

Responses to Feedback Collection Form

Method of Submission	Is there a strategy missing from the SHIP? If so, what?	Are there strategies would you like to help us develop? We will reach out to you when work begins on the strategies you name. Please make sure to provide your contact information below.	Are there strategies that you would like to get updates about? We will reach out to you with status reports on strategies that you name. Please make sure to provide your contact information below.	Is there anything else you would like to say about the SHIP?
Paper feedback form	No everything seem good	Not at this time	No not at this time	Just for them to keep going with the strategies they have plan already
Paper feedback form	Help for the elderly	Just easy ways that the elderly can apply for help	No	To help the older people more the sinors we have little help and no one to explain to us
Paper feedback form	Left blank	Left blank	Left blank	Monitor & implament a plan to reduce Graffiti and disband homeless (tents) around the city.
Paper feedback form	Left blank	Left blank	Left blank	In general, as a taxpayer, I would like to see better quality-control or screening to ensure less fraud and that those who are awarded benefits truly qualify. Once they are given benefits, better oversight to ensure people follow the rules.
Paper feedback form	Left blank	Left blank	Left blank	I would like to see more homes are Available for the elderly.
Paper feedback form	Left blank	Left blank	Left blank	More Access to affordable Housing for citizens. Home buyer program with assistance for credit repair and 1st time Home buyer assistance.
Paper feedback form	Target run down homes, fixing them and using them. Getting with Landlords that have a lot of properties	Maybe we can target homes that we being Auction off or foreclosed and turn those homes into affordable housing homes Maybe getting with landlords on helping fixing up homes in return of using those homes for affordable housing	Helping seniors, single partents, mental disable.	Looking into developing more non profit ageniecs transition homes. Have more agencies in the court to help people from being Homeless.
Paper feedback form	The inbetween ex: there needs to be more options outside of shelters places where low income families can reside.	Yes <i>provided name and phone number- not sharing to protect individual's identity</i>	Yes all strategies	I would like to work and be apart of the ship movement. I would like to see ship really make it non complex to help the community/low income maintain and be stable
Paper feedback form	Left blank	Left blank	Left blank	Taxes are being raised, But I don't see "any" repairs on: streets, cut grassy areas on bike trails. Also, why aren't any housing houses on apts being builded on all parts of town. Housing tenants have more people living with them in a single apt. and trash thrown everywhere. More code compliance for housing.
Paper feedback form	No	No very friendly and helpful	No doing a great job	Keep up the good work
Paper feedback form	not that I know of	not at this time	not right now	Make housing more affordable lower property taxes give new home buyers credit on closing costs
Paper feedback form	To work and reach out to the public more to continue to have ease managers explaining things and helping people.	Yes	Yes all <i>provided name and phone number- not sharing to protect individual's</i>	Make the city programs more accessible to people so that they know the programs are there. Its so much help out there tha people don't know about.
Paper feedback form	We need to Focus on who really needs the Help. Seniors, single parents, disable.	Maybe turn old Hotels, apartments, Motels into affordable Housing. Give tax releif to landlords that help	Left blank	Getting with Landlords to fix their homes before selling to use for Housing.
Paper feedback form	Left blank	I would like to participate in the development of a community land trust	I would like to get updates over: 1) Code Enforcement Process 2) Land Banking	I would like to see an emphasis on AMI's between 0-15 and 15-20
Paper feedback form	Absolutely not	Negative everything was great	No great customer service	No thank you for all the help!
Paper feedback form	Community Land Trust (CLT)...similar to the one implemented in Burlington, VT. I know its not missing but there is not much detail to it on p. 13. Also, why not allow the COSA build public housing?	1. CLT 2. Land Bank 3. 1000 K permanent supportive housing 4. County-wide system analysis. 5. EAP & Gap Funding 6. Monitoring the purchase of SFUs by big trust/Hedge Funds in COSA & Bexar.	More on the thinking beind the 1800 homes (80-120% AMI. Who would own the properties? Where would they be built? Does the COSA plan on selling them after 10 years? If so, what will the profits go towards?	I had a rare opportunity to ask multiple questions at St. Phillips. I'm very appreciative of that BUT more people should have attended. THERE SHOULD BE QUORAM-LIKE REQUIREMENTS to these meetings. If X amount of people don't show up, it doesn't count.
Paper feedback form	More help on housing please and you do for people who can't	<i>phone number provided- not sharing to protect individual's identity</i>	<i>phone number provided- not sharing to protect individual's identity</i>	When does it start?

