

HOUSING COMMISSION OFFICIAL MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 2021, 9:00 AM
PHIL HARDBERGER PARK ECOLOGY CENTER

Members Present: Robert Abraham, Member
Pedro Alanis, Member
Jeff Arndt, Member
Dr. Paul Furukawa, Member
Jessica O. Guerrero, Chair
Nikki Johnson, Member
Ed Hinojosa, Member
Susan Richardson, Member
Sarah Sanchez, Member

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Verónica R. Soto, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Jameene Williams, *City Attorney's Office*;
Juan Valdez, *Mayor's Office*;
Michelle Lugalía-Hollon, *Mayor's Office*;
Ian Benavidez, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Edward Gonzales, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Sara Wamsley, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Irma Duran, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Allison Beaver, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Rachel Smith, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Sharon Chan, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*

-
- **Call to Order** - The meeting was called to order by Chair Jessica O. Guerrero at 9:07 AM.
 - **Roll Call** – Sara Wamsley called the roll. At the time when roll call was conducted, nine (9) members were present representing a quorum.
 - **Public Comments** – Duran announced there was (1) resident signed up to speak for public comment. *One (1) resident submitted public comment after deadline. This comment is included in the minutes for the Commission's consideration.*
 1. Michael Taylor, Executive Director of Cross Timber Homes, commented regarding Item 3. He stated that both Natalie Griffith and he would not be able to attend the Retreat but reiterated their support for staff's recommendation. He stated Cross Timber Homes and Habitat for Humanity help provide homeownership opportunities to low- and middle-income families. He expressed that many families in the community are not able to afford homeownership and some have attempted to lower their income level to qualify for subsidies for homeownership. He stressed the City should support affordable homeownership for families earning up to 120% AMI.

2. Monica Baietti's statement regarding Item 3 was submitted as follows via a source outside the Commission and provided by a third party:

When I first moved to San Antonio, I was naïve on what to expect when it came to housing. I was going through a divorce, I had left my career for my marriage, so I was literally starting over.

I truly thought I should be able to find quality housing for \$700 month; I knew I would not be living in the most amazing neighborhood, but if you cared about your place and kept it clean, things should work out. I cannot tell you how wrong I was in that thinking.

I moved into a place called Lincoln Village Apartments, I really thought I had hit the jackpot, rent was affordable \$750 a month, HEB was literally two blocks away, I was excited to start my life over. I paid cash for nine months, thinking this would help me know if I picked quality location, this was smart on my part. My first week I had problems with cockroaches, but I thought I am clean, I can fix this! This was also Wrong thinking!

The front office employees were the worst when I brought up the roach problem. I would think the staff would legally have to fix pest issues, but they just lied! It was absolutely unbelievable! And on top of all that, 30 days before my lease ended, they served me with my termination notice, forcing me to move when my lease was up; while I had no interest in renewing my lease, I did find it odd they were forcing me out, when all I ever wanted was to live in a quality apartment complex without roaches!

I traced the corporate company who owned the complex and it sent you to some answering machine that NEVER picked up! I tried to call the city housing authority (2016) and left messages; at the time I did not know about 311.

Two years later I was still be contacted by people because I posted a horrible review of this complex on Google and they were reaching out to me for help. I called the housing authority again and this time was told about 311, I updated my Google Review to include their message of code compliance, it was actually quite a relief to hear back from someone.

What the saddest reality was, is the buildings needed to be bombed and the corporate office had no interest in spending that money to actually provide that quality of life for their paying residents. I think that in a first world country, people (the government) would actually care about its citizens and think that its citizens would deserve to not live with pests/rodents, but it was a nightmare to get anyone involved and care about living with cockroaches it was so depressing and can see how living in this situation can hurt someone's mental health. For example, I questioned my worth, like maybe I deserved this, because I could not get anyone to help me.

When we talk about affordable housing it is not just about providing affordable rent, it is about the holistic picture, affordable rent, and a quality environment, to provide affordable housing does not mean the property owners should be cheap and not pay for severe problems like roach infestations.

When I moved to another complex, I paid \$1200 a month so I knew I would not have to deal with cockroaches, but I had to double my rent! I did not consider this affordable; this was the cheapest apartment in the complex. It is important to point out how much I had to pay to find a place where I would not have to worry about cockroaches and why there is that difference should be researched.

