

HOUSING COMMISSION OFFICIAL MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2021, 4:00 PM
VIDEO CONFERENCE

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

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Verónica R. Soto, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Juan Valdez, *Mayor's Office*;
Jameene Williams, *City Attorney's Office*;
Travis Smith, *Office of Innovation*;
Ian Benavidez, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Sara Wamsley, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Edith Merla, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Irma Duran, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Allison Beaver, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Rachel Smith, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Crystal Grafft, *Neighborhood & Housing Services Department*;
Colton Powell, *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 4:03 PM.
- **Roll Call** – Irma Duran called the roll. At the time when roll call was conducted, eight (8) members were present representing a quorum. Kammy Horne was in place on behalf of Commissioner Arndt. Duran noted that Commissioner Sanchez would be attending after 5:00PM.
- **Public Comments** – Duran announced there were zero (0) residents signed up to speak for public comment.

Staff note: The Housing Commission deadline for comment is 4 pm the day 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 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 March 24, 2021 Regular Meeting and April 7, 2021 Annual Retreat.

Commissioner Richardson requested the following correction on Page 5, Line 6, of the Minutes for March 24, 2021:

“Benavidez stated up to 120% AMI is being included for homeownership only rental.” to
“Benavidez stated up to 120% AMI is being included for homeownership *not* rental”.

Commissioner Johnson asked where the recordings are held for each meeting. Sara Wamsley, Affordable Housing Administrator, stated that the recordings are hosted on the Commission website and can also be downloaded from the Council agendas webpage. Johnson requested additional time to review the March 24, 2021 Minutes.

Richardson highlighted the following portion of April 7, 2021’s written testimony by Monica Baietti:

“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.”

She stated Baietti’s statement incorporated items that should be addressed with the SHIP’s principles and included with other discussions.

Commissioner Paul Furukawa motioned for the approval of the Minutes for April 7, 2021 Annual Retreat and postponing the Minutes for March 24, 2021 until the next regular meeting. Commissioner Susan Richardson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Item #2: Discussion and Possible Action to Formalize a Letter of Support Defining Housing Affordability to be included in the Strategic Housing Implementation Plan (SHIP).

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

Wamsley stated the matrix that was revised by the Commissioners was presented to the Planning and Land Development Committee (PLDC) and SHIP members and both bodies were receptive to the updates. The graphical representation was revised to include the new AMI bands. The Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO) suggested to include hourly income rates as this depiction was typically easier to communicate. She stated that \$7.25/hour is the federal minimum wage rate applied in Texas. Analysis of Census data conducted by Economic Planning Systems, a consultant on the SHIP, determined that 71% of San Antonio households are between 0-120% AMI. Wamsley stated along with the matrix, the Commissioners planned to develop a supporting statement for public and policy makers who will use the definition. Chair Guerrero, Commissioner Johnson, and Commissioner Hinojosa helped create a draft for this session’s editing. The Letter was read as follows:

Mayor and Council of the City of San Antonio,

As you know, the Housing Commission was reconstituted by recommendation from the Mayor’s Housing Policy Task Force Report/HPF-Housing Policy Framework. We are 9

members of the San Antonio community including Executive Director of the San Antonio Housing Trust, CEO of VIA, Vice President of the San Antonio Economic Development Foundation, and CEO of SAHA-San Antonio Housing Authority and 5 members of our community at large appointed by Mayor Ron Nirenberg.

Our Housing Commission is charged with oversight of implementation of the MHPTF Report/HPF and engaging the public in our efforts. We are working hard to hold discussions informed by diverse perspectives and guided by broad expertise that drive us toward shaping recommendations for housing solutions grounded in equity.

Following completion of the MHPTF Report/HPF, the Removing Barriers Committee was formed and requested that the Housing Commission make a recommendation to Council & Mayor for San Antonio's definition of affordable housing to be used in efforts to update the UDC-Unified Development Code and to be utilized in the City's SHIP-Strategic Housing Implementation Plan process to support clear communication in efforts to develop next steps in implementation of the MHPTF/HPF.