Online feedback form	<p>Why is public engagement one of the last steps in the process? Your online presentation states there were over 80 stakeholders. When you speak to some of the community leaders involved, not the housing developers or financiers, they'll state that a lot of their input was not listened to. Input, such as a shared definition of what is affordable. Public engagement and input is not only the last step, but it is commonly the shortest period with the least amount of notice. The DRAFT of SHIP was released Oct 29, AND it's followed by 1 week of public input? Just 3 short meetings? If this SHIP is already being implemented (3 yrs into 10 yr plan) Why are we here? Before making "transformative investments" and strategies in housing, maybe we should look at the process.</p>	<p>Why are strategies inclusive of funds being spent to build housing for 100% to 120% AMI? 101% to 120% is \$80,040.00. You show budgeting for 900 units at these AMI's, to be built per year for a total of 1,800. Realtors can tell you there is a surplus of houses for sale at those AMI's. People in higher AMI's have other options. The option for people in those lower AMI's is homelessness.</p>	<p>Why is affordability established at 60% AMI, when almost half (48%) of San Antonio renters and homeowners (44,734) make 30% of AMI, or less? This is per your own calculations of Households most at risk. 30% AMI is a \$20,010.00 income. How is this plan focused on ensuring affordable housing choices for people with the lowest income?</p>	<p>Appreciate this first DRAFT of the strategies to tackle 'affordable housing' in San Antonio, but I consider this a beginning. Certainly not a plan City Council should be voting on.</p>
Online feedback form	<p>Voucher expansion; SAHA cannot be expected to meet the need of the severely cost burdened residents in the 0-30% AMI range. I also did not see a specific strategy to address GAP financing for new or rehabilitated rental housing for residents at 0-50% AMI - other than assignment to SAHT. If monies are expected from the federal government (HUD) to meet these needs, why are they not included outright as a funding source? And finally what about assistance/incentives for 'Mom & Pop' landlords who keep their rents low for those residents in the 30-60% AMI and their properties up to code, despite incredible property tax increases and pressure to sell to 'flippers' for unbelievable prices? Shouldn't there be a strategy to keep these folks in business?</p>	<p>Willing to help in any way.</p>	<p>Would like to be updated on all strategies relative to cost-burdened renters.</p>	<p>Notes on SHIP Draft: Page 8: Would like to have seen the 0-15% AMI breakout for renters separated out to see the true need that SAHA is being expected to meet (despite a 40,000 waitlist); also, do we know what percentage of "vulnerable residents" live alone – either homeowners or renters? Page 9: How many houses and rental units for EACH of the AMI categories have already been completed and how many will be completed by the original deadline for the city to be able to state that they are "on target"? On target with what? Where did the 11,882 number come from and what is the breakdown by AMI's? Wasn't there a SHIP recalibration of targets in Summer 2020? A framework itself doesn't create numbers last time I checked – people do. Page 15: Re: the bar graph w/ \$150M for each of the 2022 and 2027 bonds - was the recent reduction of \$100M (from \$250M) in Housing for the 2022 bond or the 2027 bond, or both? Page 20-21: Re: strategies and timeline - NHSD should have already ceased to support market rate development so why is this a strategy for 2022, not 2021? Also, isn't there already a community land trust that OURSA oversees? If so, then why is this assigned to SAHT? And how many vacant buildings does OHP (and COSA) currently have inventoried? Should we really wait until 2023 to expand the voucher program in SA, and then only advocate at the Federal level? Seems like more could/ should be done at the local level. I did not see any type of strategy that includes incentives or financial assistance for landlords that have only a few properties, keep their rents low and properties up to code. There are many of these kind folks out there that took major hits from the eviction moratorium and could use some help prior to property tax time again.</p>