Staff note: The Housing Commission deadline for written comment is 24 hours before the start of the meeting in order for comments received in a language other than English to be translated. 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.

1. Item #1: Approval of Minutes for February 24, 2021 Regular Meeting and February 10, 2021 Special Meeting.

Commissioner Richardson requested the following correction on the February 24, 2021 Minutes:

Page 7, Paragraph 2: “other tenants to continuously experience” should be changed to “other tenants to *not* continuously experience.”

Commissioner Arndt motioned to approve the amended Minutes for February 24, 2021 and February 10, 2021 Special Meeting. Commissioner Sanchez seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Item #2: Briefing on the Purpose of the Meeting and Remarks.

Francisco Gonima, Retreat facilitator, introduced Mayor Ron Nirenberg.

Mayor Nirenberg opened the Housing Commission Retreat thanking the Commission for its hard work for the past fifteen months of great challenges; leading work with compassion and conviction. As one example, the Commission has supported the Risk Mitigation Fund (RMP) which started with a mere \$1 million of assistance and is now the \$133 million Emergency Housing Assistance Program (EHAP). This program has been celebrated nationally in assisting people to live with dignity even in a pandemic. He also thanked staff for navigating the intricacies of federal and state requirements needed to sustain the program. Nirenberg also acknowledged other programs (ForEveryoneHome, Strategic Housing Implementation Plan, and Homeless Strategic Plan) that have progressed have made progress. He requested key items be address during the retreat:

- 1) Set key priorities for the year
- 2) Improve the community engagement structure
- 3) Formalize accountability structures in the Commission sub-groups/committees
- 4) Develop a post-pandemic process
- 5) Create a collective agreement on shared values

Nirenberg highlighted that trust and shared values are vital to working together and creating a collective outcome. He thanked Commissioners for their passion and dedication to this housing work.

Gonima introduced District 5 Councilmember, Shirley Gonzales.

Councilmember Gonzales thanked Commissioners for their work. She noted the Shotgun House Pilot Project in development in District 5 and expressed her surprise that many houses from the era did not have kitchens and bathrooms as they had communal spaces for said items. Gonzales expressed her support on the Charter Amendment as the new specifications on housing bond projects would benefit future affordable housing. She stated the Commission exists to guide the City with housing policies and is grateful to staff and Commissioners.

3. Item #3: Discussion and Possible Action on the Definition of Housing Affordability to be Included in the Strategic Housing Implementation Plan (SHIP).

Guerrero requested Sara Wamsley, Affordable Housing Administrator, to present.

Wamsley reviewed staff's original recommendation as follows:

Definition	Housing Policy Framework	Staff Recommendation
Homeownership		
Affordable Housing	120% AMI and Below	120% AMI and below
Rental		
Workforce Housing	80-120% AMI	60-100% AMI
Affordable Housing	30-80% AMI	30-60% AMI
Supportive	0-30% AMI	0-30% AMI

Wamsley stated the survey regarding the definition of affordability closed on March 29, 2021 and received 170 responses (168 English, 2 Spanish). The most common themes in survey responses were 30% of income, property tax reform, ability to afford necessities bills, and a safe, quality, comfortable environment. Key requests from the Commission were to add nuance to AMI bands and align with the HUD scale, identify better verbiage for AMI band identification or use percentages only, and communicate additional goals and priorities in definition. She presented staff's revised recommendation as follows:

Program Type	0-30% AMI	31-50% AMI	51-60% AMI	61-80% AMI	81-100% AMI	Up to 120% AMI
Rental Development & Preservation	Deeply Affordable	Affordable		Median / Moderate / Missing Middle		Market Rate
Homeownership Development & Preservation	Deeply Affordable			Affordable		

Wamsley also presented a graphical representation of what types of occupation are associated with each AMI band and the affordability level.

Guerrero paused for public comment.

Commissioner Alanis noted the need to solidify verbiage for the 61-100% area. He stated that the graphical representation was a good way to relate individuals and AMI bands. Alanis stated the encompassing issue that is faced throughout the nation is income disparity; costs are increasing but incomes are not rising with the cost of living. Alanis stated by understanding this wealth gap, programs can be created to provide affordable housing opportunities.