Our Process

Through our public meeting discussions and working sessions, the Housing Commission learned that impacts of displacement and housing insecurity on our families and neighborhoods are significant, ongoing and intensified by impacts of the Covid19 pandemic. We have seen that tax credit units do not solve the problems of families most in need. We understand that housing preservation and production efforts should support deeper affordability and work to keep people housed. Tenants' rights must be respected, homeowners need relief from rising property taxes, unsheltered people need improved support and small businesses need support as well. We assert that housing is a human right -that all people should have access to a home with dignity and to quality options for housing. These goals, while aspirational, would be well served by extensive coordination of services and planning efforts conducted by the City.

The Housing Commission considers making a recommendation for our city's definition of affordable housing one of our most important tasks. We engaged City Staff and housing industries to provide technical expertise in our review of the question, and, as our charge mandates, we also sought the expertise of the public.

- We heard from various members of the public including renters, homeowners, landlords, community advocates, academics & educators and representatives of local housing providers, and real estate industries on multiple issues that informed our recommendations for the definition of affordable housing.
- We heard presentations from the City of San Antonio's Office of Innovation on the digital divide, and the Office of Economic Development on the City's workforce recovery program. We discussed the implementation of RMP/EHAP and assert that we anticipate ongoing need for accessible housing assistance for our communities as they continue to surmount the pre-covid housing crisis exacerbated by impacts of the pandemic.
- Housing Commission colleagues made presentations about the approach that San Antonio Housing Trust and VIA take toward assuming their role in supporting affordable housing in San Antonio.

- We invited SAWS and CPS Energy to present on their efforts to make utilities, a housing cost, more accessible to families and individuals with low income or needing home repair support.

Our Recommendations

Affordable housing means *a place to live that is “affordable” so that when the rent or mortgage is made, money is left over for basic necessities* like food, transportation, healthcare, and all that contributes to one’s socioeconomic mobility and quality of life.

Program Type	AMI Served						
	0-15%	16-30%	31%-50%	51-60%	61-80%	81-100%	Up to 120%
Rental Development & Preservation Programs such as loans, grants, or tax credits	Critically Affordable	Deeply Affordable	Fairly Affordable	Affordable	Moderate Rate	Median Rate	Market Rate
Homeownership Development and Preservation programs such as loans, grants, CLT and MHP support	Deeply Affordable				Affordable		

The Housing Commission recommends that the City of San Antonio regard housing units serving 51-60% AMI being considered for receiving support toward preservation or production as affordable.

We recommend that the City of San Antonio use the terms in the diagram to describe varying levels of housing unit affordability based on the AMI served. In line with our assessment that comprehensive solutions are needed with coordination across sectors of housing industries and institutions serving multiple communities with varying housing needs, we identified the need to make distinctions between affordability of rental units and affordability of housing units available for ownership.

The Housing Commission recommends that the Mayor and Council calculate the impacts of housing costs on each level of affordability shown in the diagram, and consider the sum of total housing expenses when assessing the City’s updated goals for preserving and increasing affordable housing supply in our communities. We regard the following expenses as inclusive of housing costs:

- *Rent, insurance*
- *Mortgage, insurance*
- *Utilities including water, energy, internet*
- *Transportation*
- *Food*

This definition of affordable housing should provide clear and streamlined communication for housing professionals and people with housing needs. Our hope is that people applying for housing services who may interact with these terms feel comfortable identifying with various income ranges and affordability levels as described here. We also expect that this definition will facilitate effective communication amongst housing professionals and support the SHIP's articulation of updated housing goals.

In coming months, as you consider proposals for housing solutions based on this definition, it is critical to keep in mind that this matrix is a reduced representation of an expansive range of experiences of individuals and families in our communities. Impactful solutions that serve them will be part of coordinated efforts across City and County departments linking major housing institutions and public and private-serving housing providers and industries.

Our vision for broad equitable access to housing is aspirational and will not be achieved overnight. It will require true coordination and partnership between representative governments, housing industries and institutions, and the communities impacted by housing policy. The San Antonio Housing Commission respectfully submits these recommendations and invites you to engage directly with us providing any feedback and insights that may enrich our efforts. Thank you for your consideration of our position on housing affordability. We look forward to ongoing work with you.