Online feedback form	<p>The plan looks good as it is.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Left blank</p>
Online feedback form	<p>What's going to happen to disabled, people on SSI/SSDI, elderly and fixed incomes? It doesn't mention these fragile populations.</p>	<p>Are the disabled, elderly and working poor going to be excluded from this? Rents are skyrocketing and many of us disabled are being outpriced from our homes. Where are we in this?</p>	<p>My contact information is included.</p>	<p>It needs more information. You need tenant advocates on the board, i.e. Jessica Guerro, people who are actually in public housing, disabled, etc</p>
Online feedback form	<p>Not that I can think of.</p>	<p>-Preservation of Single family housing through rehab programs -Expand support service provision in affordable housing projects -Support & Grow non-profit housing providers -Implement public information campaigns for housing -Use holistic financial counseling as a foundation and at the center of service provision -Expand land title remediation program -Advance universal design and visibility standards</p>	<p>Sam As above</p>	<p>Thank you to the many stakeholders and staff that worked on this plan.</p>
Online feedback form	<p>Yes, how about people paying for their own homes? I worked hard to get where I am. I worked for years to get my first home, and had little money for anything else. I also pay huge amounts of property taxes for the 'privilege' of living in my own home. People who can't afford a home shouldn't own one. Homes are money pits. Repairs, taxes, heating and cooling, landscaping. It all takes time and money. Housing is not the taxpayer's responsibility to pay for someone else to have a better home or apartment. Let them earn that like everyone else not on welfare.</p>	<p>Yes, increase trade job training in High School. Not everyone needs to go to college.</p>	<p>Update me when you cancel this horrible idea.</p>	<p>This is pure wealth transfer. You're killing the middle class with your bleeding heart good intentions, which ALWAYS go horribly wrong. Every single time. Also, allowing people to move into areas with a voucher is a bad idea. If they didn't earn their way to live in a good area, they are not ready to live there. I don't live in the Dominion because I can't afford it. Will you give me a voucher???</p>
SA Speak Up	<p>No</p>	<p>Strategies to have better playground for children and apts that take housing to provide a safe environment for children..no broken down areas . Maybe a aftercare room for parents who work late instead of picking up at school again.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Qualified individual who meet the housing needs ..should try and have people work ,or train to try and get off housing.. people get to comfortable and have other people live with them that are not on there lease.. more how to survive as a single parent program...</p>
SA Speak Up	<p>Left blank</p>	<p>Develop a coordinated housing system Funding Pan Affordability Protect and Promote Accountability ; Develop a Coordinated Housing System • Increase City Investment in Housing with a 10-Year Funding Plan • Increase Affordable Housing Production, Rehabilitation, and Preservation • Protect and Promote Neighborhoods • Ensure Accountability to the Public</p>	<p>listed in question 2</p>	<p>Left blank</p>
SA Speak Up	<p>Speed humps on richland drive Its dangerous speeding endangering children. racing .speeding in school zone need jelp</p>	<p>Speed humps on butler drive same problems</p>	<p>Left blank</p>	<p>Infrastructure. Was approved That council women in district 6 does nothing</p>
SA Speak Up	<p>Left blank</p>	<p>Left blank</p>	<p>Left blank</p>	<p>Left blank</p>