Commissioner Richardson stated her preference for "moderate" to be selected for the 61-100% category.

Commissioner Hinojosa stated his preference for "moderate" term to be selected for 61-100% AMI band. Hinojosa was concerned about the subsidies that each AMI level would receive and fully addressing the 0-30% AMI spectrum.

Commissioner Johnson stated there are many items in the associated housing costs that add

to a large amount apart from the cost of basic necessities that should be accounted for in the classification. She recommended for “deeply affordable” to be changed to “fairly affordable”.

Commissioner Arndt noted that discussion of household cost complexities had been very meaningful while developing the definition. Arndt supported “moderate” for the 61-100% AMI band and the graphical representation to help associate people and their professions. He recommended for the median income of the profession to be used instead of the end of the income spectrums.

Commissioner Abraham requested elaboration on the term “missing middle” on Slide 14. Ian Benavidez, Assistant Director, stated that “missing middle” is a Planning term to describe a section of housing that is overlooked (ex. duplex, quadplex) or income level that is unable to qualify for subsidies and unable to afford market rate. Abraham agreed that the graphical representation could be fine-tuned but believed its intention would be relayed.

Commissioner Sanchez suggested scaling of “deeply” to “affordable” seemed steep and recommended “affordable” as “nearly affordable” and “median” as “affordable”. Sanchez supported placing the median income level for professions displayed on the graphical representation.

Commissioner Furukawa supported staff’s revised recommendation and was interested in further discussion of verbiage structure.

Guerrero welcomed the inclusion of the graphical representation as many in the community requested relation to household income. She recommended to define what types of costs were specified as household costs, stress 50% and below AMI as a target focus, and adding a 0-15% and 16-30% AMI band. She also recommended for the Commission to declare housing as a human right.

Alanis agreed for a subcategory for 0-15% and suggested the term “critically affordable housing.” As HUD sets rental and income caps for the tax credit programs, there are allowances that mitigate additional housing costs for individuals. He stated that developing programs for developers and individuals are different but should combine to ensure the household is in an affordable situation. He concurred that the graphical representation should have the median income and include household sizing. He stated that the allocation of resources goes more towards the SHIP process rather than the definition.

Abraham inquired about the formulation of program assistance and how it factors to the definition. Verónica R. Soto, Director, stated that formulation is more the responsibility of the SHIP but the definition would center the SHIP to find what items to consider when planning for funding. The City understands there is a large need and not enough resources; therefore, recalibrating and targeting will create the most help for people.

Arndt acknowledged currently if a program is run for 80% or below AMI, it typically assists only 80% AMI. He stated that it was more the fault of the program than the definition. He suggested to have a solid definition and shift targets and ranges with the programs launched with the SHIP.

Guerrero acknowledged that the definition gives priorities on how to achieve goals set. She

stated that if support is given as AMI categories, individual directed support like EHAP may increase as program gaps occur.

Johnson inquired which categories would Habitat for Humanity assist. Benavidez stated that Habitat assists single families with homeownership in the 40-60% AMI. Cross Timber assists families up to 120% AMI. 0-30% AMI homeownership is difficult even for Habitat. Johnson inquired if down payment assistance would help 0-30%. Benavidez stated the City has Homeownership Incentive Programs (HIP) for 80% and 120%; however, HIP80 is difficult to qualify, while HIP120 is more successful.

Richardson agreed for the sub-categories of 0-15% and 16-30% and suggested for 0-15% AMI to termed “at-risk” and 16-30% “deeply affordable”.

Guerrero request to table the discussion until later in the retreat. Gonima noted the critical interdependence of the definition to the SHIP process and suggested to solidify factors that the Commission agrees upon to give SHIP stakeholders ability to progress.

Wamsley suggested to take note of Commissioners support for category verbiage and would be presented to the Commissioners later in the retreat. Categories for AMI bands were as follows for rental housing:

0-15%	16-30%	31-50%	51-60%	61-100%
Critical or At Risk	Deeply Affordable, Fairly Affordable, or Nearly Affordable	Very Affordable, Nearly Affordable, Or Fairly Affordable	Moderate	Affordable

Commissioner Abraham motioned for Item 3 to be tabled for later in the retreat. Commissioner Alanis seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Item #4: Briefing and Possible Action on the Housing Commission Course and Progress.