*Sincerely,
San Antonio Housing Commission*

Guerrero stated that this letter was to share a comprehensive overview of the development process and blend technical expertise with community input that were considered by Commissioners.

Commissioner Abraham requested clarification on line 62 defining only the 51-60% AMI band being considered for support. Guerrero stated only 51-60% AMI is considered affordable but all ranges in the matrix should be considered for support. Commissioner Alanis suggested to notate both rental and homeownership programs and what AMI bands both would serve. Abraham agreed that the changes would give clarity to the letter.

Alanis requested on line 61 that “rental units” be changed to “rental programs”.

Johnson requested that “childcare” be added with the expenses listed on line 78. Richardson expressed hesitation of childcare being listed. She noted that healthcare and childcare are handled with separate programs and may need additional coordination with other entities. Johnson expressed that “childcare” is as essential as “transportation” as a parent would not

be able to go to work without having proper childcare and the expense is necessity for the household. Guerrero asked Commissioner Hinojosa if childcare was included in SAHA's supportive services. Hinojosa stated that childcare is not included in the supportive services list. He noted that a new federal proposal for childcare and nationwide Pre-K services is being discussed. Alanis requested clarification on the expense inclusions, how it would factor into the different programs, like house rehabilitation, and how it would be implemented. Guerrero noted that the intention of the expense list is to acknowledge a larger range from the initial rent/mortgage and utilities inclusion. Consideration of specific expenses would be reviewed when developing programs. Alanis stated that further analysis could be done to detail the overall housing budget on a local scale and what percentage of income does it equate to for better developed and informed programs. He noted that a line should be drawn as there are many factors considered in a budget. Guerrero noted that analysis for centering the community's experiences is critical for decisions and many household costs are interconnected. Alanis expressed how he did not want to disregard the importance of a household's expenses but noted that further analysis would need to be done to implement practicable programs.

Commissioner Furukawa appreciated the discussion and inclusion of items beyond the initial housing costs and noted the accessibility of these items were essential to securely live in their residence. Guerrero elements are aspirational as well to set a stage for conversation.

Johson sympathized with Alanis' hesitation of where to draw the line on expenses and stated that the expenses listed were a starting point for consideration as they targeted large critical expenses.

Hinojosa noted that housing, healthcare, childcare, and education are all components of broader social justice issues.

Alanis noted that all components of housing expenses are important and reiterated that analysis can be done to create a baseline for program implementation. He illustrated that to mitigate the high cost of transportation, programs can be implemented for TODs, (Transit Oriented Development). Expense analysis can assist with the specificity of where programs should be developed. He noted that "Other household costs" may be an appropriate addition to lead into the analysis.

Furukawa noted households do not start off at the same starting point and programs should consider a holistic approach when developing programs with the data collected for expenses.

Alanis noted that household maintenance and property taxes could also be considered.

Richardson agreed that a holistic approach for expenses should be considered.

Commissioner Sanchez entered at 5:08PM.

Alanis requested the following changes:

Sentence Position	Original Text	Proposed Edit
Line 25-26	tax credit units	existing financial tools
Line 31	with dignity and to quality options for housing	with dignity and our housing system is considered critical and necessary infrastructure that provides quality options for the residents of San Antonio
Line 44	real estate industries	real estate individuals
Line 55	a housing cost	<i>No replacement</i>
Line 60	Fairly Affordable	Very Affordable
Line 60	Moderate Rate	Moderate Income
Line 60	Median Rate	Median Income
Line 60	<i>All AMI Bands</i>	<i>Include Housing with term</i>
Line 107	City and County departments	the City and County departments

Alanis noted that Bexar County departments are not under the Commission's charge but would like discussions on creating a closer partnership with the County. Hinojosa noted with line 31, more capital investment is needed for housing infrastructure. Guerrero noted with line 107, San Antonio encompasses a large part of Bexar county and though residents may move outside the city limits they still consider themselves San Antonians.

Kammy Horne stated that Commissioner Arndt expressed that the draft was well written and did reflect previous discussions.

Abraham complimented the drafting Commissioners for their work and noted overall the minimal suggested edits to the draft.