Feedback Collected Via Email or Hand Delivered

Email Submission	<p>My push is for really only using funding and support for 50% AMI and below I dont think we should be doing any subsidizing of single family home development and instead only focusing on multifamily, and homeowner preservation.</p> <p>Development is already expensive and we can help so much more with bigger bang for the buck if we focus on multi-family as well as keeping people in current homes.</p> <p>I hope we can get funding to support public housing as SAHA does not have enough funds to repair their public housing but would be best if we do give them funding they divert funding back to vouchers to be at 100% fmr.</p> <p>If we were going to push funding for vouchers I ask them for set aside for seniors as there is no voucher set aside program for seniors.</p>
Email Submission	<p>I'd like to recommend qualifying language that makes recommendations about affordable housing so it is unambiguous. Examples: • The strategy, DEVELOP A COORDINATED HOUSING SYSTEM (CHS) Recommendation: Should read DEVELOP A COORDINATED AFFORDABLE HOUSING SYSTEM • CHS 2: UPDATE THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE TO REMOVE BARRIERS TO HOUSING PRODUCTION AND PRESERVATION. (pg 23) How is this goal different than the strategy, "INCREASE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION, REHABILITATION, AND PRESERVATION (HPRP)"? (pg 37) Recommendation: This goal should be eliminated. • Goal in CHS: INCREASE CITY INVESTMENT IN HOUSING WITH A 10-YEAR FUNDING PLAN (pg 13) Recommendation: Change to INCREASE CITY INVESTMENT IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING WITH A 10-YEAR FUNDING PLAN • CH 6: UPDATE THE CITY FEE WAIVER PROGRAM POLICY AND STRUCTURE TO PROVIDE MORE SUBSIDY TO AFFORDABLE PROJECTS INCLUDING ADUS. (pg. 35) We need the ADUs be for owner-occupied otherwise, the incentives will create investment opportunities for developers to put two or three units on a single-family lot without going through the Zoning Commission cutting out neighborhood input. This will also create less housing available to purchase on the market. Recommendation: UPDATE THE CITY FEE WAIVER PROGRAM POLICY AND STRUCTURE TO PROVIDE MORE SUBSIDY TO AFFORDABLE PROJECTS INCLUDING ADUS ON OWNER OCCUPIED PROPERTIES.</p>
Hand Delivered	<p>Support the SHIP Strategies and goals especially related to homeownership. Homeownership is a permanent, housing solution, especially for families with children who need 3-4 bedrooms. Subsidy per unit for homeownership is lower than subsidy per unit for creating rental units at 51-60% AMI (\$9k for homeownership vs \$60k for rental. Virtually every study shows homeownership leads to improved health, education, and employment outcomes. We need to provide homeownership opportunities for new homeowners, not just existing homeowners.</p> <p>SHIP should include homeownership upto 120% AMI. SHIP does not allocate funding, it only makes it possible to apply for funding. Council reviews each project individually and awards funds based on merit. This is how to avoid bad projects. Less than 3% of the 10-year budget is for homeownership for families earning 80%-120% AMI. This is not a substantial portion. The subsidy per unit at this income level is low. In exchange, the City ensures the house remains affordable for a set number of years which is critically important given the rapid rise in home sales prices SA is experiencing. Funding for homeownership allows Habitat for Humanity to build neighborhoods that include homes for low income and middle income families. Providing affordable, modest homes for families at 80%-100% is the best catalyst to break the cycle of poverty. These families lose all their social safety-net benefits like food stamps, health insurance subsidies, and child care subsidies so they are faced with choosing between decent housing or being able to pay for food or health care or childcare or all 3.</p> <p>SHIP should include homeownership upto 120% AMI. SHIP does not allocate funding, it only makes it possible to apply for funding. Council reviews each project individually and awards funds based on merit. This is how to avoid bad projects. Less than 3% of the 10-year budget is for homeownership for families earning 80%-120% AMI. This is not a substantial portion. The subsidy per unit at this income level is low. In exchange, the City ensures the house remains affordable for a set number of years which is critically important given the rapid rise in home sales prices SA is experiencing. Funding for homeownership allows Habitat for Humanity to build neighborhoods that include homes for low income and middle income families. Providing affordable, modest homes for families at 80%-100% is the best catalyst to break the cycle of poverty. These families lose all their social safety-net benefits like food stamps, health insurance subsidies, and child care subsidies so they are faced with choosing between decent housing or being able to pay for food or health care or childcare or all 3. There is a strong public support for affordable homeownership development. In a previous request for public input for affordable housing, 2,225 people indicated in writing, their support for affordable homeownership development which aligns well with the SHIP recommendations. This should be counted toward this discussion on affordability. This is the 3rd time this year there has been a public comment period related to affordable housing. The city should not disregard the prior feedback or require people to come say the same thing over and over.</p> <p>Support these specific strategies: Update the UDC to remove barriers to housing production Support and grow non-profit housing providers Establish land banking program to acquire land for future affordable housing projects Update the City Fee Waiver Program policy and structure to provide more subsidy to affordable projects</p>