Chair Guerrero stated that the retreat was a culmination of many years and efforts of stakeholders working toward bettering housing for the community. She acknowledged that not all goals have been accomplished from the previous retreat but invited fellow colleagues to make strides at the retreat for successful future efforts. Guerrero implored colleagues to consider all communities.

Verónica R. Soto, Director, expressed her excitement in meeting in person for the retreat. However, she acknowledged that she did not feel in sync with the Commissioners and wanted to work together at the retreat to have clarity on Commissioners’ direction and timelines for achievable progress on shared expectations. Soto conveyed that she hoped to look forward to future meetings with Commissioners on this important work.

Francisco Gonima stated he began his career at the American Red Cross assisting in community work. In the later part of his career as an executive coach, connectiveness was the substantiating issue. This lack of connectiveness has been exasperated with the quarantine where typical personal interactions are stiff and formalized rather than an ebb and flow. Compounding connectivity with a subject matter like housing affordability and economic effects of the pandemic, Gonima stated that Soto’s concern was characteristic to

the lack of connectiveness. He stated the key element for this retreat is to rebuild the relationship with shared sense of purpose. Gonima previously tasked Commissioners and staff create a drawing of “What makes housing personal to you?” and specified that words could not be used. He requested each person to come up to center stage and share their images.

Gonima anchored the discussion by stating the initial charge of the Housing Commission. He noted the first goal of the retreat was to renew collective understanding and commitment for the Commission’s shared vision. Gonima rationalized that the housing issue at hand has been a dilemma for ages that still is seeking resolution and most likely will not be resolved in the Commission’s tenure. Progressing forward with this sobering fact, the vision will blur but can be refocused with renewing perspective. Gonima stated alongside this obstacle is the turnover of the Commissioners through the past year that perspective also require integration to the vision. Gonima stated he will attempt to guide members to assess and prioritize issues. He stressed perfection may inhibit progress as programs will be monitored and updated when necessary. He noted that according to W. Edwards Deming, errors are due to systemic issues 94% of the time rather than a special cause. Gonima stated the Commission had an adaptive problem with no set definition and where experts and group must identify the problem and solutions. As this is the most difficult type to resolve, relationships between persons with the problem and experts are crucial as one without the other creates an incomplete solution. He highlighted ForEveryoneHome as an example balance between thoughtful community engagement and technical expertise. He noted that the analysis would be incomplete, but an executable solution must be formulated with continued monitoring.

Gonima addressed team learning and the concern of multiple agenda items with heavy content. He voiced concerns that items are discussed but no clear direction is gained for progress. He noted that subgroups/committees typically are formed to develop solutions to items. These subgroups gather in work sessions with staff before presenting to the larger Commission.

Richardson supported the idea of subcommittees and delegated workgroups in the committees. Gonima added that the SHIP is an ad hoc planning group that will dissolve once their plan has been created. But the structures that have been created for guidance should continue within the Commission for oversight.

Johnson supported the idea of splitting the staff information and briefing to create more time for discussion of items.

Abraham supported the idea of targeted focus on action items and a decreasing the number of agenda items to thoroughly concentrate to complete tasks. Gonima stated that a portion of the target focus is awareness of the Commission mandate and resisting drift. He stated that collective impact is the action of taking a complex issue that has a ripple effect to other items. Gonima noted that without rigorous focus, most collective impact groups separate as they cannot hold steadfast to their initial target.

Gonima stated that the Housing Commission’s defined purview it to oversee the Housing Policy Framework’s (HPF) recommendations. As such, NHSD is held accountable to the Commission on the execution of the recommendations; however, the staff does not work for the Commission. He stated it was imperative to create a positive partnership between NHSD’s technical expertise and the Commission’s insight to advance the HPF. Gonima

requested that Commissioners and staff convene into two groups sessions during lunch and discuss, “What is the genesis of our work and how do we positively partner as Commissioners and staff to advance the HPF for the people of San Antonio?”