Wamsley read the paragraph starting at line 75 with edits. The following changes were requested:

Member	Position	Original Text	Proposed Edit
Commissioner Hinojosa	Line 75	Impact	Impacts
Commissioner Alanis	Line 82-83	Rent, Insurance Mortgage, Insurance	Rent/Mortgage Insurance
Commissioner Johnson	Line 91	Childcare	Property Taxes <i>Childcare</i> Healthcare
Chair Guerrero	Line 79	in our thinking.	...in our thinking, considering historic inequities of access to affordable housing
Commissioner Johnson	Line 87	Maintenance	<i>No replacement</i>
Commissioner Furukawa	Line 89	Healthcare	Healthcare / Accessibility

Commissioner Sanchez requested clarification on the connection between healthcare and housing affordability. Alanis stated previous discussions noted housing costs would need to

be analyzed to show the amount of stress incurred on a household's budget and housing affordability situation.

Wamsley read the following from line 78:

When considering what is included in household costs and affordability, we should be holistic in our thinking and consider the need to address historic inequities. Additional household living expenses should be considered as essential to a household's budget such as:

- Rent/Mortgage
- Insurance
- Utilities
- Transportation
- Property Taxes
- Childcare
- Healthcare
- Education
- Food
- Other household costs

Wamsley read the full edited draft letter. The following changes were requested:

Member	Position	Original Text	Proposed Edit
Commissioner Furukawa	Line 44	Individuals	Professionals
Commissioner Sanchez	Line 29	Rising property tax	Excessive property tax increases
Commissioner Richardson	Line 60	Market Income Housing	Market Rate Housing

Guerrero recommended that the phrase above the matrix reflect the listing of housing costs previously edited. Alanis suggested to add "childcare and other household costs".

Richardson noted that the listing of costs seemed repetitive but if listing expenses should list verbatim from the housing cost list edited. Guerrero stated that the phrase and matrix would most likely be the key focus taken from the letter by the public and should contain the key sentiments from the Commissioner discussions. Richardson and Johnson concurred.

Abraham noted his objection with the phrasing change above the matrix and preferred the original phrase as it was originally from the HPF and believed the current phrasing was repetitive. Guerrero noted that the phrasing was updated to reflect the proposed definition of affordability and noted that the matrix itself may not always be presented with the additional context of the letter.

Commissioner Richardson motioned for to finalize the Letter of Support Defining Housing Affordability with the recommended edits. Commissioner Alanis seconded.

AYE(S): Guerrero, Alanis, Horne, Furukawa, Johnson, Hinojosa, Richardson, Sanchez
NAY(S): Abraham

Motion passed.

Verónica R. Soto, Director, noted that the next steps would be for staff to present the formalized letter to the PLDC and coordinate any requested follow-ups with Council offices and Commissioners. Commissioners could also designate a Commissioner representative to be present at PLDC.

Guerrero asked if any of the Commissioners were interested in participating. Richardson asked for clarification of the participation process. Guerrero stated that a body of four or less Commissioners would have follow-up meetings with the Council, Mayor, and City Manager Offices to answer any questions and give further insight of the letter.

Alanis noted that staff typically conducts briefings with Committee members not Commissioners but said he would be available for any specific questions asked. Ian Benavidez, Assistant Director, stated that staff coordinates council briefings on items and the letter mentions an opportunity for Council to follow-up with the Commissioners. Guerrero expressed that with the ongoing process of the definition and substantial context to incorporate in the letter there was a responsibility for direct communication.

Abraham inquired if the topic of affordability would be presented in a Council B-Session and if there would be other opportunities for Council follow-up. Benavidez stated that the letter and definition of affordability topic would be presented to the PLDC then to the full Council with the rest of the SHIP document. The SHIP could go to a B-Session but that would be scheduled by the Mayor and City Manager. Soto noted that the Council could also request for an item to be moved from A-Session to B-Session. She noted that with the Mayor's Housing Policy Task Force, a representative from the Mayor's staff was present at all meetings but members did not have individual briefings with any Council members just the Mayor as it was his taskforce. During a B-Session, all members were present as the Chair presented their final report to the Council, but that was the only time Council and members had collective discussions.