Tier One Neighborhood Coalition (T1NC) is a group of San Antonio downtown (inside Loop 410) neighborhoods organized to advocate and work for compatible development, as well as other important issues that affect our communities, and to promote communication, cooperation, education, and support among neighborhoods. Contact t1nc.sat@gmail.com or visit T1nc.org

December 1, 2021

Dear Councilwoman Castillo,

Members of Tier One Neighborhood Coalition and partner neighborhoods outside Loop 410 would like to share specific concerns and make recommendations to the SHIP for your consideration before adoption in early December. Tier One has been soliciting comments and recommendations through our newsletter, *T1NC Update*, and social media and at our recent in-person meeting. This list of concerns and recommendations has also been sent as input to NHSD, but we have not been informed about how the and by whom the information will be considered.

We have shared with you our grave concerns, in a previous letter, regarding public input about the SHIP. Because there is a sense of distrust about the assurance of any future public engagement, we urge you to consider the following recommendations.

Specific Change Requests:

Our primary recommendation is that qualifying language be added to make recommendations about affordable housing less ambiguous and open to interpretation. The following specific recommendations should also be reflected in the summary (page 13).

Examples:

1. (page 22) The first strategy, "Develop a coordinated housing system (CHS)"
Recommendation: "Develop a coordinated **affordable** housing system."
2. (page 23) The goal "CHS2: Update the Unified Development Code to remove barriers to housing production and preservation"
 - **Recommendation: should be eliminated.**
 - **Alternate Recommendation:** "CHS2: Update the Unified Development Code to remove barriers to affordable housing production and preservation"
 - **Rationale:** The strategy "Increase affordable housing production, rehabilitation, and preservation (HPRP)" (page 37) addresses the same issue without the language that implies that developers could produce any kind of housing anywhere, no matter the affordability or compatibility to the surrounding area,

potentially destabilizing neighborhoods and displacing its residents. The goal could be altered: “Update the Unified Development Code to remove barriers to **affordable** housing production and preservation” but most of us feel this is still too open to interpretation in favor of incompatible and market-rate housing production.

3. (page 13) The goal in CHS: Increase city investment in housing with a 10-year funding plan”
 - **Recommendation:** “Increase city investment in **affordable** housing with a 10-year funding plan.”

4. (page 35) On the goal “CIH 6: Update the city fee waiver fee program policy and structure to provide more subsidy to affordable projects including ADUs”
 - **Recommendation:** “Update the city fee waiver fee program policy and structure to provide more subsidy to affordable projects including ADUs **on owner-occupied properties.**”
 - **Rationale:** ADUs should continue to be owner-occupied properties otherwise the incentives will create more investment opportunities for developers to put multiple units on a single-family lot without going through the Zoning Commission thus, cutting out neighborhood input. Our neighborhoods already suffer from investors and speculators removing affordable housing from the market, driving up land values, and displacing neighbors. For many neighborhoods, this kind of commodification has become acute.

Other Considerations and Requests:

Page 8: Would like to have seen the 0-15% AMI breakout for renters separated out to see the true need that SAHA is being expected to meet (despite a 40,000 waitlist); also, do we know what percentage of “vulnerable residents” live alone – either homeowners or renters?

Page 9: How many houses and rental units for EACH of the AMI categories have already been completed and how many will be completed by the original deadline for the city to be able to state that they are “on target”? On target with what? Where did the 11,882 number come from and what is the breakdown by AMI%? Wasn't there a SHIP recalibration of targets in Summer 2020? A framework itself doesn't create numbers last time I checked – people do.

Page 15: Re: the bar graph w/ \$150M for each of the 2022 and 2027 bonds - was the recent reduction of \$100M (from \$250M) in Housing for the 2022 bond or the 2027

bond, or both?

Page 20-21: Re: strategies and timeline - NHSD should have already ceased to support market rate development so why is this a strategy for 2022, not 2021? Also, isn't there already a community land trust that OURSA oversees? If so, then why is this assigned to SAHT? And how many vacant buildings does OHP currently have inventoried? Should we really wait until 2023 to expand the voucher program in SA, and then *only* advocate at the Federal level? Seems like more could/ should be done at the local level.

