



Mayor's Housing Policy Task Force
Technical Working Groups Report
May 18, 2018

The Mayor's Housing Policy Task Force (the Task Force) is leading a policy-making process to develop housing policy recommendations that will increase the availability of housing that is affordable to all economic segments of the population and address challenges that include gentrification and displacement, rising property taxes, decreasing affordability, neighborhood preservation, low affordable housing production levels, insufficient gap financing, limited capacity, and existing programs that target higher-income households. The process includes a commitment to inclusive community engagement that engenders trust, facilitates open and thoughtful conversations, and identifies innovative solutions.

The Task Force established five Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and charged them with establishing statements of policy priorities and objectives with regard to:

- Providing housing for all, including special needs populations
- Creating a transparent, coordinated housing system
- Removing barriers to housing affordability and supply
- Identifying and expanding housing funding and financing mechanisms
- Developing and preserving housing for stable, equitable and resilient neighborhoods

Please see below for the TWG scopes and see Appendix A for full descriptions.

Each TWG comprised 20-25 practitioners, allied professionals, community leaders, advocates, and policy experts. Their members and two co-chairs were appointed by the Task Force. The groups were staffed by LISC and NALCAB, with various City of San Antonio departments providing data, logistical, and other support. Please see Appendix B for a full list of TWG members.

On January 23, 2018, all five groups met for an orientation meeting during which they reviewed the Task Force's mission and vision, received their charge from the Task Force, and met to introduce themselves and define the key issues each group would address. Following the introductory meeting, each group met four times between January and April 2018. These meetings were facilitated by NALCAB and LISC. As needed, the groups also formed subcommittees and charged them with conducting additional research, developing recommendations, and other tasks. Over the course of the meetings, each group identified key issues and problems; reviewed data and research provided by the consultants, City staff, and working group members; discussed and developed policy ideas; and organized their ideas into policy priorities, which are the focus of this report. Please see Appendix C and D for the agendas, notes, and other materials from the TWG meetings, as well as bibliographies of the resources considered by each group, and comments submitted in writing by working group members outside of the meetings.

Technical Working Group Scopes

Providing Housing for All, Including Special Needs Populations: identify vulnerable groups with unique housing needs; assess current efforts to quantify and meet these needs; determine what policy changes are necessary at a local, state and federal level; and identify housing production models to ensure that special populations have access to affordable, dignified, and supportive housing.

Creating a Transparent, Coordinated Housing System: identify and inventory programs, services, providers, investments, and funding sources that can be aligned to create a more efficient housing delivery system. Establish metrics and models for system accountability that assure effective management and monitoring of housing programs. These outcomes will establish targets to make a significant impact in closing the housing gap for extremely low- to moderate-income households and will improve public confidence and facilitate investment of additional resources in the housing sector. Identify policies to enhance coordination; make best use of existing human, data, and financial resources; support prioritization of investments; shift focus to outcomes rather than outputs; and look for opportunities to centralize information.

Removing Barriers to Housing Affordability and Supply: recommend a set of policies to guide the City of San Antonio's investment in housing projects and programs. Prioritize policy recommendations to effectively reduce the cost of land acquisition, technical innovation, and construction. Policies could address alternative building materials, techniques, and types; streamline development regulations; eliminate fees and other barriers; and expand the construction workforce.

Identifying and Expanding Housing Funding and Financing Mechanisms: examine existing affordable housing finance programs to evaluate how funds are being distributed and whether public sector dollars are being targeted to projects that house those resident populations with the greatest housing need; propose policies that create new funding sources and strategies for reallocating existing resources that better align with data trends and local community needs; create a model for building capacity at all levels and sectors to support and sustain heightened levels of housing development and housing rehabilitation activities; and recommend that the City of San Antonio make affordable housing a top policy priority.

Developing and Preserving Housing for Stable, Equitable and Resilient Neighborhoods: identify policies that support diversity, equity, and growth, while assisting homeowners and renters to remain in their homes and communities, including policies that create and preserve affordable housing, including targeted incentives, land banks, and social impact bonds; provide renter and homeowner protections, including property tax reform and controls on short-term rentals; support homeownership assistance programs; improve owner- and renter-occupied rehab programs; recognize the impacts of gentrification and displacement; and create opportunities for cross-sector collaboration in transportation, health, education, and economic development.

Policy Recommendations

Providing Housing for All, Including Special Needs Populations

The Housing for All, Including Special Populations, Technical Working Group was charged to identify vulnerable groups with unique housing needs; assess current efforts to quantify and meet needs; determine and propose policy changes; and identify models and strategies to ensure access to affordable, dignified and supportive housing. Priority policy actions are listed below and broken down into immediate term (this calendar year), short term (24 months) and longer-term timeframes, presented under five headings: **Recognize and quantify special populations and their housing gap; Commit sufficient resources to close gaps; Integrate special needs populations; Provide accountability and oversight;** and **Remove specific barriers.** For greater clarity, this report also includes a glossary in the appendices.

The technical working group (TWG) recognizes that providing housing for special populations occurs within a context of systemic and institutionalized factors that continually increase demands for services. For example, discrimination and economic inequality both exacerbate the impact of the criminal justice system on specific populations such as minority males, who subsequently have severe difficulties obtaining housing. Addressing these underlying factors is beyond the current scope. Acknowledging that some problems cannot be solved through their efforts, the TWG accepted the task of identifying and creating policy solutions to address the needs of those facing the most obstacles to accessing housing, and further ensuring that these needs are considered as an integral part of any housing initiative, investment, policy or plan. Within the larger community, special needs can and should be met through a combination of approaches, from accessible urban design, land use and regulatory codes to on-site services, delivery of services, or supportive modifications.

Special populations should neither be marginalized or overly-concentrated in a specific location; rather, the diverse needs of our community should be reflected, understood, and addressed as broadly as possible, whether through the siting of new facilities to better serve existing housing stock (such as naturally occurring retirement communities), the construction/adaptation of new housing near existing facilities, or the adoption of standards and guidelines that make all housing healthier and more accessible (i.e universal design). The TWG's recommendations are grounded in the belief that San Antonians with special medical, mental health, physical or development needs are an untapped resource within our community, and that acting on this precept is both morally and economically sound public policy.

As both geographic and social inclusion are important in building a healthy community, policies supporting housing opportunities for all should be implemented in existing and new neighborhoods. In addition, standards promoting inclusion in all aspects of life—shopping, recreation, and employment, as well as housing—should be adopted. Friends, caregivers and family members of special needs individuals will also benefit directly from the development and adaptation of healthy, accessible, affordable housing. In some cases these will be low-cost solutions, such as siting housing on existing transit lines or next to social service centers; in other cases additional capital costs will be incurred, such as retrofitting properties for older San Antonians to age in place or providing clinic space in a new project; and in some cases operating costs will be increased through on-site delivery of counseling, training, medical or other services.

In summary, the TWG recommends policies that will allow more members of our community to live with dignity and the opportunity to be self-sufficient, which will require additional resources. All San Antonians deserve more choice, less isolation and reduced stigma, which the TWG believes can be realized through increased awareness and commitment to a community wellness model built around affordable, accessible housing. Additionally, existing data supports the position that an integrated, inclusive approach is both a more efficient and more effective use of public dollars. However, while we have some data in this area, the TWG believes that we need more, including the return on investment of funds dedicated to housing and fuller cost/benefit analyses. Disaggregated data will allow effective advocacy for specific program and project investments that are beyond the scope of the current report, which focuses on the policy recommendations necessary to improve the housing and services ecosystem.

The Healthy People 2020 Social Determinants of Health framework defined by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is a model which outlines programs and policies that support health equity by “creating social and physical environments that promote good health for all”. The adoption of such policies by the local government (County and City) and community partners has the potential to develop and sustain healthy communities for all, including the most vulnerable. The concept of social determinants of health provides a national framework that housing and service providers in San Antonio can explore further and work within to achieve positive outcomes. Below are the five domains of the Social Determinants of Health Model.



Policy Recommendations

1. Recognize and quantify special populations and their housing gap.

a. Immediate Term

- i. Across all sectors, partners adopt a definition of a Service Enriched Housing Community which is inclusive of Permanent Supportive Housing, with the understanding that how targeted populations are defined does impact funding availability and other opportunities.
- ii. The City of San Antonio, including the Neighborhood Housing Services, Human Services, Metropolitan Health and Planning departments, supports the creation, oversight and collaboration with a coalition/alliance of SEHC developers and providers to ensure implementation of policy goals, community advocacy and education around SEHC/PSH creation and benefits.
- iii. The City of San Antonio will integrate its local, state and federal advocacy and legislative plans with the SEHC coalition recommendations.

b. Short Term

- i. The City of San Antonio works with the SEHC coalition, other governments and organizations to develop and regularly update a report on the demand for, supply of and resulting gap in provision of affordable SEHC/PSH (by City Council district and Commissioners Court precincts). This report should collect, analyze and communicate data to inform decision making (for example evictions, homelessness, health outcome, demographic shifts, etc.).
- ii. The City and other partners should support the SEHC coalition to make consistent and reliable information, referrals, and data relating to SEHC/PSH units widely available, which will also assist with implementing a “no wrong door” service delivery approach.

c. Long Term

- i. Explore expanding efforts to create a regional coalition and solutions.
- ii. Continue to support and provide oversight of the SEHC coalition.
- iii. Monitor the progress of the City’s efforts to incorporate suggested policies in the design and subsidy of new and current housing developments, and overall funding allocations.

2. Commit sufficient resources to close the identified housing gaps; at least 30% of new dollars committed to affordable housing should be targeted to special needs populations.

a. Immediate Term

- i. The City of San Antonio, other local governments, private and non-profit organizations, social service providers and the health care sector establish

cost/benefit ratios for SEHC investments for targeted populations and use them to guide budget decisions.

b. Short Term

- i. The City of San Antonio, other local governments, private and non-profit organizations, social service providers and the health care sector identify and dedicate sources of funds to the construction, rehabilitation and retrofit of both rental and owner-occupied units for special populations needing SEHC/PSH.
- ii. The City of San Antonio, other local governments, private and non-profit organizations, social service providers and the health care sector identify and dedicate sources of funds for the provision of services to special populations needing SEHC/PSH.

3. Integrate special needs populations.

a. Immediate Term

- i. All City of San Antonio housing incentives should include the requirement to deliver a minimum percentage of units of special needs housing.
- ii. Recognizing that some previously homeless individuals may have poor credit and rental history, and possibly criminal justice history, providing incentives to landlords/property owners who grant housing opportunities to these individuals by removing/minimizing admission barriers to housing:
 - a. Utilizing a Risk Mitigation Fund for landlords/property owners providing reimburse in case of an adverse event.
 - b. Supporting (financially and with technical assistance) landlords/property owners providing housing opportunities for vulnerable populations who implement financial education and asset building programs to help tenants improve their financial stability and credit history.

b. Short Term

- i. SEHC is integrated into all construction and rehabilitation to the greatest extent possible through the adoption of guidelines such as Healthy Housing Standards or others that support accessibility, ageing in place, and universal design.
- ii. Recognizing that some residents are not literate or do not speak English or Spanish, ensure that communication about housing takes place in multiple formats and media.