Richardson inquired if the Housing Summit would be able to be a forum for discussion on this item. Soto noted that due to the pandemic no Housing Summit is currently scheduled and would likely be held in June 2022 in person. Richardson noted that due to the pandemic may also be hard to speak to the Council in person as well. Soto stated that all staff briefings have been virtual since the pandemic.

Johnson asked for clarification that individual follow-ups are not prohibited but are irregular. Guerrero agreed that Commissioner follow-ups are not prohibited.

Staff Note: Finalize Letter of Support Defining Housing Affordability is included as "Attachment A".

3. Item #3: Briefing and Possible Action on the Next Steps for the Development of Subcommittees of the Housing Commission.

Guerrero requested Verónica R. Soto, Director, to present.

Soto stated that during retreat the creation of two subcommittees, Dashboard & Annual Report (DAR) and Public Engagement & Outreach (PEO), were approved. Additionally, the Agenda subcommittee was previously established. She highlighted examples of active subcommittees in other commissions and noted that the Commission must determine the following subcommittee points: purpose & charge, number & roles of members, selection process for members, and frequency of meetings. As the Commission is the final authority for formal action, subcommittees can only be tasked to research and compile recommendations for Commission approval. Subcommittees must have fewer members than the Commission and, if more than four Commissioners in the subcommittee, follow the Open Meetings Act. Soto stated options to formalize the subcommittees were as follows: 1)

Hold a special session; 2) Formalize in one or multiple regular sessions; 3) Selection of some Commissioners to draft recommendations and present to the full Commission for discussion and approval. Staff recommends Option 3.

Guerrero noted her support for Option 3 and requested Slide 18 for Commissioners to emphasize details that they would like the selected Commissioners to consider.

Richardson stated her support for Option 1 or 3.

Guerrero asked for clarification on how to proceed with the options. Soto stated the Commissioners could vote on the options or vote to designate the Chair to select a workgroup of Commissioners.

Johnson expressed hesitation with proceeding with any of the presented options as the process was not what she had expected. Guerrero stated that Johnson could offer different options for the Commission to consider as well. Johnson stated she thought there would be further discussion now regarding the details of the subcommittees and then set up the workgroups. Guerrero asked for clarification if Johnson was referring to the decision points and considerations of the subgroups. Johnson expressed that she was expecting to discuss the details of the subcommittees and decide on which Commissioners would be in which subcommittee. Benavidez stated that Johnson's view is fairly consistent to current process. But as the in-depth discussions would be lengthy for the full Commission, staff recommended that a small group of Commissioners meet to draft recommendations for the full Commissioners' consideration.

Abraham volunteered to work on a subcommittee but requested more clarity on the process.

Guerrero noted the Arndt supported Option 3 and volunteered to chair the DAR subcommittee.

Alanis supported Option 3 and noted it would be helpful for staff to extract Commissioner considerations on each subcommittee from the retreat in the minutes. He noted that it would be helpful for the Commissioners to have preliminary recommendations to discuss.

Furukawa inquired about the previously proposed renters' subcommittee and how it would be handled with the other subcommittees. Benavidez stated that the renter's subcommittee had not been presented back to the Culture and Neighborhood Services Committee of City Council (CNSC). Subsequently, the item has been placed on hold until further direction from the Council. Guerrero agreed that the renter's subcommittee could only be addressed when the item is brought back to the Commission.

Horne stated that Arndt offered suggestions for the number of members and make up of each committee. Arndt suggested that DAR consist of Commissioners only as it tracks the progress of the Commission and for the PEO to be broader than just Commission members. Guerrero inquired if Arndt may be interested in assisting with the recommendation drafting for both subcommittees. Horne stated she felt confident that Arndt would be interested in assisting.

Guerrero asked Abraham would also be interested in assisting with the process. Abraham stated he would assist.

Guerrero asked if there were any Commissioners also interested in assisting with the subcommittee process. Furukawa stated he was interested in assisting and noted he felt that there should be a larger make up of members in the DAR. Horne stated that Arndt also mentioned that there could be room for community involvement and his suggestion was not set in stone.