I did not see any type of strategy that includes incentives or financial assistance for landlords that have only a few properties, keep their rents low and properties up to code. There are many of these kind folks out there that took major hits from the eviction moratorium and could use some help maintaining affordability.

Thank-you for your continued support of neighborhoods.

Respectfully,

Tier One Neighborhood Coalition Steering Committee

Tony Garcia, Jordan Ghawi, Mary Johnson, Gemma Kennedy, Ricki Kushner, Margaret Leeds, Bianca Maldonado, Velma Pena, Cynthia Spielman, Steve Versteeg, Taylor Watson, Christina Wright, Theresa Ybanez



Tier One Neighborhood Coalition (T1NC) is a group of San Antonio downtown (inside Loop 410) neighborhoods organized to advocate and work for compatible development, as well as other important issues that affect our communities, and to promote communication, cooperation, education, and support among neighborhoods. Contact t1nc.sat@gmail.com or visit T1nc.org

November 1, 2021

Dear D9 Councilman Courage,

On November 3rd at the City Council B Session, you will receive a presentation on the draft version of the SHIP (Strategic Housing Implementation Plan). We're writing ahead to let you know that we have some serious concerns and think that you will find that you have the same concerns out of consideration for your constituents. We are concerned that the Public Participation Principles, which play such an important part of the SHIP, are not being followed in this public input stage: There is not enough time for meaningful input on a 68-page document has yet to be released on the website at the time of this writing (days before input begins.)

We feel the Public Participation Principles are not being taken seriously as necessary metrics that ensure the inclusivity of the public in decisions that will have decades worth of impacts. Those impacts will either decrease or increase the housing crisis. The language throughout the presentations and documents regarding the SHIP, the Housing Bond Evaluation Framework, and the Housing Bond, etc. all talk about connecting to the most vulnerable populations. As one Westside resident put it, "We're suppose to go to bond meetings, ARPA meetings, be concerned about UDC amendments, and keep up with other issues like zoning cases, and read 68 pages and give input within a couple of weeks along with our jobs and our families? We feel like we are always left out in the cold because we can't keep up, and here we are again. This feels like it is on purpose."

The draft SHIP was not available until two months after the intended August deadline. It was decided at the Housing Commission that the timeline would not be adjusted to the right so as to keep the adoption of the SHIP on schedule for December. Because of this delay, and the decision not to shift the timeline, there is now the negative consequence that our communities are facing.

The first public input session is scheduled for November 1st on the Westside, one of our most vulnerable populations, without the adequate time to receive the information or the proper accessibility to ensure that they are able to give input. The flyer information in English and Spanish were not made available until Friday, October 29th. The Neighborhood Housing Services Department (NHSD) site is not updated with the draft SHIP nor the intended Summary needed to make the information accessible prior to the input session. What exacerbates this issue is the lack of accessibility to information has

been a primary topic in all of the meetings, as a part of insuring the Public Participation Principles.

NHSD, which facilitated the SHIP task force meetings and the production of the document, is responsible for the task of meaningful public input in a short window before adoption by City Council. At a Housing Commission Public Engagement and Outreach Committee, they have recognized the challenges and have admitted to not being able to meet certain accessibility criteria. Is this not serious enough that the Housing Commission could anticipate the problems for public participation when they decided not to shift their timeline? The Administrative Directive AD 10.1 Public Participation and Engagement has guiding principles such as "inclusive", "accessible", "informative", "timely" and "convenient", that are the minimum criteria to be met when engaging the public. Determined milestones that keep everything (ethically) in check. It is the people that body our governance structure and, the people that are the majority, are left out of critical policy making processes.

Public input is scheduled for three input sessions, by person and by webex and phone, as well as a survey that will close on November 15th. Again, the draft and the summary have not been made available to the public on the NHSD site (as of Sunday October 31st; the first input session is Monday November 1st). And it should be reiterated that the most vulnerable populations who need to know whether or not they are included in the Strategic Housing Implementation Plan and who deserve a voice in this policy, need accessible engagement and outreach.