4. Provide accountability and oversight.

a. Immediate Term

- i. City of San Antonio Departments should have adequate, trained staff to implement new initiatives.
- ii. Oversight of the Mayor's Housing Policy Task Force recommendations should be assigned to a community-based group or commission via ordinance.
- iii. Housing policy recommendations should be adopted via ordinance.

b. Short Term

- i. SEHC/PSH provision at a level sufficient to close identified gaps is addressed in SA Tomorrow implementation and all other City of San Antonio neighborhood and housing planning efforts, documents and studies, with particular attention to creating accessible public spaces and transportation.
- ii. Local governments, the SEHC coalition and other partners collaborate with the community to develop and carry out a transparent, data-driven, third party assessment to determine whether we are meeting our annual goals, and to benchmark our efforts vs. peer cities.

5. Remove barriers specific to the creation of SEHC/PSH.

a. Immediate Term

- i. The City of San Antonio appoints an advisory commission of housing professionals, advocates and service providers to review codes, regulations and standards that may hinder development of SEHC/PSH, especially using innovative materials and construction methods such as modular and self-help.

b. Short Term

- i. Following the recommendations of the advisory commission, the City of San Antonio amends regulations that hinder development of affordable housing for special needs populations.

Appendices

- **Appendix A: Written Comments**
- **Appendix B: Glossary**
- **Appendix C: Policy Goals**

Appendix A: Written Comments—Aging in Place

The following written comments were received after the April 26th TWG meeting.

Establish policies that improve opportunities for older persons to age in place.

- a. Create a dedicated fund from general revenue funds or general obligation bonds to fund home modifications/retrofitting of owner occupied homes of persons age 65 and older.
- b. Provide greater support for aging in place and home modifications. The majority of older adults' homes lack supportive features and/or contain hazards for this population. Appropriate modifications can be made by certified or trained vendors, but cost remains a problem since funding often falls between the cracks of housing, social services, and medical care. A program should be developed that employs teams of handymen, nurses, and occupational therapists, and policies passed for initiatives to support home modification in San Antonio under a Modification Assistance Initiative to help the current situation
- c. Support the provision of resources for Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities by collaborating with neighborhood associations to identify social service needs in their neighborhoods and developing plans to address such needs.
- d. Review relevant Building Codes and City Ordinances to identify opportunities to support multi-generational housing and reduce barriers to older persons aging in place with their families or loved ones.
- e. Amend the Building Code to include provisions that include standards for new construction that include Universal Design Standards such as 30-inch door openings, wall reinforcements for grab bar installation, height limitations for light switches, outlets and thermostats, and no-step entrances to the first floor for wheelchair access.

Rehabilitate housing stock occupied by older persons in need of critically needed repairs.

- a. Survey housing stock in San Antonio to identify homes and neighborhoods with older housing units focusing on homes with the greatest need for repair and rehabilitation.
- b. Having identified neighborhoods and homes most likely to require repair and rehabilitation, collaborate with builders, the non-profit community and neighborhood associations to develop a plan of action to address critical repairs such as weatherization, roof repair, and floor repair.

Appendix B: Glossary

Intellectual and developmental disability (IDD) includes many severe, chronic conditions that are due to mental and/or physical impairments. IDD can begin at any time, up to 22 years of age. It usually lasts throughout a person's lifetime. People who have IDD have problems with major life activities such as language, mobility, learning, self-help and independent living (<https://hhs.texas.gov/services/disability/intellectual-or-developmental-disabilities-idd-long-term-care>).

Permanent supportive housing (PSH) is a combination of housing and services designed for people with serious mental illnesses or other disabilities who need support to live stably in their communities. These services can include case management, substance abuse or mental health counseling, advocacy, and assistance in locating and maintaining employment. Permanent Supportive Housing is a proven solution for people who have experienced chronic homelessness as well as other people with disabilities, including people leaving institutional and restrictive settings. Research has shown that supportive housing not only resolves homelessness and increases housing stability, but also improves health and lowers public costs by reducing the use of publicly-funded crisis services, including shelters, hospitals, psychiatric centers, jails, and prisons. Three PSH Models include:

- Single-site housing: permanent supportive housing buildings are newly constructed or rehabilitated and tenants have access to voluntary on-site services
- Scattered-site housing: Private market apartments dispersed throughout the community, where rental assistance is provided and tenants have access to mobile and/or site-based supportive services
- Unit set-asides: supportive services are offered to participants in designated units within affordable housing developments.

(Reference: US Interagency Council on Homelessness and US Department of Housing and Urban Development).

Service-enriched housing community (SEHC) features rental or ownership homes in which residents are connected to social services and other supports. Services may be available onsite or through an accessible program. An SEHC meet diverse populations' needs, utilizing healthy housing and universal design standards. Housing and services can be provided by nonprofit, private, or government organizations and may be unsubsidized, government assisted, mixed income or a combination. Support programs may serve--but are not limited to--extremely low income families (<30 % AMI), older San Antonians, people with physical, intellectual or developmental disabilities, mental health care consumers, those with substance use disorders, criminal justice-involved populations, or veterans.

Social determinants of health - Social determinants of health are conditions in the environments in which people are born, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality-of-life outcomes and risks. The goal is to create social and physical environments that promote good health for all. Resources that enhance quality of life can have a significant influence on population health outcomes. Examples of these resources include safe and affordable housing, access to education, public safety, availability of healthy foods, local emergency/health services, and environments free of life-threatening toxins. (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - Healthy People 2020)

Supportive wrap-around services - Examples of supportive wrap around services include case management, financial counseling, substance abuse or mental health counseling, advocacy, and assistance in locating and maintaining employment. (US Interagency Council on Homeless)

Appendix C: Policy Goals

1. Service Enriched Housing and Communities (SEHC), including Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), is better defined and the need for SEHC is broadly understood as a central component of affordable housing demand.
2. Planning, development and preservation of new and existing affordable rental and ownership housing communities supports both de-concentration of special populations and the accessibility of wrap-around services necessary for SEHC.
3. Dedicated funds are identified and set aside for the construction, rehab and retrofit of both rental and owner-occupied units for special populations needing SEHC.
4. The healthcare sector and social service providers are an active partner in investing in, developing and providing supportive service – enriched housing.
5. San Antonio has an ongoing, collaborative, community based, data-informed process that enables the integration of supportive services and the delivery of SEHC.
6. Local governments and other partners collaborate with the community to develop and carry out a formalized, data-driven, third party assessment to determine whether we are meeting our goals, and to benchmark our efforts vs. peer cities.
7. Our collaborative approach and integrated supportive service model mean that there is “no wrong door” to access affordable SEHC.
8. Regulatory, process and community barriers unique to SEHC are removed and we continue to meet and exceed our Fair Housing baseline.
9. San Antonio utilizes innovative materials and construction methods for SEHC.

Policy Recommendations

Creating a Transparent, Coordinated Housing System

The purpose of this working group is to provide policy priorities that create a housing system that is 1) *coordinated* across public, private and non-profit housing sectors and 2) is *transparent and accountable* to the public, those in need of housing services, and the housing sectors that will utilize the system. To accomplish this purpose, the group focused on policies that establish a model to align programs, services, providers, funding sources and investment strategies to create a more efficient housing delivery system; and to establish metrics for system accountability that assure effective management and monitoring of housing programs.

The working group focused on large-scale, strategic approaches to address the issues of transparency and coordination. The following recommendations represent the highest priorities that emerged from the deliberations of the group.

Policy Recommendation: Commit to create, support, and sustain a regional housing framework for a coordinated housing system by formalizing a working group of interagency and community housing partners that will hold all involved parties accountable.

This purpose of this policy recommendation is to support the creation of a transparent housing system that is coordinated across sectors, and that aligns services, regulations and funding requirements across these sectors to increase the efficiency and accountability of the housing delivery system in San Antonio and Bexar County. The group noted that the systems change work started with the Task Force and Technical Working Groups can only be sustained by the creation of an overseeing body comprised of members with decision-making authority. This organization would be able to maintain long-term, continuous housing strategies and priorities.

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends:

- The City of San Antonio should invest and sustain this continued effort for the long term. However, housing needs are not limited to within the City's jurisdiction, and the organization should include other significant actors such as Bexar County and other organizations that provide funding for affordable housing
- The organization should catalogue and prioritize existing funding sources and have decision-making authority to award funding, ensuring that deployment of funding is coordinated and aligns with a consistent strategy
- The organization should determine metrics/goals based on the completed housing inventory; should include data and accountability from all housing sectors (public, private, and non-profit) and housing gaps by income category
- Entities that accept funding should be required to consistently report progress toward goals
- Members should be elected officials, community members, and interagency representatives
- Organization should identify and cross-reference all housing-related plans to ensure coordination, including aligning land use and zoning to housing policy maps
- Organization should oversee/manage the housing resource one-stop-center (see next policy recommendation for more detail)
- Organization should engage private sector/corporations to explore businesses case for their investment in affordable housing

- Potential models for this type of organization include the following:
 - Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) – MPOs are federally mandated and federally funded transportation policy-making organizations that are made up of local government and governmental authorities. The following aspects of MPOs would be relevant to the working group’s recommendation:
 - Has dedicated funding for staffing from a governmental source
 - Has government mandated authority to make policy and funding decisions
 - Goal is to provide a comprehensive, coordinated and continuous planning process across the greater San Antonio area
 - Places special emphasis on providing equal access to a specific resource
 - For more information visit www.alamoareampo.org/About-Us or www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/transportation-planning/metropolitan-planning-organization-mpo
 - South Alamo Regional Alliance for the Homeless (SARAH) – SARAH is a federal mandated organization consisting of the City of San Antonio, Bexar County and agencies that provide homeless services. The following aspects of SARAH would be relevant to the working group’s recommendation:
 - Has a single application for services and centralized intake hubs
 - Developed a real-time information management system that shows available units and eligibility requirements
 - Developed a process developed to ensure that people experiencing a housing crisis are quickly identified, assessed, and connected to the appropriate and available housing assistance, based on who has resources available
 - For more information visit www.sarahomeless.org/coordinated-entry

Policy Recommendation: Create an online portal and physical location(s) for a housing resource one-stop center that provides access and information to all service providers and potential users.

The need for this policy derives from the working group’s observation that there is no central location - either physical or digital - where information is consolidated regarding how public, private and non-profit funds are utilized, who provides affordable housing, what types of affordable housing are available; and other relevant information. The group noted that although much information regarding affordable housing does already exist, people do not know where to start or how to navigate through all the resources. The group sought to provide one point of access to navigate information for all users: public, private and non-profit developers, community members in need of housing resources, and the general public. Having one consolidated resource would also help the City and the public to use this information to more effectively align resources and leverage all publicly-funding projects.