Jameene Williams, Assistant City Attorney, noted that a subcommittee must have a minimum of one Commissioner and noted that staff is not able to serve as a formal member of a subcommittee. Benavidez stated that the subcommittee recommendation group would also have staff, including the City Attorney's Office, present to help advise Commissioners.

Guerrero supported Arndt, Abraham, and Furukawa to lead the subcommittee process discussions under Option 3.

Hinojosa, Sanchez and Alanis were in support for Option 3.

Johnson noted her opposition and expressing still being hesitant of the process. Guerrero stated that the current vote was to bring initial recommendations for both subcommittee selection processes for Commission consideration. She suggested that Commissioner Johnson be included in at least one of the development process meetings and expressed wanting to attend some meetings as well. Benavidez stated that staff would coordinate with Johnson and Guerrero on assisting with the process development and ensure meetings do not meet quorum.

Commissioner Alanis motioned for Option 3, the selection of Commissioners Arndt, Furukawa, and Abraham to draft subcommittee process recommendations for Commission approval. Seconded by Commissioner Richardson.

AYE(S): Guerrero, Abraham, Alanis, Horne, Furukawa, Hinojosa, Richardson, Sanchez

NAY(S): Johnson

Motion passed.

4. Director's Report.

Guerrero requested Verónica R. Soto to present.

Soto stated that currently the HUD five-year consolidated plan (Con Plan) is being developed. The Con Plan is required by HUD for cities to prioritize and create a strategy spend federal dollars. The Commission is being briefed as the funding involves community input and can be allocated to affordable housing projects. Soto presented that over the course of five-years an estimate of over a \$100 million will be allocated to San Antonio programs. Soto asked the Commission to assist in asking the community, "What would you do with \$100 million?" A survey was launched in April and is seeking responses for this question. She noted that Maureen Milligan, one of the planning consultants from the National Development Council (NDC), was present to answer questions.

Soto continued with the Plan's timeline. In April, along with the survey launch, stakeholder engagement would be conducted, and resident engagement would be finalized. A draft of the Plan and FY2022 Annual Action Plan would be release for public comment in June.

Finalization of the Con Plan would be in July with Council consideration and submission to HUD in August.

Soto stated that surveys will be conducted until May 15, 2021 and can be completed online or by requesting a paper survey by phone (210-207-6600) or by email (Communitydevelopment@sanantonio.gov). Further information can be viewed at www.sanantonio.gov/conplan.

Richardson inquired if there had been any feedback. Soto stated that at the community input sessions had a smaller turnout but a robust discussion of items. Regarding the survey, a bigger push for survey responses has started as the ForEveryoneHome (FEH) Anti-displacement survey is finishing. Soto noted that 360 responses to the Con Plan survey have been received to date.

Guerrero requested Slide 22 and inquired if the linking of the planning process was new. She appreciated the request for community input for this plan and requested more direct input sessions outside of the survey request. She suggested staff use an alternative name besides “Con Plan.” Soto noted that the Con Plan only happens every five years so it may seem new, but it has been a requirement since HUD’s creation. She stated that this Plan’s process is very data intensive and much of the data is interconnected to the analysis from FEH and SHIP. Likewise, an effort to circle back with Fabiola Torralba, a community engagement coordinator with FEH, and the SHIP stakeholders to find different strategies of community engagement can be done.

Soto continued to the Housing Commission Retreat Report draft that was shared to Commissioners for editing and feedback. Edits are requested by May 7, 2021. The report highlights key discussions and is presented in new Commissioner orientations. She stated that the draft is also hosted on the Housing Commission webpage for public viewing.

Soto stated that staff is continuing to compile key metrics for the Housing Commission’s Annual Report is ready to assist DAR’s draft report process.

Guerrero requested to resend on the retreat slide information. Soto stated staff will follow up on the request.

Furukawa inquired if there was a date for the Annual Report release. Soto stated that the Report should preferably be completed before the end of the fiscal year, October 1, 2021.

Soto stated that the Source of Income Discrimination Policy (SOID) was renamed to the Housing Voucher Incentive Policy (HVIP) as some community and Council members expressed hesitation with including the term “discrimination” in the language and the penalty provisions with ordinance violations. Council members have been individually briefed over this item and is slated to go back to A-Session on May 13, 2021.

