

HOUSING COMMISSION OFFICIAL MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 2022, 10:30 AM
114 W COMMERCE & VIDEO CONFERENCE

Members Present: Robert Abraham, Member
Pedro Alanis, Member
Jeff Arndt, Member
Kristin Davila, Member
Shirley Gonzales, Chair
Taneka Nikki Johnson, Member

Members Absent: Ed Hinojosa, Member
Amanda Lee Keammerer, Member
Sarah Sanchez, Member

Staff Present: Mark Carmona, *City Manager's Office*; Veronica Garcia, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*; Juan Valdez, *Mayor's Office*; Teresa Myers, *Mayor's Office*; Jameene Williams, *City Attorney's Office*; Veronica Gonzalez, *Neighborhood & Housing Services*; Sara Wamsley Estrada, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*; Mona Muro, *Neighborhood & Housing Services*; James McKenzie, *Neighborhood & Housing Services*; Jessica Lozano, *Neighborhood & Housing Services*; Siboney Diaz-Sánchez, *Neighborhood & Housing Services*; Jaime Lalley-Damron, *Neighborhood & Housing Services*; Sharon Chan, *Neighborhood & Housing Services*

➤ **Call to Order** - The meeting was called to order by Chair Shirley Gonzales at 10:36 AM.

➤ **Roll Call** – Sara Wamsley Estrada, Affordable Housing Administrator, called the roll. At the time when roll call was conducted, six (6) members were present representing a quorum.

➤ **Public Comments** – One (1) resident signed up to enter written public comment.

- 1) **Agenda Item #1:** Kimberly Dross – San Antonio needs to address affordable housing for disabled, retired, lower- working class and the poor. The lower income brackets are quickly being priced out of a place to live anywhere in San Antonio. This is happening at an alarming rate. The wait list for affordable housing and Section 8 is anywhere from two to six years on the average.

Staff note: The Housing Commission deadline for submitted written comment is 24 hours before the meeting. The reason for this is because it takes 24 hours for comments received in a language other than English to be translated. Speakers can leave a voicemail to be played during the meeting up to three hours before the meeting. Speakers can sign up to speak live during the meeting virtually up to 3 hours before the meeting or to speak during the meeting in person up until the meeting starts. Speakers who call

past the deadline are given the opportunity to submit a written comment to be included in the minutes but not read during the meeting, and to sign up in advance for the following meeting.

Item #1: Workshop and discussion for Housing Commissioners to explore details related to the 2022-2027 Housing Bond solicitation process, to include an update on the Request for Proposal (RFP) scoring criteria, bond-funded development proposals; and public information campaigns. [Video timestamp 00:25]

Díaz-Sánchez introduced the session and noted that the public was notified prior to the meeting for public comment. All comments would be entered into the minutes but would not be read aloud. She polled the Commissioners regarding their expectations for the discussion. Commissioners stated that the following were important:

- Clearer understanding of the DIA
- RFP funding structure review and potential adjustments for CHDO (Community Housing Development Organization) considerations
- Streamlining content of RFP for accessibility and transparency
- Aligning goals with SHIP (Strategic Housing Implementation Plan)

[Video timestamp 12:00]

Veronica Garcia, Interim Director, provided an update regarding the Housing Bond RFP and noted the following changes:

- Increased points in Affordability Category and redistribution of AMI priority points
- Decreased points in Gap Request, Project Readiness, and Underwriting Review
- Awarding up to 50% of the RFP-tied Bond funding to current round
- Additional Community Bond Committee Representative on Scoring Committee for Production

Garcia also noted quality assurance standards for development and maintenance of all housing projects.

[Video timestamp 28:10]

Arndt inquired regarding the small and veteran-owned business scoring between each RFP. Garcia stated with CDBG funding, local preference scoring is prohibited. Mark Carmona, Chief Housing Officer, noted that the permanent supportive housing's (PSH) on-site supportive services would be the most distinctive feature and require the attunement for the Continuum of Care (CoC) funding.