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends:

- One-stop physical and digital locations should be created and managed by the City of San Antonio, with a dual goal of providing a location for providers to contribute data and for community members to access information
- The first step should be consolidating COSA’s existing housing services into a one-stop shop and aligning their use. COSA should also engage participation from as many affordable housing developers of different sizes and types (public, private, non-profit) as possible

- Data should be consolidated from many existing sources, including the San Antonio Housing Authority, the Housing Authority of Bexar County, San Antonio Apartment Association, Alamo Area Council of Governments, etc.
- The City should track and make public at least the following components:
 - Who is receiving/awarded housing and economic development public incentives
 - What affordable housing incentives were accepted by developers and progress toward achieving those outcomes
 - Where available affordable housing units can be found, including housing for all income brackets, as well as housing for homeless or low-income residents
 - Policies regarding construction of affordable housing and administration of affordable housing programs
- One-stop should include a universal application process for housing services with clear information regarding eligibility and transparent, easily accessible information on where the applicant is in the process of obtaining housing
- Information should be included for housing programs for all income brackets, not just homeless or housing for the poor
- Information should be presented in non-technical language that is accessible to non-experts, include Spanish translation of all content, and be designed to be utilized by many types of users, including lenders, developers, funders and members of the public who are looking to access assistance for all housing types/needs
- The physical location(s) should include Navigators to help people access and understand information
- Potential models for this type of one-stop center include the following:
 - The Los Angeles County Housing Resource Center – Provides information on rental housing, specialized housing resources for seniors, veterans and other populations, homebuyer information and more. It is a web-based portal supported by a call center. The service is managed by an umbrella agency supported by the County of Los Angeles and includes the City of Los Angeles, the local housing authority, smaller nearby municipalities and area non-profits. It is intended to be used by individuals, non-profits, real estate agents and developers. For more information visit www.housing.lacounty.gov
 - Community Housing Network Housing Resource Center – A one-stop housing resource center in Southeast Michigan with multiple partners, led by a non-profit. Intended to be a resource for all things housing to direct those who are homeless, people with disabilities, and anyone in housing crisis people to resources. The Housing Resource Center is both a website and call center, with trained housing specialists who conduct an intake screening and connect callers to community resources and programs that provide housing assistance, affordable housing options, and information on subsidized housing and other long-term housing options. For more information visit www.communityhousingnetwork.org.
 - REnewSA – REnewSA was an inter-agency collaborative that brought together major policy-making and regulatory bodies in the City of San Antonio to coordinate community development resources. REnewSA began to create a portal to consolidate information about City resources that has since been discontinued.

Policy Recommendation: Any economic or housing development project that includes public funding should include incentives for affordable housing, and recipients should be held accountable for results.

The working group recommends this policy to address the lack of transparency regarding publicly funded/supported economic development and housing programs, and the perception that COSA's housing policies and housing information have not been used effectively. The purpose of the recommendation is to increase transparency of city incentive programs to the public and to disclose if the money is used as promised, as well as to increase the availability the overall production of affordable housing in conjunction with other development. The working group recognizes that there are policy limitations based on state law and are not recommending an inclusionary zoning policy or linkage fees. However, the working group still sees a potential to positively impact the creation of affordable housing by ensuring that any public funding that goes to an economic development or housing-related project would also facilitate the creation of affordable housing in conjunction with the project.

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends:

- For any major public investment or capital improvement
 - The City of San Antonio should require that a housing impact assessment be completed. Models of impact assessments include the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) implemented by transportation authorities and Health Impact Assessment (HIA) implemented by the Center of Disease Control and Prevention, both of which evaluate the potential effects of a plan, project, or policy on the surrounding area before it is built or implemented.
 - The City should dedicate a certain percentage of total project funding to create affordable units or go toward an affordable housing fund
- For any housing-related project that receives public funding
 - The City should dedicate a certain percentage of the project budget to create affordable units or go toward an affordable housing fund
 - Potential models for this type of incentive program are The City of San Antonio's Decade of Downtown incentives and Public Art San Antonio
 - An independent 3rd party compliance audit for housing incentive packages should be conducted and findings should be made public in order to hold the beneficiary of incentives accountable to the public for appropriate use of incentive conditions, such as percentage of units that would remain affordable and occupied by eligible low- to moderate-income households/individuals

Policy Recommendation: Improve resident planning process to better align resident, developer, and city goals.

The working group identified community engagement as a critical housing issue, noting that residents are not often engaged in the current housing system. Opposition from community members may be due to lack of general awareness of what affordable housing is, as well as details of specific projects being planned in their neighborhoods. This recommendation provides for multiple methods of engagement in ways that will provide the opportunity for community input earlier in the process of a proposed project and incorporate education on affordable housing.

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends:

- Create a bilingual public notice and input procedure for both housing policy decisions and potential development projects that can lead to revision before the policy decision or project goes to committees and/or City Council for approval. As part of the procedures for public notice this should include:
 - Expanding the minimum notification requirement for development projects to a wider geographic area
 - Require developers to connect with and notify neighborhoods at an earlier process for a proposed development
 - Publish draft proposal of housing policies with enough time to receive public input prior to official approval
 - Any public comments related to proposed policies or development projects should be tracked in one document and published
 - Materials should also be translated to non-technical language for non-experts
- Institute a bilingual Resident Academy that is housing focused
 - Include information on development process and the meaning of affordable housing
 - Educate public officials to help them communicate the benefits of affordable housing with constituents
- Engage in a bilingual affordable housing marketing campaign
 - The City should develop a matrix of engagement for different populations to engage people in helping them understand what affordable housing is and how it affects a variety of people and families that also includes information on property taxes
 - Make it known that the City supports affordable housing equity, and that neighborhoods with no affordable housing should plan for how to incorporate it
 - Show data on how mixed income neighborhoods can thrive

Policy Recommendations

Removing Barriers to Housing Affordability and Supply

The Working Group recognizes the opportunity for municipal policy to remove or reduce significant barriers to housing affordability and supply in San Antonio. The following recommendations represent the highest priorities that emerged from the deliberations of the Working Group. The full range of ideas and suggestions that were discussed in the Working Group meetings are documented thereafter. As an overarching consideration, the Working Group recognizes that a lack of coordination of new policies with existing planning processes has the potential to create significant new barriers and, as such, the Working Group believes that the recommendations of the Mayor's Housing Task Force should be coordinated with existing plans, including SA Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan and VIA 2040.

A. Focus real estate-related City incentives, tax abatements and fee waivers to support housing affordability.

The Working Group believes that public investments should be clearly connected to a public good and that housing affordability is now the most important public good that should be the target of real estate-related City incentives, tax abatements and fee waivers. In all of its recommendations, the Working Group seeks to emphasize that the costs of transportation are inextricably related to housing costs and should be taken into account when measuring the affordability of housing.

Specific Policy Recommendations

- a. The Working Group recommends affordable housing incentives with a value greater than market rate incentives.
- b. The Working Group recommends the City update the ICRIIP City Fee Waiver Ordinance to include all City development- and construction-related fees unless specifically exempted by name from the ordinance.
- c. The Working Group recommends that at least one-third of each year's SAWS total allocation of impact fee waivers be set aside for affordable housing units. Additionally, the group recommends lifting the \$5,000 per-unit impact fee waiver cap, instead making the cap the maximum per-unit impact fee for that year.
- d. The Working Group recommends the full value of the incentive or fee waiver should be provided on a per unit basis for rental units that are leased to households that have been certified as earning 60% of AMI or below, with a graduated reduction of the value of the incentive or fee waiver for units leased to households that have been certified as earning between 60% and 80% of AMI (e.g. a unit leased to a household at 70% of AMI would receive half of the value of the incentive or fee waiver). Rental units leased to households above 80% of AMI would not receive affordability incentives.
- e. The Working Group recommends the full value of the incentive or fee waiver should be provided on a per unit basis prioritized for units that are sold to households that have been certified as earning 80% of AMI or below, with a consideration for up to 120% of AMI. Homes for sale to households above 120% of AMI would not receive affordability incentives.

B. Reduce the uncertainty and risk to real estate developers that seek to develop affordable housing.

The Working Group recognizes that developers seeking to create or preserve affordable housing face risks and uncertainties associated with municipal processes and costs and that the City of San

Antonio has the opportunity to reduce the uncertainty and risks associated with the development of affordable housing.

Specific Policy Recommendations

- a. The Working Group recommends a City infrastructure improvements fund be established to fund or reimburse affordable housing developments on a proportional basis to the number of affordable units for actual costs incurred for improvements to pre-existing right-of-way infrastructure such as:
 - i. Repair or replacement of damaged or missing water and sewer laterals;
 - ii. Repair or replacement of inadequate electric or gas delivery lines and poles;
 - iii. Street repairs including mill and overlays required because of above items;
 - iv. Repair or replacement of pre-existing damaged or inadequate sidewalks, drive approaches, and curbs;
 - v. Repair or replacement of inadequate or poorly maintained drainage systems; and
 - vi. Repair or replacement of other pre-existing deteriorated right-of-way infrastructure
- b. The Working Group recommends development of criteria that would allow by-right development/zoning with at least 50% affordable units (i.e. with alignment of SA Tomorrow – on the transit corridor, within a regional center, etc.).

C. Encourage financing of affordable homeownership, for a variety of housing types including, but not limited to condominiums, cooperatives and other innovative multi- or single-family housing.

The Working Group identified opportunities to specifically reduce barriers to access and sustaining homeownership.

Specific Policy Recommendations

- a. The Working Group recommends that the City encourage successful home ownership through significant increase in City support of public-private partnerships that provide quality home buyer and home owner education on important topics such as home purchase and financing, home maintenance, household budgeting, code compliance, neighborhood safety, and other important topics every home owner should know.
- b. Increase the City’s investment in down payment assistance programs for first time homebuyers earning up to 100% AMI, with consideration for up to 120% of AMI.

D. Improve access to publicly-owned land and/or property for affordable housing development.

The Working Group identified the cost of land as a significant barrier to new affordable housing production and recognizes land currently owned by public and quasi-public agencies as an important resource for potential affordable housing development.

Specific Policy Recommendations

- a. The Working Group recommends that the City Council direct the boards of public and quasi-public entities to prioritize potential affordable housing uses in their disposition of publicly owned land and, in their fiduciary consideration, to take into account the long-term financial impact of a lack of housing affordable to a significant portion of San Antonio’s population.

- b. The Working Group recommends the significant enhancement of the City of San Antonio's land banking strategy through a public-private partnership to acquire readily developable property.

E. Support the preservation of the affordability and physical viability of existing affordable housing stock.

The Working Group believes that affordable housing policies should ensure residents have the choice stay in their current neighborhoods and communities. The effects of gentrification and involuntary displacement is a concern for the Working Group. The Working Group also recognizes that the existing housing stock is not being fully nor most efficiently utilized to meet the housing needs of our City's growing population. The Working Group also recognized that the ongoing maintenance and operating costs of existing housing can be a significant barrier to affordability as rent or a mortgage payment.

Specific Policy Recommendations

- a. The Working Group recommends focusing public resources to support the financing of affordable rental housing properties with affordability covenants (e.g. expiring low-income housing tax credit properties, properties financed with federal HOME or HOPWA funds, etc.) that expire within the next five years.
- b. The Working Group recommends ongoing investment in owner-occupied rehabilitation programs targeted to households earning less than 80% of AMI.
- c. The Working Group recommends ongoing efforts to design a local tax credit/abatement/freeze for the maintenance/reinvestment of owner-occupied homes that have been owned by the same family for 15+ years.