If it is not corrected now, in this first step, there will be consequences in the near future that include the growing mistrust of CoSA to remove the barriers to affordable housing and to solve the housing crisis. There is a lot of language that protects neighborhoods but there are concerns about certain portions regarding removing barriers to housing production which opens a door that could compromise everything we have worked towards if housing production includes market rate housing and those barriers are the protections we have fought for to prevent displacement. This is a discussion that needs to be had in full length. In order to build trust in the process, a process that residents feel is skewed towards the benefit of the development community, we are asking that more time be given for public input and more is done to ensure accessibility.

Respectfully,

Tier One Neighborhood Coalition Steering Committee

Tony Garcia, Jordan Ghawi, Mary Johnson, Gemma Kennedy, Ricki Kushner, Margaret Leeds, Bianca Maldonado, Velma Pena, Cynthia Spielman, Steve Versteeg, Taylor Watson, Christina Wright, Theresa Ybanez



City/County Joint Commission on Elderly Affairs

233 N. Pecos, Suite 590
San Antonio, Texas 78207
Telephone: (210) 335-6918
Fax: (210) 335-6788



December 1, 2021

City of San Antonio
Housing Bond Committee

The City/County Joint Commission on Elderly Affairs, (JCOEA), purpose is to improve the quality of life for Seniors in San Antonio and Bexar County through support services, advocacy and educational programs, outreach efforts, legal assistance and financial guidance, and other challenges facing Seniors.

Older adults represent one in five San Antonians who have invested in this city for most of their 60+ years, through paying taxes and supporting bond issues as the most voters in any municipal election. The JCOEA has addressed housing for seniors through two resolutions that you will find attached to this letter.

As affordable housing is the home you live in, and as aging in place is critical to the long-term health and well-being of older adults, adequate support of funded programs to ensure that their homes meet current codes must be a priority for this proposed Housing Bond. Providing adequate housing at a variety of price points is the second and equally important housing goal the JCOEA has identified.

The Strategic Housing Implementation Plan (SHIP) calls for New Housing & Preservation Targets of 1,200 units of the proposed 28,094 for older adults. We request that the number of age-restricted units target increase to 4,776-5,619, the percentage reflecting the number of older adults. Our second request is that the term "Vulnerable Population" explicitly include older adults.

As the SHIP moves forward as the carrier of the first Housing Bond in San Antonio requesting citizen support, our goal is to ensure that older adults are represented in the planning, budget, and communication efforts leading to the Housing Bond's success. We must honor these one in five San Antonians who are our older adults.

Sincerely,

Lila Aguirre

Lila Aguirre
Chair

cc: Melody Woosley, Director, Department of Human Services

Chair

Lila Aguirre
Mayor Appointee

Vice-Chair

Daniel Meza
Council District 9 Appointee

Members

Lila Aguirre
Mayor Appointee
Barbara Witte-Howell
Council District 1 Appointee
Frank Brown
Council Dist. 2 Appointee
Noralyn Rippes
Council Dist. 3 Appointee
Fernanda Cardenas
Council Dist. 4 Appointee
Gloria Zamora
Council Dist. 5 Appointee
Bert Pickell
Council Dist. 6 Appointee
Doris Griffin
Council Dist. 7 Appointee
Jane Velasquez
Council Dist. 8 Appointee
Daniel Meza
Council Dist. 9 Appointee
Gavin Nichols
Council Dist. 10 Appointee
Chris Dawkins
County Judge Appointee
Frank Covarrubia
County Precinct 1 Appointee
Jerry Tyson
County Precinct 2 Appointee
Teresa Martinez
County Precinct 3 Appointee
Betty Eckert
County Precinct 4 Appointee

