older homes.

The Commission recommends

*THAT THE STATE BOARD OF HOUSING CLARIFY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES REGARDING THE REHABILITATION AND RENOVATION OF OLD HOUSES AND THAT

*THE VIRGINIA HOUSING STUDY COMMISSION WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE OFFICE OF HOUSING EXAMINE LOCAL HOUSING MAINTENANCE CODES DURING THE UPCOMING YEAR AND TO INCLUDE ITS FINDINGS IN THE 1978 REPORT.

TAX INCENTIVES IN REHABILITATION AREAS

Conservation and rehabilitation of the Commonwealth's urban and rural areas are vital in supplying citizens with decent housing at reasonable costs.

Many techniques have been developed at all levels of government to restore declining areas. Through trial and error it has been found that the most effective programs have been those that have been jointly undertaken by the private and public sectors.

A number of proposals were presented to the Commission that are designed to create tax incentives to industry which is willing to locate in redevelopment areas. These proposals include giving the locality the authority to freeze property tax assessment rates for a given period of time. They also encourage plant modernization and property improvements, enable localities to reduce the tax rate of new plants that are located in a rehabilitation area, and enable localities to allow a property tax credit based on the number of persons the plant employs.

While the Commission does not necessarily support any or all of these particular proposals, it is of the opinion that the concept may be invaluable in assisting in revitalization work.

The Commission recommends

*THAT FURTHER PUBLIC HEARINGS BE CONDUCTED WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE VIRGINIA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITIES TO DETERMINE METHODS OF CREATING TAX INCENTIVES FOR IMPROVEMENTS MADE IN REHABILITATION AREAS AND INCLUDE ITS FINDINGS IN THE 1978 REPORT.

THE VIRGINIA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

The Commission heard extensive testimony at its public hearings, particularly from local redevelopment and housing authorities, concerning the significant strides Virginia Housing Development Authority has made in providing housing and services to Virginia's low and moderate income citizens.

During the 1977 session of the General Assembly legislation was enacted authorizing VHDA to make energy conservation loans. This enabling legislation, however, did not specifically limit the eligibility for these loans to persons or families of low and moderate income.

The Commission concurs with the Board of Commissioners of the Virginia Housing Development Authority's position that the energy conservation loans serve that portion of the public the Authority was created to service.

The Commission recommends

*THAT SECTION 36-55.31:1 OF THE CODE OF VIRGINIA BE AMENDED, ENABLING THE VIRGINIA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY TO PROMULGATE BY RULES AND REGULATIONS, OR BY RESOLUTION, TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR THE ELIGIBILITY FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION LOANS.

In addition the Commission recommends

*AN AMENDMENT OF A "HOUSEKEEPING" NATURE TO CLARIFY THE PROVISIONS OF THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ACT RELATIVE TO THE PLEDGE CUSTOMARILY GIVEN BY THE AUTHORITY TO THE PURCHASERS OF ITS NOTES AND BONDS. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 36-55.40(4) IS ALSO DESIGNED TO FACILITATE THE PLEDGING OF MORTGAGE LOAN NOTES, WITHOUT ACTUAL PHYSICAL DELIVERY THEREOF, IN COMMERCIAL BORROWING TRANSACTIONS.

ALTERNATIVE MORTGAGE INSTRUMENTS

There are two general types of Alternative Mortgage Instruments: the variable rate mortgage and the graduate payment mortgage. Generally, the variable rate mortgage is a mortgage with interest payments that fluctuate with some pre-determined index so as to allow the payment to rise and fall within a given range based on the index chosen. The graduated payment mortgage permits lower monthly payments in the early repayment schedule of the mortgage with the payments gradually increasing over time, in accordance with anticipated earnings of the mortgagor.

The Commission is of the opinion that both of these instruments could be part of the solution in solving the ever increasing costs of housing which is rapidly exceeding the grasps of Virginia's middle income citizens.

However, the Commission is concerned that if such alternative mortgage instruments become available to the citizens of Virginia, the proper safeguards to the consumer should be incorporated. For example, it is felt that the number of repayment schedule changes and the timing of changes for the variable rate mortgage should be carefully guarded.

The Commission recommends

*THAT ALTERNATIVE MORTGAGE INSTRUMENTS BE MADE AVAILABLE TO CITIZENS OF VIRGINIA PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THE INSTRUMENTS HAVE PROPER CONSUMER SAFEGUARDS AND SERVE TO REDUCE THE COST AND INACCESSIBILITY OF HOUSING.

HOUSING FOR THE HANDICAPPED

At several public hearings the Commission heard testimony concerning the lack of adequate housing designed especially for Virginia's handicapped citizens.

Evidence indicates that the limited number of units within a housing development authority project which are designed for the handicapped are frequently occupied by non-handicapped individuals. This situation is due largely to the fact that there is still a critically short supply of housing for all low and moderate income families.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development under the present administration has placed housing for the handicapped as a priority for the future. There are indications that new regulations and programs will be directed specifically at creating more units tailored to the needs of our handicapped citizens.

The Commission is of the opinion that the special needs of Virginia in the area of handicapped housing has not yet been fully researched or realized and much knowledge is left ungathered.

The Commission recommends

*THAT DURING THE UPCOMING YEAR PUBLIC HEARINGS AND RESEARCH BE CONDUCTED WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE OFFICE OF HOUSING TO DETERMINE THE NEEDS OF THE HANDICAPPED CITIZENS OF VIRGINIA IN THE AREA OF HOUSING.

Further, the last session of the General Assembly amended Section 36-124 of the Code of Virginia relating to the power of the State Board of Housing to promulgate and administer design standards relative to making places of public accommodation accessible to and useable by the physically handicapped. Places of public accommodations was amended to include office buildings containing 10,000 or more square feet of gross floor area. At the same time, the Governmental Management Committee recommended legislation that created the Department of Housing and Community Development and in so doing, listed the powers of its Executive Director. These powers included the promulgation of design standards relative to making places of public accommodation accessible to the physically handicapped. However that section, which is 36-139N, does not include the amendments that were passed by the General Assembly.

The Commission recommends

*A LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENT OF A "HOUSEKEEPING" NATURE THAT WOULD AMEND SECTION 36-139N TO INCLUDE THE LANGUAGE FOUND IN SECTION 36-139N THAT DEFINES PLACES OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION AS OFFICE BUILDINGS CONTAINING 10,000 OR MORE SQUARE FEET OF GROSS FLOOR AREA.

WINTERIZATION PROGRAM

The Winterization Program is an energy conservation program seeking to conform homes of Virginia's elderly and low-income citizens to a reasonable standard of energy efficiency.

The bulk of the funding for the program is received through the Federal Community Services Administration and the Federal Energy Administration.

Evidence presented to the Commission, supports the testimony given at all of the public hearings, that ninety percent (90%) of all funds received are mandated to be used on materials only.

In order to implement the program the burden has fallen on the shoulders of the Commonwealth to aid in supplying necessary tools and equipment, storage spaces for warehousing the materials, vehicles for the transportation of the materials to the job site, and for the general administrative personnel and supplies to successfully administer the program.

The Commission recommends

*THAT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY BY A RESOLUTION ENCOURAGE THE GOVERNOR TO DIRECT THE NATIONAL GUARD TO ASSIST THE WINTERIZATION PROGRAM THROUGH THE UTILIZATION OF ITS STORAGE AND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES. FURTHERMORE, THAT THE APPROPRIATIONS BE MADE TO THE OFFICE OF HOUSING TO ADMINISTER THE WINTERIZATION PROGRAM.