F. Strengthen the readiness, capacity and quality of the labor force and small business sector that are necessary to expand housing production and preservation.

The Working Group recognizes that a shortage of a well-trained labor force and contractors has become a significant barrier to the production and preservation of affordable housing.

Specific Policy Recommendations

- a. The Working Group recommends expanding and investing in recruitment and job training programs for the construction trades, including youth apprenticeship programs.
- b. The Working Group recommends increased investment in small business development, bonding and financing resources and programs targeted to the construction trades.
- c. The Working Group recommends editing Jobs and Economic Competitiveness Policy 1 of the SA Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan to include "residential construction trades" as a targeted industry.
- d. The Working Group recommends developing a database with information on construction training programs in the city, including in-house training programs offered by construction firms, to raise the public profile of these programs and aid in recruitment.

In addition to the specific policy recommendations listed above, the issue of transportation was a repeated topic of discussion among the working group:

It is the sense of the Working Group that the City of San Antonio should strive to achieve balance in the location of affordable housing throughout the city in order to offer choice to households with earnings across the income spectrum, taking into account access to public transportation, employment opportunities and cultural assets.

Although a specific policy recommendation was not developed, a number of suggestions for how to improve transportation connectivity in connection with housing were discussed, including the utilization of the H+T Index (Housing & Transportation) as a method of identifying priority locations for new housing development and developing a map or tool to identify areas incentivized for affordable housing and close to jobs targeted to developers and companies that are looking to locate/relocate in San Antonio.

The Working Group offers the following recommendations with regard to the City of San Antonio's staffing and implementation of its housing-related services and programs.

- a. Add a Deputy or Assistant City Manager with extensive experience in areas of affordable housing development and finance.
- b. Develop a streamlined process for all DSD aspects of affordable housing development that utilizes specific, dedicated staff within DSD that specialize in the development of affordable housing and the City's goals related to affordable housing.
- c. Build the capacity of non-profit organizations to implement owner occupied rehabilitation.
- d. Consider ordinances to crack down on housing-related predatory practices such as predatory house flipping, antagonistic home buyers, non-permitted construction, and unlicensed contractors.
- e. City develop a housing assistance program to educate and assist renters and owners with predatory repair and/or rehab practices.

In addition to the priority policy recommendations listed above, many other policy and implementation ideas were shared and discussed by working group members throughout the process of prioritization. These can be found below in no particular order.

- i. Create a database with information on the many training programs in the City, including in-house training programs offered by some construction firms, to raise the public profile of these programs and aid in recruitment. Encourage participation by leaders of workforce programs, construction firms and trade unions.
- ii. Incentivize the extension of expiring covenants on affordable rental housing.
- iii. Develop housing centers to provide housing counseling, referral to housing-related resources and report abusive/ predatory activities.
- iv. Prioritize use of the City's existing legal assistance fund/program to clear titles to residential properties or aid in the transfer of titles. Develop a family legacy housing assistance program.

- v. Develop a policy that targets the preservation of existing, single family homes by providing partially forgivable, deferred interest rehab loans to qualified individuals, establishes loan guidelines, clear title assistance, and contractor vetting.
- vi. Provide incentives for affordable housing development in areas with access to public transportation and/or job centers. Qualifying areas could be identified through resources such as the Housing + Transportation Index, VIA, and the City's comprehensive planning efforts.
- vii. Encourage development of housing in transit accessible areas and incentivize affordable/mixed income housing by prioritizing Housing Goal 3 of the SA Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan, "Housing Choices are available in walkable and bikeable neighborhoods located near transit, employment, retail, medical and recreational amenities."
- viii. Target the development of larger apartment projects to transportation corridors and regional centers.
- ix. Encourage affordable housing in all areas of the City including for the thousands of residents living or wanting to live and work in or near their neighborhood schools, small local businesses, churches, and extended family neighborhoods which includes numerous neighborhoods outside of higher density transportation corridors and many of SA's large employers.
- x. Zone areas around public transportation and/or job centers for density and/or affordability.
- xi. Prioritize public investment to support affordable small multifamily.
- xii. Incentivize mixed-income developments.
- xiii. Develop an incentive or requirement for the use of vacant/underutilized public land to be used for affordable housing.
- xiv. Develop a coordinated and ongoing effort among all city and related agencies (school districts, health systems, VIA, etc.) to discuss housing affordability as a priority and how each institution could contribute.
- xv. Encourage large employers to incentivize their employees moving into certain neighborhoods.
- xvi. Encourage public/private co-development of targeted sites.
- xvii. Incentivize in-fill housing that has a scale compatible with the existing neighborhood profiles framed by neighborhood conservation districts and zoning; do not create projects that are isolated from the surrounding neighborhood.
- xviii. Further develop or modify the city's density bonus policy to act in a similar way to inclusionary zoning.
- xix. Support existing policy development for accessory dwelling units.
- xx. Re-examine the City's density bonus policy and identify any barriers to imposing an in-lieu fee.
- xxi. Expand City and County incentives and low-cost loans for housing rehabilitation of existing rental properties. Condition loans and tax assessment relief with a multi-year freeze on rent.

- xxii. Shift development services enforcement focus from production builder subdivisions to “flippers” in existing neighborhoods; use predictive analytics and home sales information to select neighborhoods prone to “flips.”
- xxiii. Place a moratorium on razing existing affordable multi-unit housing unless that housing is being replaced with an equal number of new affordable units.
- xxiv. Regulate short-term rentals.
- xxv. Provide an easy cash buyer option for distressed urban properties, in an attempt to get ahead of the house flipping market.
- xxvi. Develop compliance protocols relating to rental property, where tenants can go to get assistance relating to conditions of their housing.
- xxvii. Recognize that a large portion of the labor force in San Antonio is made up of undocumented workers and that there is disconnect between education and training resources and those individuals.

Statements from members of the working group regarding this report can be found below.

- a) May need clarification on B, b. I am assuming that the justification for by-right development/zoning is the fact that the San Antonio community (and City Council) has already weighed in through previous and ongoing guidelines such as those noted at the end in (i.e.). By-right zoning often runs into problems when folks attempting to stop developments using the "we haven't had our concerns voiced or heard"). The studies cited have had an extensive public input, and it may be helpful if that is noted.
- b) The discussion of by-right zoning and references to the other streams of city planning (SA Tomorrow and VIA 2040) are problematic. I would add caution to the language in our document because – based on my participation in those planning streams – their criteria are too broad for the more finely grained issues that arise in siting new developments, whether affordable or market rate. E.g. the transportation corridor planning uses a standard ½ mile metric for planning and transportation hubs envision up-zoning the surrounding area for increased density. Similarly, the Midtown plan in the SA Tomorrow stream broadly up-zones entire neighborhoods and diminishes neighborhood plans (approved by the City) to the status of suggestions rather than stipulations. These characteristics have been repeatedly flagged as unacceptable in community meetings during the last six months. So, while we want to prioritize affordable housing, we shouldn't inadvertently fuel conflicts that are arising in other planning streams by pinning our recommendations to theirs.
 - a. I would strike B.b. altogether. Alternatively, I would remove the parenthetical comment that references “with alignment of SA Tomorrow – on the transit corridor...” etc. Another possibility is to specify with a new sentence that by-right zoning criteria might be developed for siting developments directly on corridor streets (within 100 feet).
- c) In the section on the recommendations for staffing and implementation of the city's housing-related services, I would like to rephrase b.: “Develop a streamlined process with dedicated staff at the City's Office of Development Services to manage proposals for affordable housing projects provided that NCDs and Neighborhood Plans are followed.” Alternatively add to current language the following sentence: “The new process must include a neighborhood

advocate for NCDs and Neighborhood Plans from the Department of Neighborhood Housing and Services.”

- d) Regarding E,c: Incomes fluctuate for everyone; I don't get the objection to an income limit. If we need a number, how about 140% of median family income?
- e) Regarding one of the last policy proposals about the moratorium on the demolition of existing affordable multi-unit housing: I believe this proposal should be one of the top proposals. Given our commitment to increasing the stock of affordable housing, it seems logical to oppose the demolition of existing affordable housing that is currently occupied, unless the existing units are replaced with an equal or greater number of affordable units.
- f) My comments, as you would expect: I don't agree with striking the items that X and X mention related to VIA/Transit/SATomorrow.

Policy Recommendations

Identifying New Housing Funding and Financing Mechanisms

The Funding and Finance Technical Working Group (TWG) was charged to examine existing affordable housing finance programs; propose policies to create new funding sources and reallocate existing resources; review financing models or structures that could sustain higher levels of housing development, rehabilitation and preservation; and recommend an affordable housing focus. Priority policy actions are listed below and broken down into immediate term (this calendar year), short (24 months) and longer-term timeframes, presented under four headings: **Creating New Revenue**, **Reforming Current Sources**, **Partnering with the Private Sector**, and **Defining Focus and Goals**. With regard to the final action area, which is further developed under recommendation #4, the TWG wanted to establish the greatest possible clarity regarding their recommendations and thus agreed on the following definitions and goal statement:

Affordable housing should consume no more than 35% of residents' incomes. Funds made available by or through the City of San Antonio (CO SA) should be invested in multifamily (MF) units serving families earning 80% or less of the city's Area Media Income (AMI); a sliding scale of incentives should provide the highest level of public support for projects serving the lowest-income families. CO SA investments in affordable single family (SF) homeownership should be restricted to families earning no more than 120% AMI. The term of MF affordability restrictions should be no less than 50 years but should be permanent whenever possible.

These policy recommendations are intended to enable funding of our affordable housing infrastructure: a comprehensive construction, preservation and rehabilitation effort capable of eliminating the ten-year minimum estimated growth in the housing gap which will total 29,700 units as per Economic & Planning Systems data. CO SA should aim to produce a minimum of 2,970 units of housing each year for ten years, which is estimated to require a minimum annual investment of \$119 million dollars in new funding.

On December 9th, 2017, the Mayor's Housing Policy Task Force held a public meeting to hear the voices and concerns of San Antonians. When participants were asked the question, "What do you want the task force members to know about housing in San Antonio?" the most common response was "that affordable, safe housing is the most important thing they should tackle along with a local definition of affordable housing." One third of the San Antonio community is considered housing cost burdened and half of that third are considered to be severely cost burdened. This number has increased in recent years as the amount of housing units affordable to these families continues to fall compared to the number of families in need. EPS estimates that that more than 91,000 families earning below 80% AMI are paying too much for housing and that the annual increase in the mismatch between affordable units available and households needing them is almost 3,000. At the very least, the tidal wave of unaffordability must be stemmed.

Unfortunately, as need has grown resources have withered. Since 2010, total federal funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) awarded to San Antonio has decreased by \$7 million. The negative impacts of this reduction have shaken San Antonio's affordable housing community because these federal dollars are the only source of dedicated revenue for affordable housing (outside of state 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits--LIHTC--allocations, which are sufficient

for no more than 3-4 projects comprising about 400-500 units annually). The Housing Trust Fund, initially capitalized with \$10 million, has not received a substantial injection of new capital since its creation. In order for the city to create a stable, reliable, and robust affordable housing infrastructure, the City must commit more sources of dedicated revenue, while continuing to advocate for federal and state funding to be protected and expanded in light of the recent volatility of these sources.