Benavidez presented the Group 1 discussion points as follows:

1. Begin with the end in mind. Articulating how items fit into the bigger picture.
2. Being transparent and forthcoming with information. Staff better defining NHSD borders and what falls under their scope and capability.
3. Closing the loop for public feedback. Ensuring space is created to resolve feedback that may or may not be within the Commission’s purview.
 - a. Townhalls
 - b. A/B Session Meetings

Abraham inquired if it was allowable to have a townhall for agenda items without public comment. Benavidez stated that townhalls would be used as a space for the public and their concerns. For agenda items, briefing and public comment would be taken during B-Session, while A-Session would be reserved for Commissioner discussion and action.

Johnson presented the Group 2 discussion points as follows:

1. Tying items back into the HPF - Ensuring Commission is kept on task.
2. Communication – Engaging together to set expectations and understanding time restraints.
3. Thought Partners – Finding different or informal ways to collaborate.
4. Clarity - Understanding roles, boundaries, and vernacular to enhance engagement.

Wamsley added that Group 2 discussed that the origin of the work is laid out in the Housing Policy Framework and both Commissioners and staff are tasked to fulfill. Gonima agreed that both groups’ consensus on HPF direction will help counteract drifting.

Gonima stated that for organizational development conveying one’s issue but not overstepping boundaries during discussion can frequently be prevented by gently inquiring if the issue raised is “above the line”. He elaborated that the personal interaction between peers for resolution would be better than email, as it is seen as more aggressive.

Abraham noted that he did not have updated contact information for all commissioners. Benavidez stated that staff would follow-up and send the updated information.

Furukawa inquired if there is a measure built within the HPF to keep it functional to San Antonio’s current needs. Gonima stated that using Furukawa’s metaphor, the HPF is like the Declaration of Independence where it set intentions but not programs or methods. The SHIP will be the actuated methods used to carry out the HPF.

5. Item #5: Briefing and Possible Action on the Organization of the Commission for 2021.

Gonima requested Benavidez to present the updates on the Housing Policy Framework (HPF) and Strategic Housing Implementation Plan (SHIP).

Benavidez stated that the SHIP is a combination of a funding plan and implementation strategy. This plan will create cross-agency and cross-sector actions and accountability centering around lived experiences and need from the community. He stated that the SHIP

Committee receives input from public and stakeholder forms to present to the Commission. Ultimately, Council, SAHA and SAHT will adopt the SHIP to implement it respectively within their organizations.

Sanchez requested clarification on which Council committee reviews the SHIP. Benavidez noted that the Planning and Land Development Committee oversees and reviews the SHIP.

Benavidez stated that the four principles leading the SHIP are as follows: affordability, quality, accessibility, and choice. He stated Phase 1: Synthesis & Strategy was virtually complete save minor edits of the recalibration with the passing of the affordable housing definition. Benavidez noted that Phase 2's funding plan creating is beginning with local developers to understand current conditions and implementation strategies are being developed. Benavidez presented and overviewed a status table of HPF strategies.

Sanchez inquired regarding if all taxpayers would pay the affordable housing tax. Benavidez stated that details of how the tax would be implemented have not been determined. Sanchez asked for elaboration on the requirement for public agencies to conduct a displacement impact assessment for projects receiving \$15 million or greater and if it would include developers that receive tax abatements. Benavidez stated that no guidance has been created for the impact assessment but would be developed during the SHIP.

Richardson inquired why the One-Stop Housing Center was considered "Complete/Ongoing" instead of "In Progress". Benavidez stated the Financial & Housing Resource Center currently assists with many issues that clients have. It is an ongoing process as "Housing Base", a program being developed as an affordable housing locator, is being added along with improvements sourced from the clients and the community.

Guerrero requested elaboration regarding the "In Progress" item, "Prioritize City funding and incentives..." and what programs does it include. Benavidez stated that gap funding is provided to developments from the City's general or grant funding to incentivize/subsidize developers to meet rent level requirements. Benavidez stated that TIRZ, CDBG, utility waivers, and tax abatements are tools that the City has for this purpose.

Benavidez stated that the Housing Commission annual report updates the public and updates them on activities and accomplishments of the Commission. He requested direction from the Commissioners on how to complete this task. He suggested that a subcommittee could be designated for discussion. Benavidez also inquired about how to engage the public and what part could the Housing Summit play in that role.