Soto continued that the Office of Innovation is starting to review the Fair Housing division, focusing on EHAP (Emergency Housing Assistance Program). This review will focus on ensuring the sustainability and efficiency of the program per the project charter and prepare the division for the post-pandemic work shift. Innovation will conduct stakeholder interviews and review the staffing structure for improvements. Soto stated that the review should be concluded in July but hope that the ongoing process would inform the current budget work.

Richardson noted her interest in the promising efforts of Innovation with the Fair Housing review and hoped it would be established more collaboration efforts between departments. Soto noted that Innovation collaborates frequently with departments. She highlighted that Innovation initially recommended the split of the Planning and Community Development Department and the formation NHSD.

Johnson expressed interest in speaking with Innovation as a stakeholder and requested more information on how they conducted their interviews. Soto noted that stakeholders' and community members' contact information was forwarded to Innovation. Soto stated Innovation would be contacting the compiled list of 30 stakeholders to set up individual phone interviews and would ensure Johnson's participation.

Guerrero expressed her excitement for the collaboration and suggested that the Office of Equity would be able to be included as well. She wanted to ensure that the programs were sufficiently and properly staffed for the longevity of EHAP in a post-pandemic capacity. Soto noted that NHSD works closely with the Office of Equity and would need to check if the work charter is in the scope to include the Office of Equity. Guerrero also noted she would hope that the review would encompass staff's internal strain with their work efforts.

Guerrero inquired if the Housing Voucher Program was 100% federally funded. Soto stated they were 100% federal. Guerrero asked for clarification if the landlord only participates when approached by a voucher holder. Soto stated the unit would first need to be certified to qualify for the funding. Guerrero asked if there was a database of available certified units. Hinojosa noted some landlords certify one to two units while others certify their complete property, as such, a database is not readily accessible. A working database would be of whom SAHA is paying vouchers. He stated that SAHA had a landlord engagement process to interest landlords in accepting vouchers but that process has been on hold due to the pandemic. He noted that there is less landlord willingness to accept vouchers but this is also possibly due to the limited supply of units. Guerrero asked if the database could be converted into a distributable list. Hinojosa stated that it may be possible, but the main concern would be HUD's anti-steering policy but would need to research further.

Guerrero requested clarification on the policy name change, specifically the term "incentive". Soto stated that the "incentive" was referring to any potential developer receiving a City incentive for development to adhere to the policy and accept housing vouchers. Guerrero asked for clarification of the term "discrimination" as an industry word. Soto stated that SOID was a term used in the housing policy making space but also encompasses broader income sources not just housing vouchers. However, there was discomfort with the use of "discrimination". Guerrero stated there was a perceived aversion to the term "discrimination" that she found perplexing and was a step backward. Guerrero asked if there were any additional concerns from Council. Soto stated there was an additional concern of the standard language for ordinance violation. As many in the landlord/real estate community see acceptance of housing vouchers as voluntary, criminalization for a voluntary program was raised as a concern. Soto mentioned that individual Council briefings are currently being conducted regarding this concern. Guerrero stated that this item did have support from the Commission and welcomed Commissioners to communicate either directly with Council or with a statement of support to Council.

Richardson asked for clarification on the "Claw-back" provision. Soto stated it was an

industry term for recapturing incentives if contract provisions were violated. Benavidez also noted that the term “recapture” is also used. Williams further clarified that there are terms with the same definition, recapture and claw-back. Recapture typically is used in financial transactions like loans or grants. Claw-back is used in economic development programs.

Abraham requested confirmation regarding a news article from KSAT noting that the policy would only apply to new projects. Soto confirmed that the City is not recommending renegotiating contracts that have been finalized but would apply to upcoming projects. Staff has reach out to some landlords to voluntarily accept the policy and are checking with twenty developments for voluntary compliance.

Soto continued that the FEH survey closes on April 30, 2021 and asked the Commission for a final push to their networks for responses. A Tenants’ Rights training session would be held on April 29, 2021 at 6:00 PM. Soto highlighted upcoming events pertaining to City Council, housing, and the community. She stated that the next regular Commission meeting would be held on May 26, 2021.

Closing-

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned without contest at 7:36 PM.