The TWG hopes that its recommendations will be taken into consideration during COSA's restructuring of the central city housing incentive program. As federal money for affordable housing declined in recent years, the City continued to fund the ICRIP and CCHIP programs through a combination of foregone taxes, dedicated tax increment revenues, and other sources. Created to implement an economic development policy centered on downtown revitalization, job creation and attracting middle and upper-income residents to the urban core, the "Decade of Downtown" is largely viewed as successful in reaching its goals and has met 90% of its target of creating 7500 new rental units. Although the programs helped create an average of 200 units of affordable housing each year, the investment of more than \$110 million in mostly market-rate projects had the unintended consequence of increasing property values, property taxes, rents and the overall housing cost burden paid by families throughout the urban core and its periphery. With the Mayor's decision in 2017 to temporarily cease awarding these incentives came an opportunity for San Antonio to reprioritize its spending in a way that more equitably meets the needs of the entire community.

Many occupations essential to the local economy pay, on average, below \$15/ hour and workers in these areas earn less than 60% AMI. The majority of workers in San Antonio filling these necessary jobs are shelter cost burdened, and many are severely burdened by the lack of affordably priced housing units near their jobs; they include but are not limited to wait staff, hosts, personal care aids, cooks, cashiers, dishwashers, building cleaners, maids, child care workers, bar tenders, hotel desk clerks, concierges, parking lot attendants, packers, hair dressers, barbers, bakers, taxi drivers, floral designers, artists, security guards, grounds keepers, material movers, and tire builders. These workers and their families play a vital role in San Antonio's economy and culture, and yet they are being priced out of the market. If COSA wants local businesses and the local economy to continue to thrive, it must direct its funding to make San Antonio's housing stock meeting minimum safety and quality of life standards accessible for these workers. Viewed through an economic development lens, increased investment in affordable housing also helps stabilize families, enabling asset formation. Thus the most successful housing policies will both address the negative impacts of low-wage economies while empowering residents to break the cycle of generational poverty.

However, after thorough examination of existing public funding programs and housing finance systems, the Finance Technical Working Group finds that there is a disconnect between the needs and aspirations of the community and current funding allocations. The community's perspective on housing must shift so that it is understood as an essential component of local infrastructure, much like adequate streets and drainage. An annual investment of \$110 million in street maintenance calls for a similar if not greater investment in housing stock. The TWG believes that our community should aspire to eliminate all substandard housing and assist all rent-burdened households; mirroring the MHPTF mission. However, existing programs and structures were not designed to deal with – and therefore continue to contribute to -- the challenges San Antonio faces today. By pairing public and private funding to address the most pressing issues, and in proportion to the magnitude of the need, the City and its residents will

enjoy the benefits of greater stability, prosperity and equity. Rather than a tidal wave of change that swamps precariously positioned San Antonio families, a rising tide of growth will improve the lives of all.

Policy Recommendations

Creating New Revenue

- 1) The City of San Antonio will secure new sources of funding for ownership and rental single-family and multifamily affordable housing development, including its construction, preservation and rehabilitation, and including appropriate staffing.**

Immediate Term

- a) Propose a charter amendment in 2018 to enable the use of bond proceeds for residential construction and preservation:
 - i) Initiate a new bond measure for \$150 million for affordable housing gap financing.
 - ii) Inform advocacy groups regarding bond measure.
- b) Dedicate short-term rental taxes to affordable housing (example—New Orleans).

Short Term

- c) Create an as-of-right incentive program for affordable housing with a clearly-defined process that includes consultation with the community.

Long Term

- d) Determine annual COSA property tax revenue from new market-rate rental housing and capture a percent, for a determined number of years, to fund affordable rental housing.
- e) Work with the State Legislature to create new funding and finance mechanisms:
 - i) Create a regional affordable housing district administered by the San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA).
 - ii) Develop a program for fee-in-lieu payments from state-owned, tax exempt properties (for example, universities).
 - iii) Raise caps or approve new taxes and fees dedicated to affordable housing: sales tax, document recording fees, tobacco tax, etc.

Reforming Current Revenue Sources

- 2) The City of San Antonio will establish, for a period of at least ten years, a dedicated municipal or pass-through source of affordable housing funding from existing sources, tied to annual data and projections regarding housing needs.**

Immediate Term

- a) Implement a policy to capture any amount over the annual budget projections for COSA-owned utilities (CPS and SAWS) revenue to be dedicated to affordable housing.

- b) Commit to allocating \$20 million annually from the General Fund to affordable housing, similar to the level of foregone revenue dedicated to center city housing during the past 7-8 years.
- c) When new program guidelines are approved, require recapture of CCHIP and ICRIP investments at the time the property is sold or changes ownership.
- d) Assess the priorities, production and investment profile of the San Antonio Housing Trust and all related entities.
- e) Dedicate revenue from the sale of all City-owned land to affordable housing.
- f) Roll any available budget surpluses in any applicable federal, state, or local community development funding into affordable housing.
- g) Scour general and restricted fund budgets (as allowed) for excess funds or for funds that can be used more productively to address housing issues, using a broad definition of housing.

Short Term

- h) Based on the Housing Trust assessment, develop a strategy to grow the corpus of the Trust Fund and to align Housing Trust priorities with COSA priorities and goals.
- i) By ordinance, require that a minimum percentage of the total annual COSA budget be dedicated to affordable housing, based on a historical average of total past spending as a floor.

Longer Term

- j) Capture a percentage of COSA property tax revenue resulting from property tax roll valuation increases due to public investment through incentives or infrastructure development, including the valuation increases in properties that received CCHIP and ICRIP investments or are in close proximity to these properties.
- k) Explore models for investing a percentage of COSA reserves in affordable housing.

3) The City of San Antonio will determine whether existing reserve fund policies deliver the highest cost-benefit ratio to the community and are successful at stimulating growth, among potential investment opportunities.

Short Term

- a) Determine and compare the net present value of housing investments and maintaining an AAA rating, using a sufficient time horizon to address a two-generation transformation period.

4) The City of San Antonio will diversify and leverage existing local, state and federal funding sources, and continue to advocate for increased levels of affordable housing investment from other governmental entities such as the federal and state governments while minimizing dependence on them.

Immediate Term

- a) Create a Housing Finance & Production Unit with underwriting capacity within the COSA Neighborhood Housing Services Department to support higher production levels and more effective partnerships.
- b) Incorporate TWG and overall Mayor’s Housing Policy Task Force policy recommendations into the structure and implementation of the Neighborhood Improvements bond program.
- c) Direct COSA intergovernmental relations team to make affordable housing funding a priority at State and Federal levels.

Short Term

- d) Increase the amount of CDBG funding committed directly to producing new and preserving existing units of affordable housing, by:
 - i) Designating all CDBG funds for direct investment in low-income and workforce housing.
 - ii) Finding a payback mechanism for outstanding Section 108 loans—approximately \$4.8 million annually.
 - iii) Replacing CBDG funding for staff—approximately \$2.1 million—with general fund.
- e) Better leverage new and existing TIF/TIRZ to produce affordable housing units by amending TIF/TIRZ operating policies to:
 - i) Dedicate a larger percent of TIRZ increment captured for affordable housing (example--City of Houston).
 - ii) Expand TIRZ to regional centers and transit corridors to fund affordable housing.
 - iii) Expand to apply to land and property previously owned by government institutions.
 - iv) Issue revenue bonds within TIRZ to create a predictable and low-cost source of capital for lending and investment.
 - v) Create citywide Tax Increment Loan Program to leverage excess TIRZ funds.
 - vi) Audit the TIRZ program to determine program performance.
- f) Establish a transit-oriented communities funding mechanism in partnership with the FTA and VIA.

Long Term

- g) In conjunction with the Bexar County Appraisal District, implement additional property tax relief, such as “circuit breakers” for long-term homeowners facing rapidly escalating property assessments.
- h) Support the expansion of housing bond issuance by the San Antonio Housing Trust Housing Finance Corporation, SAHA and other housing finance corporations.
 - i) Eliminate need for City Council approval of every 4% tax-exempt bond issuance.
 - ii) Explore providing COSA support or guarantees for HFC issuances in order to reduce rates or secure additional capital.
 - iii) Explore issuing tax-exempt revenue bonds for single family home construction in anticipation of higher interest rates.
- i) Increase and leverage other federal sources:
 - i) Seek Department of Defense funds to house civilian employees.
 - ii) Support federal legislation to expand the LIHTC program.

Partnering with the Private Sector

- 5) The City will collaborate with private sector partners to reduce risk and attract new investment in the affordable housing sector on the supply side and the demand side, including efforts to help families build assets and improve their financial capacity.**

Immediate Term

- a) Explore the potential for Opportunity Funds to invest in affordable housing in newly-designated Opportunity Zones.
- b) Work with financial institutions to reduce the servicing cost of affordable housing loans.
- c) Create a deposit/utility guarantee fund for eligible renters with no credit history, such as immigrants or victims of domestic violence.
- d) Work with developers to include ongoing monitoring and performance costs in pro formas and to require in loan documentation.
- e) In conjunction with various community-based organizations, provide guidance on developing free loan associations that can be general or focus on single family housing-assistance.

Short Term

- f) Expand employer-assisted SF down payment assistance programs.
- g) Support and coordinate with a Funder's Collaborative to develop and implement Program Related Investments (PRI) in low-income homeownership, land trusts, limited equity housing cooperatives, small infill projects in the urban core, and other challenging MF and SF investments.
- h) In conjunction with private sector employers, create an employer-assisted rental voucher program funded with public and private resources to target lower wage workers (example—Live Denver).
- i) Expand financial counseling, literacy and empowerment programs as a way to increase the number of qualified homebuyers and stable renters.
- j) Develop saving circles or micro-lending circles to encourage homeownership or SF housing renovation.
- k) Create publicly-funded loan loss reserves to encourage private investment in more risky housing projects.
- l) Support asset-building strategies that allow families to save for home ownership, such as payday lending alternatives.
- m) Explore social impact bonds as a source of funding for housing those individuals with multiple needs who are currently relying on medical, social service or mental health care systems.

Long Term

- n) Support efforts to raise wages in low-paid sectors, thus improving residents' capacity to be stable renters and homeowners.

Defining Focus and Goals

- 6) **Create a new framework for the distribution of COSA housing funds based on data showing which income groups have the greatest need; incorporate Housing Commission consumer lending and financing recommendations as well as SA Tomorrow planning efforts to recognize a variety of housing types, project sizes, and geographic locations.**

Immediate Term

- a) Create new definitions, goals and objectives for all COSA-assisted MF housing finance programs to prioritize units serving families under 60% AMI, while still allowing funding of units serving families between 60-80% AMI on a sliding scale.
- b) Maximize affordability targets and rent restrictions on all projects receiving an investment of funds through COSA or affiliated entities.
- c) Extend affordability targets and rent restrictions from 30 years to 50 or more, preferably maintaining affordability permanently.
- d) Recognize that other costs impact affordability of housing, including transit accessibility.