Gonima stated that the items displayed prove that the Commission's tasks are impactful wide-reaching. He noted that a pillar within collective impact is constant communication. He stated with his previous work with the Uvalde City Council, many mentioned the "2010 Vision", a significant community wide process, but failure to communicate that progress had led to public distrust. When reviewed, 60% of the vision had been accomplished, but was not communicated to the citizens.

Guerrero stated regarding ForEveryoneHome, "closing the loop" was heavily discussed. What was slowly recognized was that as a "loop" it was a constant item to not only address concerns, but to update progress to build trust. Outreach was also improved with each

reiteration to refine target concerns.

Gonima stated concern was raised that there is no standard on engaging the public for the Commission. He requested for Commissioners and staff to convene back into breakout groups to discuss what would be a workable and authentic public engagement model.

Johnson presented the Group 2 discussion points as follows:

1. Follow-up from Commission and staff on public commenter's concerns.
2. Summit setting where small groups of rotating staff and commissioners address public comment and questions.
3. Dedicated email set up for public response.
4. Follow-up responses gathered in a report to publicly share.
5. Program implementation to be determined by Commission subcommittee.

Arndt expressed concern regarding individual replies as the Commission should respond as a body. Johnson stated that the subcommittee would be able deliberate between proposals to be brought to the Commission.

Benavidez inquired if the summit referred to the established Housing Summit or a new event. Johnson stated that Soto suggested the Housing Summit but could be up for discussion in the subcommittee.

Guerrero presented the Group 1 discussion points as follows:

1. Creation of subcommittee for public engagement efforts
2. A/B Sessions for meaningful public engagement
3. Inclusion of the Government and Public Affairs (GPA) department for outreach efforts and data from previous outreach
4. Dashboard with project updates and upcoming outreach
5. Assessment of public outreach on developing policies
6. Public input for annual goals
7. Education on the housing bond and projects

Sanchez inquired if the inclusion of GPA referred to SpeakUpSA. Benavidez stated that NHSD will request assistance from GPA for input and surveys; however, their staff are experts in data collection and can propose other methods for input. He noted GPA also has previously acquired data that may be beneficial to a project.

Alanis noted that both groups created spaces to connect the community on updates and education. He expressed that the Housing Summit would be a perfect way to have a gathering space for community and professionals.

Gonima asked what venue could further develop and discuss these ideas. He noted that a charter/bylaws must be established for the group to give it structure and accountability.

Richardson suggested to rename the Outreach Working Group to the Public Engagement Group (PEG) to assist the Commission in the creation of action items such as A/B Sessions or procedures regarding types of public engagement.

Johnson supported the renaming and suggested to decide which items the PEG should start developing.

Benavidez suggested consideration of two subcommittees due to the large workload of Commission participation, outreach, annual report/dashboard and summit. Guerrero suggested that the annual report be an ad hoc committee. Benavidez stated the report/dashboard after initial development could be updated annually. He noted the summit would be a large time commitment for individuals to coordinate. Gonima noted that the dashboard would take a considerable effort to ensure effective intention. He expressed that concern that multiple items on one committee's plate will fall into disarray.

Johnson inquired if the Commission were doing all suggested topics. Gonima stated that nothing is solidified but rather a working train of thought. Benavidez stated he suggested further division due to the workload. Wamsley noted that staff and Commissioner participation should be defined. She mentioned that GPA could also assist Commissioners in navigating the planning duties.

Gonima inquired if the PEG would play a more active role to seek public for engagement forums. Benavidez confirmed that the PEG would be used for more expansive communication and accountability efforts.

Jameene Williams, Assistant City Attorney, noted that only volunteers with technical disciplines or areas of expertise can serve on subcommittees. Staff can only serve as support for the Commission and committees. Arndt expressed that the Commissioners should note to be smarter with delegation of staff assistance. Gonima inquired if there was another structure that could be a Commissioner/staff partnership. Benavidez stated that staff could still be a collaborative part of the subcommittees but would not be a formal member.

Richardson inquired the target audience of the Summit was for stakeholders or the public. Benavidez stated that the existing Summit targets both stakeholders and the public. Johnson expressed that from her group discussions, she felt it was mainly to engage the public.

Alanis noted that typically summit themes change yearly and the large conference could be tailored from education residents to townhall feedback sessions.