Davila thanked staff for the adjustment to include the Section 202 (Supportive Housing for Elderly; 62 and above) and 811 (Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities). She noted that though the HUD programs require developers to serve households up to 50% AMI, the majority of households fall below the 30% threshold. She noted that only non-profits are eligible to apply for Section 202 funding. Gonzales inquired regarding the requirements and selection process of the funding. Davila stated that application is directly through HUD and HUD determines the award through a national and community review method. The funding covers basic operational expenses but not additional supportive amenities which would be listed as a gap funding request. She noted Section 202 funding opportunities are not consistent. Carmona stated it would be best to loop HUD's local office into the PSH discussions.

Gonzales noted a previous situation where a landlord that inherited a property from his grandparents that rented affordable units. The property was not well kept and out of compliance but stated his units would no longer be affordable if he fixed all the requirements. She inquired how could the current programs assist this example situation. Garcia stated currently a smaller landlord could apply through either the RFP or the home rehabilitation and preservation application. Plans are still being discussed for standalone small rental housing rehabilitation. Gonzales noted the high City fees associated with projects and progress to reducing the fees would be beneficial.

Alanis inquired regarding the point distribution for PSH's permanent supportive services if there was a comparative example of a twenty point versus forty-point designation. Garcia noted the criteria for supportive services included population serviced, trauma informed care consideration, types of services offered, partnerships, and leverage of existing resources.

Johnson inquired if developers are lacking in supportive services would they be able to discuss potential adjustments. Garcia stated that developer interviews can be scheduled with the scoring committee if requesting additional information or category discussion. Jaime Lalley-Damron, Housing Bond Administrator, added that the Permanent Supportive Services points are taken as a holistic consideration instead of a criteria checklist.

Arndt inquired if the developer could modify their proposal. Jameene Williams, Assistant City Attorney, stated that modification is a matter of degree. The interview is to discuss and clarify the proposal's information. During the interview, the developer may consider amending some items, but modification is not requested from the committee as everyone is treated uniformly without advantage.

Gonzales inquired how far along would the developer be in their project for award consideration and what would happen to other proposals. Garcia stated that the project would need to be fairly along the process as the RFP award is aligning with the CDBG and HOME funding distribution.

[Break End: Video timestamp 1:09:29]

Williams further clarified that the scoring committee interviews were to help clarify the information and scope of the project and respondents were not expected to modify their proposal nor are they able to resubmit an amended proposal during the process. She also stated a pre-submittal conference is held for all potential respondents to receive information and ask questions. Garcia also noted respondents can ask questions in writing before the deadline and answers are posted for everyone to review.

Wamsley Estrada presented DIA mock exercises and noted updates to the DIA included DSD permit data on renovations, remodels, and demolitions, and removal of proximity to physical barrier.

[Video timestamp 01:27:00]

Arndt inquired why the 10% census tract comparison was not matched with a fully occupied project number. Wamsley Estrada stated the project would likely have a fluctuating number of residents, so the calculation accounted for that concept. She noted that the comparison was to give an indication to look more heavily into the area's details.

Alanis inquired if the calculation assessment accounted for multiple projects in the same tract. Wamsley Estrada stated currently the assessment doesn't account for multiple projects in the same area; however, the census data would be updated annually for future assessments of projects in the tract. Alanis acknowledged that many projects vying for the same potential area do not close, so the assessment would be just to only consider what is currently in the tract.

Gonzales commented that San Antonio sprawls and questioned the impact of the DIA as the information gathered would be like traffic studies. Wamsley Estrada stated as the DIA was a request from Council to complete prior to funding approval, staff looked for a strategy to determine and assess projects that would be a catalytic development to the tract. She noted that the DIA is not a part of the scoring categories but is given as supplemental information for the development's area. DIA score given is separate from the RFP score.