Long Term

- e) Annually update housing data.
- f) Dedicate additional funds as needed, demonstrated by annual data.

Policy Recommendations

Developing and Preserving Housing for Stable, Equitable and Resilient Neighborhoods

The Developing and Preserving Housing for Stable, Equitable, and Resilient Neighborhoods technical working group was charged with identifying policies that would create an equitable approach to growth that ensures growth does not come at the expense of residents with limited incomes and that our neighborhoods become places that enable children, families, individuals, and senior citizens to prosper by stabilizing housing, reducing residential displacement, and developing and sustaining community capacity. The group considered policies to create and preserve affordable housing, provide renter and homeowner protections, support homeownership assistance programs, improve owner- and renter-occupied rehab programs, recognize and mitigate the impacts of gentrification and displacement, and create opportunities for cross-sector collaboration.

To create stable, equitable, and resilient neighborhoods, the working group identified five priority policy recommendations, listed below. Following the list of five priorities are additional recommendations and comments made by individual working group members but not discussed and agreed upon by the entire group in a meeting. These comments include a definition of stable, equitable, and resilient neighborhoods.

Recommendation: Invest in the preservation of affordable rental and owner-occupied housing

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends the City of San Antonio (the City):

- Provide incentives to property owners to keep rental units affordable (costing no more than 30% of household income) to households earning up to 30%, 50%, and 60% of AMI
- Prioritize resources for vulnerable populations, including low- and middle-income (up to 120% of AMI) seniors
- Expand efforts to rehabilitate and repair existing owner-occupied housing stock through the following actions:
 - Increase funding for City minor home repair and owner-occupied rehabilitation programs
 - Create a revolving loan fund (pending charter amendment) to provide low-interest loans for owner-occupied home repairs that encourage sustainability/sustainable improvements
 - Create a pipeline of rehab-loan-ready homeowners by funding financial education courses and title-clearing services
 - Fund capacity-building for non-profits to deliver rehab services and redesign existing City-funded rehab programs to incentivize non-profit participation
 - Partner with construction trade training programs and incentivize contractors to hire and train underemployed young adults in the building trades
 - Create a property tax rebate for low- and middle-income (up to 120% of AMI) homeowners that invest in home rehabilitation or repair
- Address property tax burden for longtime and low- and middle-income (up to 120% AMI) homeowners through the following actions:
 - Explore ways to provide tax relief to low- and middle-income (up to 120% of AMI) families that have owned and lived in their home for more than 10 years

- Coordinate state lobbying efforts around comprehensive property tax reform with other cities
- Create a short-term rental (i.e. Airbnb) ordinance that balances the needs of property owners to generate income with the need to preserve communities and the supply of housing for San Antonio residents.

Recommendation: Invest in the production of new affordable rental and owner-occupied housing

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends the City:

- Create a package of development incentives for small-scale (single-family and small multi-family) affordable housing projects
 - For rental housing, units must be affordable (costing no more than 30% of household income) to households earning up to 30%, 50%, and 60% of AMI
 - For homeowner housing, units must be affordable (costing no more than 30% of household income) to households earning up to 120% of AMI
- Prioritize resources for vulnerable populations, including low- and middle-income (up to 120% of AMI) seniors
- Require housing developments that receive City incentives to include units which are affordable to families earning up to 30%, 50%, and 60% of AMI. The percentage of affordable units should be determined based on the size of the development (number of units).
- Expand existing City programs to purchase land and sell it to developers of affordable housing at below market cost
- Prioritize the creation of affordable housing in the disposition of land owned by public entities
- Provide subsidies to San Antonio Housing Trust Public Finance Corporation multi-family projects to make rental units affordable (rent-restricted) to families earning up to 60% of AMI
- Fund capacity building for community-based organizations to create and manage community land trusts and use philanthropic funds for land acquisition and development activities
- Fund brownfield mitigation for land that will be used for affordable housing
- Facilitate construction of accessory dwelling units
- Support efforts to amend the City charter to allow for bond funds to be invested in affordable housing
- Prioritize the development of transit oriented communities to increase access to low-cost transportation for low-income households, to maximize efficient land use for affordable (and mixed income) housing, and to deter displacement
- Increase funding for homeownership assistance programs (i.e. down payment assistance)

Recommendation: Improve education and advocacy for renters and homeowners

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends the City:

- Create housing resource centers to connect residents to existing service providers
- Expand education programs for homeowners and renters, with a focus on tenant’s rights, estate planning, predatory lending and contractor activity, and homebuyer education
- Prioritize resources for vulnerable populations, including low- and middle-income (up to 120% of AMI) seniors
- Create a dedicated office or commission to educate and advocate for renters

- Create or fund a tenant’s council similar to the Austin, TX, Tenant’s Council
- Expand the notification circumference for re-zoning and include property owners, renters, and neighborhood schools *(see the additional comments section below for ideas from working group members on how to expand community engagement in the development process without increasing barriers to affordable housing development)*
- Require that all public meetings be bilingual Spanish/English, and that translation into any other language be made available upon request
- Eliminate at-large city boards and commissions that pertain to housing and real estate development—all should have representation from each Council District
- Make the Neighborhood and Housing Services Department (NHSD) a priority for future funding and hiring so that it is fully funded, staffed, and supported
- Develop, track, and publish specific and measurable housing goals that are based in data analysis and community experience

Recommendation: In alignment with fair housing obligations, invest in increasing housing choice, decreasing segregation, preventing displacement, and creating diverse neighborhoods of opportunity

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends the City:

- Require that investment in affordable housing in disinvested neighborhoods be part of a comprehensive community development plan
- Prioritize, in the City budget, infrastructure and maintenance for streets, sidewalks, parks, transportation, and libraries in zip codes where the average median income is less than 50% of the City’s average family income
- Create a set of criteria, to include fair housing criteria, that the City must use when making any development decisions
- Increase mobility for Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher holders by:
 - Creating a mobility counseling program that is fair-housing focused
 - Increasing the number of rental units/landlords that accept vouchers by exploring strategic ways to reduce source of income discrimination and by investing in education and incentives to promote acceptance of vouchers by landlords.
- Balance affordable housing production and preservation efforts among high opportunity neighborhoods, neighborhoods facing gentrification and displacement pressures, areas benefitting from public investment, and disinvested neighborhoods
- Where not prohibited by Federal or State law, and where not already in effect, allow undocumented individuals to access housing resources and prohibit City agencies from sharing information with immigration officials

Recommendation: Address the adverse impacts of growth on neighborhoods and affordability

To achieve this policy objective, the working group recommends the City:

- Require that projects receiving incentives or direct investment from the City include an assessment of the impact on housing affordability, displacement, and hardship, as well as concurrent investments to mitigate those impacts through affordable housing preservation and production, and the creation of living-wage jobs
 - Create ways for all projects, not just those with City incentives/investment, to include a requirement for an assessment like above

- Expand financial assistance available to renters to help pay for rent or relocation costs. Program design must be based on input from renters facing displacement.
- Support minimum wage increase via state legislation and/or local action and enforce HUD Section 3 program requirements, including skills training

During a May 12 meeting of working group co-chairs, members, and facilitators; Task Force advisors; and the five Task Force members, additional input was requested from the working group on two items:

1. How can the City increase resident engagement in the development process, including the rezoning process, while ensuring that increased engagement does not create additional barriers to affordable housing construction?
2. How do we define “stable, equitable, and resilient” neighborhoods?

NALCAB facilitators posed these questions to the working group over email and seven working group members plus Christine Drennon, advisor to the Task Force, shared their thoughts and participated in a discussion over email. The full responses to these questions are below. The suggested definition of “stable, equitable, and resilient” neighborhoods that emerged from the discussion among this smaller group is the following:

A resilient neighborhood is a neighborhood where the families and individuals who live there have the capacity to survive and grow despite chronic stress and acute shock. The term commonly refers to natural disasters—to hurricanes or earthquakes, for example—but in our case, we use it to refer to sudden economic downturns or upturns that also may impact our neighborhoods (materializing as acute foreclosures and evictions or rapidly rising demand that may even provoke gentrification). A resilient neighborhood can weather such drastic change. Families and individuals who thrive despite chronic stresses, sustain resilient neighborhoods. Their perspectives are integral to determining ways to prevent and mitigate negative impacts of change to their neighborhoods. They are the most suited to create solutions that prevent displacement and the destruction of resilient neighborhoods.

A stable neighborhood is not a stagnant neighborhood. A stagnant neighborhood does not change and does not evolve—that is not what we mean. Instead, a stable neighborhood (to us) is one in which a family—if they so choose—may stay for a lifetime. It is a neighborhood with a mix of housing styles, sizes, and values to accommodate change while providing stability to the community that resides there.

Equity—equity implies comparison, thus we refer to equitable neighborhoods (not an equitable neighborhood). Equitable neighborhoods can be defined as the absence of disparity. There is no difference in the quality of life between neighborhoods—they are most certainly different—but the ability to lead a full life is the same. To walk down the street, to drink clean water, to feel safe—these are some of the characteristics that equitable neighborhoods share. This means (though) that they are not treated equally. They need different types of investment, for example (and this may include housing).

Responses to question 1 from May 12 meeting with Task Force: Do you have ideas for how to increase resident engagement in the development/zoning process while ensuring that this engagement doesn't

allow residents to prevent affordable housing construction and maintain patterns of racial/ethnic/economic segregation?

This question was raised during the conversation about the working group recommendation that the zoning notification circumference be expanded. The State of Texas sets the required notification circumference, which the City uses. The City is hesitant to increase the notification area because it may open them up to lawsuits under the Fair Housing Act—for example, if more resident engagement leads to obstacles to creating housing opportunities for protected classes.

Comment 1:

As a member who attended the meeting – regarding the zoning notification expansion – I understood the City Attorney to say that the area circumference currently used is dictated by state law. I believe that he also stated that developers might claim that the City was stacking the deck against them by opening up zoning notification to other than the state proscribed circumference and property owners notification. And the fact that this could also open the City to possible lawsuits had been part of the reason for not going against state law in changing the notification area. These additional points were my understanding of the conversation.

Comment 2:

- A. While the City is making an effort to educate the public about the implementation of the SA Planning processes and the work of the Mayor’s Housing Task Force, the average person does not pay attention until it affects him or her. This happens during the zoning and other development processes.

While many suggestions were made for more contact through the development processes by individuals and by the committee, my observation from serving on both the Zoning Commission in the past and now the Planning Commission, is that the current process of engaging residents is inadequate. If we were really serious about their engagement, the City would provide much more support for neighborhood and other coalitions that struggle to represent the residents in their areas. Especially for volunteer neighborhood associations, the extent of their residents’ involvement usually depends upon the quality of their volunteer leaders at the time. In addition, some have taken the trouble to develop neighborhood plans and now wonder if these efforts are going to be honored as change must occur.