Recommendations for SHIP Report

Page # and Section	Comments
Pg 7, vision & values	95,000 households in Bexar county—what data source is used to determine this? Is it TDHCA Income & Rent Limits for 2021? What is the base data source for TDHCA? Is it the American Community Survey? If yes, then the latest ACS data is 2019 and if that is the base, this data is pre-pandemic. Therefore, I believe the 95,000 number of vulnerable households base is too low. SAHA alone recently did an analysis and their waitlist grew by 10k since the pandemic began. Therefore, I wonder if TDHCA numbers use pre-pandemic numbers as their base. If that is the case, it should be noted and stated that the 95k households has likely increased due to the pandemic. Not noting that would be an egregious omission.
p. 7, vision & values	It states that 28,000 affordable homes is an increase of nearly 10k over the previous goals. Please indicate what “previous goal” we are referring to. Cite the document.
p. 8, Figure 2	Comment: Based on this pie chart (which might be based on numbers that are pre-pandemic) we see that the Renters and Homeowner totals at 30% and below equal to 44,734 households. This number far exceeds the 28k goal over 10 years for SHIP. If we take into account the “Equity Principles” then it makes sense to focus on where the need is the greatest in this plan and in our policies moving forward.
p. 9, Figure 4	Please include the AMI targets achieved in each of the categories (rental preservation, rental production, homeowner preservation, homeowner production) and connect them to the original HPF on p. 52. Also, please add an appendix that highlights the funding mechanisms used to reach those goals.
p. 9, Figure 5	The document states “12 of the 24 strategies are complete.” Although you are referring to the HPF strategies, that should be stated here and an appendix with a list of the strategies should be included in the report. Or list them on this page and insert a ✓ check mark to highlight which ones are complete, which ones are being worked on and which ones are in SHIP.
p. 10, Defining Affordability	More expansive definitions of affordability were created by the Housing Commission. It is VERY important to include that in this document since members of the HC spent hours on this. It also gives the public better clarification.
p. 11, Table 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NO homeownership production above 80% should be included here. Keep the homeowner production at 650 (60-80% AMI) and shift the remainder (1,300 under homeownership production) to homeownership preservation at 30% AMI and below. This need was also outlined in the Opportunity at Risk report. 2. If we are using the pie chart (figure 2) as our basis, and we see that the NEED for renters at 30% equates to 27k households, why would we only support 909 households in this table? Move the 2,046 target in 60-80% AMI to 30% below AMI in rental preservation.

p. 12, Figure 9	This pie chart is too vague. If the recommendation stated above (reduce targets at higher AMIs to lower AMIs) is incorporated, then this pie chart will change. Pie chart should also include subsections of AMI targets for clarity.
p. 14, Protect and Promote Neighborhood Preservation	Since a thorough analysis was done by the UT Law School on Demolitions in San Antonio, include the recommendations listed in that report here. Or at least mention the report for city to review and consider recommendations listed there.
p. 15, Figure 11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Funding summary has terms that should be included in the glossary. Some are and some are not. Furthermore, please include the range of AMIs that each funding strategy allows. 2. Which of these funding strategies allow market rate development? My recommendation is to include the funding sources and information such as AMI range. For example, we know that “Federal Capital Funds” for \$140 million for SAHA only funds 30% below AMI but other funding sources listed here include much higher AMIs. (some of this is highlighted on p. 57 so incorporate into bar chart on p. 15) 3. Under tax exemptions, please list all types under this category (PFCs, etc) 4. HOME ARPA—should state that it is a one-time funding source
p. 20-21, Work Plan	Add a column that connects the strategies to one of the 5 Action Items of the HPF listed on page 18.
p. 20, Work Plan	Add DSD, Planning, and SAHT (along with NHSD) to organizations responsible for Developing and Implementing a Displacement Impact Assessment
p. 20, Work Plan	Add CCDO, DSD, SAHT, Bexar County to leads under “cease public support of market rate development that will displace residents.”
p. 21, Work Plan	Add SAHA, SAHT, Bexar County as leads to “expand funding for extremely low income households.”
Throughout the document, Funding Sources	There are multiple pages that list the Housing Bond as a Funding Source for several of these strategies. Isn’t this premature to state since the public has to decide how those funds will be used? Either delete Housing Bond under those sections or refer readers to p. 58 where it clarifies that bond funds are subject to public priorities and voter approval.
p. 58 Table 2	See recommendations for p. 11
p. 59	It is not clear where the target numbers on bar chart to the far right come from. They currently do not correspond to numbers on p. 58 (which need to be changed to lower AMIs as recommended on p. 11)

- Have we revisited the discussion notes from the SHIP Roundtable on Extremely Low-Income discussion in August? Points/highlights from that roundtable should be incorporated into SHIP.