Johnson stated the focus should be to engage with the community and expressed her concern that a summit may be too grandiose of a project to properly execute. She suggested to scale back the endeavor as potential focus groups or townhalls for dedicated engagement. Gonima stated that two options of engagement could be explored in the subcommittees and recommended to the Commission.

Richardson noted no distinction between engagement during the summit or A/B session engagement. Gonima stated that the summit would be more to curate a topic to discuss rather than a general question/answer session.

Guerrero inquired if the existing Housing Summit was in the Commission's charge. Benavidez stated that the Summit was not under the Commission's charge. Guerrero noted that the Summit mentioned was not the initial intent and smaller scale engagement was preferable.

Arndt noted that three subcommittees were proposed. The PEG could be tasked to seek out focus groups could determine what theme a summit should have or if one should even be

held. If needed, another subgroup could work with staff to coordinate.

Johnson expressed that the conversation felt circular as she thought one topic was to be selected and subcommittee developed. Gonima stated that her intention was noted but expressed the exploration of enacting all three.

Alanis noted that at the existing Housing Summit, the Housing Commission should have a presence that is determined by a subcommittee. Wamsley suggested that 2-3 Commissioners could be assigned to coordinate with the larger Summit planning group.

Gonima requested a poll be taken regarding the Commission. Poll results were as follows:

Public Engagement Subcommittee	
Yea – 8	Nay/Abstain – 1
Reporting and Accountability Subcommittee	
Yea – 6	Nay/Abstain - 3

Alanis noted he did not dislike the subcommittee but thought that it would be easier for staff to develop. Benavidez noted that as the document is a part of the Commission’s charge, it may be more beneficial to collaborate.

Johnson noted that she abstained as the subcommittee would not be directly engaging the public. Guerrero stated that apart of engagement is to update the public regarding the status of issues that are being handled. She noted that to deeply engage the community, they should be informed. Gonima added that the subcommittee would act as the editorial board to present the full Commission a near finished product rather than an unedited piece. Benavidez noted that the subcommittee would be a complimentary piece to the other committees, so tasks would be able to be delegated for a balanced workload.

Commissioner Alanis motioned to establish the Public Engagement Subcommittee and the Reporting and Accountability Subcommittee. Commissioner Arndt seconded.

Richardson inquired if the makeup of the subcommittees needed to be established now. Williams stated that selecting could be done later.

Furukawa inquired about the Summit. Gonima stated that a delegation of Commissioners would be on the NHSD summit committee. Williams added that an ad hoc committee can be created and delegated to a specific task for a finite period of time.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Item #3: Discussion and Possible Action on the Definition of Housing Affordability to be Included in the Strategic Housing Implementation Plan (SHIP).

Wamsley presented three revised recommendations:

	Program Type	0-15% AMI	0-30% AMI	31-50% AMI	51-60% AMI	61-80% AMI	81-100% AMI	Up to 120% AMI
OPTION 1	Rental Development & Preservation	Critically Affordable	Deeply Affordable	Fairly Affordable	Moderately	Affordable		Market Rate
OPTION 2	Rental Development & Preservation	Critically Affordable	Deeply Affordable	Fairly Affordable	Moderately Affordable	Affordable	Median Rate	Market Rate
OPTION 3	Rental Development & Preservation	Critically Affordable	Deeply Affordable	Fairly Affordable	Affordable		Median Rate	Market Rate
	Homeownership Development & Preservation	Deeply Affordable				Affordable		

Alanis stated he did not prefer any of the presented options. He noted his preferences as follows:

	Program Type	0-15% AMI	0-30% AMI	31-50% AMI	51-60% AMI	61-80% AMI	81-100% AMI	Up to 120% AMI
OPTION 4	Rental Development & Preservation	Critically Affordable	Deeply Affordable	Fairly Affordable	Affordable	Moderate Income	Median Rate	Market Rate
	Homeownership Development & Preservation	Deeply Affordable				Affordable		

Commissioner Alanis motioned to approve the recommendation of Option 4 for the Definition of Affordability. Commissioner Arndt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Closing Remarks** – Gonima invited all Commissioners to state a positive take away about the retreat. Commissioners stated they were grateful for the open communication and personable relationship building interactions. Soto thanked the Commissioners for their time and openness.

Closing-

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned without contest at 5:18 PM.