Here are a couple of suggestions for the City:

- a. Beef up the support for neighborhoods. Whatever happened to the Neighborhood Resource Center? It was independent of City government and provided trainings and workshops, and the City recognized it and provided some financial support. That type of model is sorely needed today. Surely, the City could find some funds to stabilize such an entity. It could work with neighborhoods, both voluntary and homeowner associations, to educate them on affordable housing that must be in all city council districts. (For example, in 2017 the City invested in the Faith Based Initiative, housed in the Department of Human Services. A few staff could be housed in the Planning Department. Since it would be doing more than affordable housing education, its budget would not be dependent upon the financing mechanisms being proposed by the

Housing Task Forces. This won't happen in a vacuum. 'Budget Season' is upon us. Such an idea would need support.)

- b. When development decisions, such as zoning or platting, are going to be made, try to take the project early on to the area to explain it to the residents who live there.

If you do that, you need a message to counter NIMBY, or residents will oppose change! In today's climate, I realize that trying to appeal to the 'good of the community' can be extremely difficult. I suggest if you go this route, you ask neighborhood leaders who are in the trenches to help you develop the message.

Comment 3:

The problem I frequently see is the *timing* and type of engagement. When the community is engaged early on in the process and has a voice, they have been more likely to support. For example, the development at 100 Labor St will have some affordable housing. The community had been engaged very early in the discussions and continuously throughout, and it has had a great deal of support. More often, the community is engaged after the plans are in place and simply told to rubber stamp the plan. The community must be part of the process and the developer needs to be willing to negotiate.

Comment 4:

The assumption that all developments that are proposed are good for the people who live in them as well as the communities that surround them is flawed. Also flawed is the notion that neighborhoods should be kept out of the decision making process because they will prevent affordable housing. What is missing is the perception that often these "affordable" housing projects are simply ones that benefit the developer. Why don't we begin with the assumption, that if CoSA, neighborhoods, and developers worked together from the beginning as equal partners, then affordable housing for more residents has a better chance of becoming a reality?

The only way to assure affordable housing in our city is to create this kind of partnership and we should be working towards that end. Neighborhoods have begun to educate themselves, organize their residents, and to put pressure on elected officials. No other issue will bring people to the voting booth than a perceived threat to their homes and communities. Oppressive City policy will not prevent people from coming out against affordable housing but will actually create a hostile attitude towards those projects. Building trust is only possible through cooperation. Affordable housing is only possible with trust.

If we shut out neighborhoods and communities from the decision-making process, furthering the distrust and antagonistic attitudes between neighborhoods and the City government that is supposed to represent them) then we do a disservice to the idea of transparency and inclusiveness that is the cornerstones of our city's endeavors. Quite frankly, this kind of suggestion gives fuel to the suggestion that I've been hearing lately that several of the task force working groups are developer driven. I hope that we can clear this up.

Comment 5:

As we have suggested education in other areas of rental rights and home ownership, possibly we could encourage the City, neighborhood associations, social groups, etc. to regularly inform their spheres of influence regarding watching for signs in their neighborhoods and making their voices heard. Anyone can speak to zoning issues, not just those who receive the notices.

Comment 6:

- 1) (this is an optimistic suggestion) to present a community impact analysis of proposed project to NIMBY's (i.e. # of lives impacted, family financial success stories, real impact on affected schools, economic impact of program recipients, data showing program benefits)
- 2) offer proposed projects with an open, shared community space co-designed by new affordable housing residents and existing surrounding residents, businesses and schools. Have small fund for two community events a year in this space (i.e. National Night Out, July 4th). This way a sense of losing existing community members' space and power is not all lost, and to encourage bridging.
- 3) lastly, opposition to affordable housing projects happen with or without circumference requirements for zoning notifications. By expanding notification for all zoned property changes, not just those regarding housing, impacted citizens are made aware of what changes are occurring in their community and on their corridors so they have time to gather enough information to adequately address any concerns that may affect their business or neighborhood stability. It's not made clear by the Committee's concerns how expanding notifications puts Fair Housing laws at risk when opposition occurs regardless. I'm assuming it may be because we are recommending a policy change that creates that risk?

Comment 7:

I reject the CoSA attorney's rationale for not expanding the notification circumference for re-zoning. Our group (and our communities) would benefit from more time to discuss this piece but I don't know if the train will wait on us...

I believe [Comment 6] describes what I've heard called, "community benefits agreements" CBA. I would love to be able to add this concept to our recs regarding zoning along with the examples that [Comment 6] listed as examples of community benefits agreements -not necessarily as recs for CBAs (because i think we won't reach consensus online and fast enough to make them specific recs from the group as a whole).

If there's no strong objection to including CBAs as determined by each neighborhood, on a case-by-case basis in our rec regarding zoning, this would give Task Force members more to work with.

Responses to question 2 from May 12 meeting with Task Force: Please share your thoughts on what "stable, equitable, and resilient neighborhoods" are.

Comment 1:

In my opinion, this speaks to the problems associated with gentrification. In District 5, while extremely poor, many neighborhoods are extremely stable - houses have been in the same family for generations. This stability enhances resiliency, particularly in low income communities where inter-dependence upon

neighbors reflects an improved quality of life. This is also true in many of our older neighborhoods throughout the south, west, and east sides. However, the rapid pace of gentrification in the near-downtown areas, such as Lone Star, Dignowity, Denver Heights, etc. disrupts this stability as families become less able to afford property taxes. Furthermore, renters get hit especially hard as rising values force landlords to sell. All these things affect stability, resiliency, sustainability. Finally, short term rentals have a direct negative impact on all of these, as they are the very opposite of stable and equitable.

Stable, equitable, and resilient neighborhoods are places where families can live in and maintain their homes over generations. They are places where housing has a mix of styles and values - lower, middle, and upper middle income can live side by side.

Comment 2:

I could give you a list of attributes that could describe “stable, equitable, and resilient neighborhoods” but instead I would like to describe an actual one: Beacon Hill which shares so many attributes with most of the other downtown neighborhoods.

Beacon Hill

- Is diverse economically, culturally, and by age. It is also a mix of legacy homeowners and renters as well as newcomers. We recognize that gentrification is not about who moves in a neighborhood, but how all neighbors interact.
- has a strong sense of identity.
- Is a place in which people know their neighbors and watch out for one another
- has a strong sense of community and people attend local events.
- has a vital local, commercial district
- is walkable and has a community garden and playgrounds that people use
- has the ability through civil discourse (although it can get loud) to work out differences of opinions in a public forum through its neighborhood association.
- has a strong neighborhood association that most people recognize as belonging to the neighborhood.

The reason we work so hard to advocate for our communities is partly because these are the kinds of neighborhoods that San Antonio says it needs. These are places that are equitable and are resilient.

Comment 3:

A resilient neighborhood is a neighborhood that has the capacity to survive and grow despite chronic stress and acute shock. The term commonly refers to natural disasters – to hurricanes or earthquakes, for example – but in our case, we use it to refer to sudden economic downturns or upturns that also may impact our neighborhoods (materializing as acute foreclosures or rapidly rising demand that may even provoke gentrification). A resilient neighborhood can weather such drastic change.

A stable neighborhood is not a stagnant neighborhood. A stagnant neighborhood does not change and does not evolve – that is not what we mean. Instead, a stable neighborhood (to us) is one in which a family – if they so choose – may stay for a lifetime. It is a neighborhood with a mix of housing styles, sizes, and values to accommodate change while providing stability to the community that resides there.

Equity – equity implies comparison, thus we refer to equitable neighborhoods (not an equitable neighborhood). Equitable neighborhoods can be defined as the absence of disparity. There is no difference in the quality of life between neighborhoods – they are most certainly different – but the ability to lead a full life is the same. To walk down the street, to drink clean water, to feel safe – these are some of the characteristics that equitable neighborhoods share. This means (though) that they are not treated equally. They need different types of investment, for example (and this may include housing).

How?

- Create and preserve affordable housing
- Provide renter and homeownership protections
- Support home ownership assistance programs
- Improve owner- and renter-occupied rehab programs
- Recognize and mitigate the impacts of gentrification and displacement
- Create opportunities for cross-sector collaboration.

Comment 4:

I'm just missing something in the resilience paragraph. I'd like to see more of an acknowledgement that growth impacts the PEOPLE who live in our neighborhoods and that they should be engaged and participate in decision making about changes in their neighborhoods. (While we didn't reach solid consensus about exactly how to engage neighbors and in what process areas, I believe there was general agreement that more community engagement is a good principle to come out of our group.)

As many of you know, I'm coming from a place of commitment to preventing (not only mitigating) displacement/disaster/negative impacts of growth. So, I'd like the resilience piece to also speak to more than the inevitability of disaster and sudden impact on neighborhoods and also mark the resilience of people who have endured long term neglect in their neighborhoods....

So I offer the suggested edits below in **bold & italics** and ask for improved edits as you see fit.

A resilient neighborhood is a neighborhood ***where families and individuals who live there have*** the capacity to survive and grow despite chronic stress and acute shock. The term commonly refers to natural disasters – to hurricanes or earthquakes, for example – but in our case, we use it to refer to sudden economic downturns or upturns that also may impact our neighborhoods (materializing as acute foreclosures ***and evictions*** or rapidly rising demand that may even provoke gentrification). A resilient neighborhood can weather such drastic change. ***Families and individuals who thrive despite chronic stresses, sustain resilient neighborhoods. Their perspectives are integral to determine ways to prevent and mitigate negative impacts of change to their neighborhoods. They are the most suited to create solutions that prevent displacement and the destruction of resilient neighborhoods.***

Comment 5:

So if we go with something like this, with the changes that have been offered, and if all others agree, then there are some weak points in our report. The big one to me is that we never had a discussion/conversation about what a resilient, stable, equitable neighborhood actually looks like (in terms of housing and housing choices). I think we agree that it is mixed-age (young to old), which implies

mixed-income as well. But at what scale do we feel that mixed-income should be encouraged -- at the scale of the building (if it's multi-family); the scale of the street (if it's single family), or higher -- like the city block or elementary school? People always share wonderful stories of old neighborhoods in which everyone was working class and felt safe and secure -- those neighborhoods were NOT mixed income and were very very successful (personally I think mixed income is great but is not the solution to the problems we face).

And then we need to flush out what equitable neighborhoods look like and how to get there. Given this definition, it means that some neighborhoods may require one type of investment (in housing, for example), and others a different kind. For example, lower-income neighborhoods right now are speaking against additional subsidized housing projects in their area while high income neighborhoods lobby against additional high income development coming to their areas. What is our recommendation, given our vision?

Comment 6:

We also need to not consciously endorse (or ignore) policies and practices that we know from decades of research locally that promote/uphold segregation in housing and everything else it translates into (i.e. impacting the life outcomes of generations individuals/families negatively).

Building and sustaining mixed-income communities/housing (i.e. with developments that have AMI that actually reaches individuals/families living in the deepest forms of poverty) is one crucial strategy that shouldn't be ignored since it hasn't actually been tried seriously in the city to begin with (and followed through on). It is often consciously (and unconsciously) avoided/ignored to maintain segregation, privileges, and the inequities that come with it. We should be explicit about it.