Arndt inquired how the scoring committee would use the DIA information. Wamsley Estrada stated usage of the DIA would be up to the panelist and may affect scoring in the "Displacement, Resident Protections, etc.." Category. She stated the DIA may expand to consider other developments after the pilot program.

Alanis inquired who would prepare the interventions information, staff or developer. Wamsley Estrada stated the intervention ideas would be a collaborative effort, but if an arrangement couldn't be reached, the response would be listed for the scoring committee. Alanis stated the San Antonio Housing Trust (SAHT) would be considering using the DIA but adjusted slightly for SAHT's needs.

Johnson asked if the origins of the data included in the DIA. Wamsley Estrada stated sources included the American Community Survey/Census data, Bexar County, and South Alamo Regional Alliance for the Homeless (SARAH). Johnson suggested mock examples be included for any public information regarding the DIA as the examples helped greatly with the transparency and understanding.

[Part Three Start: Video timestamp 2:22:11]

Diaz-Sánchez and Mark Carmona, Chief Housing Officer, guided the Public Information Campaign discussion.

Abraham inquired if NHSD or the City was able to post information on NextDoor. Garcia stated that the City's Communications and Engagement Department (C&E) was able to send Citywide engagement posts and staff closely coordinated efforts with C&E.

Johnson stressed the multitude of affordable housing definitions she had experienced in the community from new affordable housing opportunities to accountability for rising rental rates. She stated information for affordable housing should incorporate access, trust, accountability, and transparency for relatability at all angles.

Gonzales asked Arndt how VIA's was able to shift public perception from bus service to modern transit system. Arndt noted VIA's transit innovations and shift of focus to connecting people to opportunities transformed public perception. Arndt stated recognizing specific individuals and their stories widened the organization's perception and vision giving humanity to VIA's services.

Diaz-Sánchez highlighted community engagement should be a balance between personal narrative and providing context, vision, and definitions for the Housing Bond and other programs. Carmona recalled during a neighborhood meeting people expressed their concern over affordable housing. He shared that affordable housing was already in the neighborhood but instead of rundown multifamily housing units, affordable housing was the family down the road that were responsible tenants in their single-family home that needed extra help for a place to live so they received a housing voucher. Abraham stated stories like Carmona's should be published or distributed to provide the human side of affordable housing.

Gonzales noted the community still had a disconnect with affordable housing, understanding the necessity to build units for the city but not in their backyard (NIMBY). She noted Portland hosted a YIMBYtown Conference that helped bridge the disconnect. Johnson noted in the Commission's previous retreat, a Housing Summit was discussed and agreed it would create an opportunity for both community and stakeholders to fill the gap.

Alanis noted a portion of the disconnect stemmed from what was currently possible with the tools at hand. He stated if there are only enough resources to serve a certain number of households up to 30% AMI, the community should understand developer limitations. Johnson agreed but expressed concern for widening disconnect if concerns were not met with alternate resources and options.

Carmona stated that solutions to outreach start with connecting to the community and finding people that are interested in developing ideas to further the SHIP strategies; once contributors see change, they will be the strongest advocates. Gonzales expressed she wished to see strong community support for the next affordable housing development going to Council but was concerned how to turn the opposition's perspective. Arndt noted VIA addressed the list of concerns to reverse misconceptions. Johnson agreed stating discussion was most important to dispelling concerns.

Diaz-Sánchez noted all Commissioner items for community engagement from the conversation and highlighted the list as a place to start and grow. Gonzales stated the conversation's momentum would best be culminated to a Housing Summit where the Commissioners could help decide the content. Diaz-Sánchez stated staff would follow up with the Commissioners on a tentative plan for list of community engagement items.

Garcia thanked Commissioners for joining the discussion on short notice and invited them to the City Council B-Session on Wednesday where the RFP information would be presented.

Closing-

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned without contest at 2:14 PM.

Respectfully Submitted:

**Sharon Chan
Administrative Assistant II**