Mixed-income, integrated housing/communities is one important strategy to tackle our problems (not the only one) along with others i.e. community development of existing neighborhoods that have historically remained working class (i.e. the Purpose Built Communities model) to disrupt the legacy of segregation (and the continued detrimental effects that come with it) that the city has yet to confront with and followed through on with tangible, long-term policies and practices when it comes to housing and the communities we building/sustaining.

Comment 7:

I'm hesitant to get on board with making the recommendation to promote more mixed income housing because I know about what [Comment 5] described (what I define as "resilient neighborhoods"), AND also because I fear that 'mixed income' is a term that can easily be exploited to promote projects that aren't as beneficial to community nor toward a vision of de-segregation like HPark, etc.

This is also why I'm so concerned about how we might remain engaged in the Task Force deliberations as they continue to flesh all of this out toward more specific policy recommendations.

And as to what we didn't get to, mentioned by [Comment 5]—I hear you; I agree; I also didn't get to several other pieces of this large housing conversation I would have liked to delve into with this group and even others, but we're out of time, no? Are others interested in continuing our work together toward affecting the ongoing work of the Task Force???

Comment 8:

I hope that whatever joint document/concept paper we end up putting forward does not run away from combating segregation head on. If we are going to be a resilient city, then matters related to segregation need to be proactively solved for.

Plain and simple it is the "original sin" that is at the root of the many of social ills/issues of our city, state, and country faces and one of the major unfulfilled goals of the Fair Housing Act/AFFH (given decades of research, past and present on building diverse, integrated neighborhoods).

The strategies to tackle it are not a mystery (mixed income housing development with guardrails, vouchers/housing choice, etc.). Political will and courage are needed.

Here is to hoping that SA doesn't become yet another city that ignores combating segregation and ends up paying (literally and metaphorically and socially) for it because it missed an important moment in time to implement a forward thinking, progressive set of housing policies.

During meetings, the working group also discussed the following policies, but did not have enough time to arrive at a recommendation that the majority of the group agreed with.

- Require residential and commercial developers to include community engagement in the development process, including meetings with school districts
 - Community engagement should be third party-led
 - All written and verbal communication with community should be in non-technical language
- Provide property tax relief to homeowners to encourage new homeownership
- For the recommendation that there be a requirement for housing developments that receive City incentives to include units affordable to families earning up to 30%, 50%, and 60% of AMI (listed under **"Invest in the production of new affordable rental and owner-occupied housing"**), the working group discussed setting aside a minimum of 25% or 50% of units as affordable.

In response to the final list of priority recommendations presented above, individual working group members submitted the following statements in writing as clarifications and additions to the list.

Comment 1: Clarification about the definition of "living wage"

Require that projects receiving incentives or direct investment from the City include the creation of living-wage jobs (meaning they match the current wage budgeted for City employees, or start at a minimum \$15/hour).

Comment 2: Addition regarding the meaning of "resilience"

On the issue of resilience, I think an important thing to say to the Task Force is that the City staff should review neighborhood plans from past years/decades in which neighbors spent a year putting together ideas for the vibrancy and improvements in their neighborhoods, and those plans should also be

considered in the housing development of the different areas of the City—not to put aside the hard work of communities that worked hard in the past to preserve and improve certain things about their neighborhoods.

Comment 3: Edits and additions to the recommendations. This comment was reformatted by NALCAB Staff for purposes of length and clarity. Please see Appendix D, part v, for full text of the submission.

Preferred edits/additions per Vecinos de Mission Trails, Member of Developing and Preserving Housing for Stable, Equitable, and Resilient Neighborhoods Technical Working Group. *(Edits and additions to the recommendations are in **bold & italic font.**)*

Recommendation: Invest in the preservation of affordable rental and owner-occupied housing

- *Edit:* Expand efforts to rehabilitate and repair existing owner-occupied housing stock through the following actions:
 - Partner with construction trade training programs and incentivize contractors to hire and train underemployed young adults in the building trades **including sustainable design and building methods and innovations**
- *Edit:* Address property tax burden for longtime and low- and middle-income (up to 120% AMI) homeowners through the following actions:
 - Explore ways to provide tax relief to low- and middle-income (up to 120% of AMI) families that have owned and lived in their home for more than 10 years **including waivers for taxes on solar panels and other taxable sustainable rehab/improvements made to homes.**
 - Coordinate **county and** state lobbying efforts around comprehensive property tax reform with other cities
- *Add:* **Incentivize permitting for ADU (accessory dwelling unit/granny flat) and make the opportunity available to STR Type1 applicants**

Recommendation: Invest in the production of new affordable rental and owner-occupied housing

- *Edit:* Require housing developments that receive City incentives **and County incentives (City tax abatements like TIRZ, CHIP, ICRIP, others; impact fee waivers from SAWS, CPS, County tax abatements)** to include **40%-60%** units which are affordable to families earning up to 30%, 50%, and 60% of AMI. The percentage of affordable units should be determined based on the size of the development (number of units).
 - **Housing developments that receive the above-mentioned City and County incentives must take measures to prevent displacement, provide relocation assistance for residents forced to relocate to later return to live in affordable units, and compliment neighborhood development plans. If no neighborhood plan is registered, developers must use improved community engagement standards and updated zoning and permitting processes detailed in this document to inform design of the project.**
- *Edit:* Expand existing City programs to purchase land and sell it to developers of affordable housing at below market cost **using improved community engagement standards and updated zoning and permitting processes (detailed in this document, with respect to scale of building preferred by neighborhood)**
- *Edit:* Support efforts to amend the City charter to allow for bond funds to be invested in **naturally affordable single and multi-family affordable housing (30%, 50%, 60% AMI)**

Recommendation: Improve education and advocacy for renters and homeowners

- *Edit:* Expand the notification circumference for re-zoning and include property owners, renters, and neighborhood schools **and extend notification to include property owners, occupants, and neighborhood community (including nearby impacted schools, small businesses).**
 - **Notification must be in terms and layout easily understood by general public.**
 - **Modifications to current zoning processes must be approved by Tenants Council as described above.**
- *Edit:* Require that all public meetings **and presentations** be bilingual Spanish/English, and that translation into any other language be made available upon request. **Please note: This requirement is different from merely having interpretation or translation of documents available upon request in advance.**
- *Edit:* Eliminate at-large city boards and commissions that pertain to housing and real estate development—all should have representation from each Council District **and from Tenants Council as described above.**

Recommendation: In alignment with fair housing obligations, invest in increasing housing choice, decreasing segregation, preventing displacement, and creating diverse neighborhoods of opportunity

- *Edit:* Require that investment in affordable housing in disinvested neighborhoods be **priority in a** comprehensive community development plan
- *Edit:* Create a set of criteria, to include fair housing criteria, **informed by Tenants Council, displaced and potentially displaced community members,** that the City (**City Council, Office of the Mayor, Office of the City Manager, Boards, Commissions, Project Oversight Committees**) must use when making any development decisions **including demolition/construction permits, rezoning, and more.**
- *Edit:* **Include Tenants Council, Apartments Assoc, and more in strategy sessions to** increase mobility for Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher holders by:
 - Creating a mobility counseling program that is fair-housing focused
 - Increasing the number of rental units/landlords that accept vouchers by exploring strategic ways to reduce source of income discrimination and by investing in education and incentives to promote acceptance of vouchers by landlords.
- *Edit:* **Prevent displacement and** Balance affordable housing production and preservation efforts among high opportunity neighborhoods, neighborhoods facing gentrification and displacement pressures, areas benefitting from public investment, and disinvested neighborhoods

Recommendation: Address the adverse impacts of growth on neighborhoods and affordability

- *Edit:* Require that projects receiving incentives or direct investment from the City include an assessment **conducted by a 3rd party, created and approved by renters, occupants, property owners, schools, and small businesses** of the impact on housing affordability, displacement, and hardship **including hardship related to relocation,** as well as concurrent investments to mitigate those impacts through affordable housing preservation and production, and the creation of living-wage jobs **and just workplace requirements for full production timeline (construction, site/apt management), and sustainable building design. The goal of impacts mitigation investments must be to support the displaced in their relocation to long term stable housing conditions as determined by the Tenants Council and members of the community directly impacted by the project. Project managers must apply for approval from Tenants Council, majority of individuals most directly negatively impacted, and City for proposed use of investments to mitigate negative impacts.**

- *Edit:* Expand financial assistance available to **individuals and families** to help pay for rent or relocation costs. Program design must be based on input from **individuals and families** facing displacement
 - ***The private sector must shoulder the costs of mitigating effects of displacement when it does occur by providing financial assistance to***
 - ***residents whose rents increase as a result of a development project,***
 - ***residents who opt for relocation as their best path to restabilizing their housing condition upon impact from a development project.***

The working group also discussed the following policies, but did not have enough time to arrive at a consensus recommendation.

- *Edit:* Require residential and commercial developers to include community engagement in the development process, including meetings with school districts **and nearby small business**
 - Community engagement should be third party-led
 - All written and verbal communication with community should be in non-technical language **and available in Spanish and English at the onset.**
- *Edit:* Provide property tax relief to **low-income** homeowners to encourage **first time** homeownership

Comment 4: Addition of items not addressed through working group discussions

1. **Identity** and why a person lives somewhere—Cities are places that have certain characteristics and lend meaning to the people living there—a sense of civic pride. Demographics, surveys, government census data, etc., allow us to recognize the signs of how citizens see themselves as part of something they are part of, or pushed aside as irrelevant to that greater thing. A sufficient amount of this data needs to be boiled down by a really good public servant and considered by a sensitive writer with a broad view of San Antonio “the place” in formulating a preamble to this study’s purpose.

Given that the findings of this initiative will never be conclusively inclusive, some statics of where the ship that is the City is sailing should be considered in addressing housing equality as will always be a work in progress.

2. **Work** and a sense of worth—Beginning from childhood, every person needs to learn what it is like to be productive, to be appreciated for the contribution and gratification of work, and to be fairly rewarded for accomplishment. Aside from the reasoning disadvantaged individuals, the innocent child, the substance or physiologically abused, or the impaired elderly, every person needs to work. The City needs to always keep this in mind as the basis of a sustainable society genuinely supportive of economic growth that benefits all.

Families cannot exist and find dignity without breadwinners, children cannot function to their learning potential without working-parent role models, and neighborhoods cannot be credibly resilient if houses are not cared for, utilities and police paid for, and social systems like schools maintained without the steady stream of taxes that consistent, good paying jobs help insure.

Public officials and government employees from all quarters should work to reinforce this notion as critical to the success of most any and all housing policy mechanisms. Educational and job skills training facilities might better serve those in need of better employment-work

preparedness by being closer to where the most under-employed people reside. Maybe something in the form of an old fashion book mobile library inspired mobile job-training purveyance initiative could be instituted.

As a teacher in higher education I know how challenging the logistics of “field work” can be, but I also recognize in the positive responses of youth these days in recognizing how valuable actual at-the-source-training can be.

3. **Education is the keystone to a prosperous society**—In all ways possible, even if not politically comfortable, all efforts to better the City’s schools (public, charter, private, etc.) must be facilitated if housing policy is to serve to build or revitalize neighborhoods and underpin points 1 and 2 above.
4. **Mobility is critical if neighborhoods are to thrive**—With such a large number of San Antonio Citizens living in or near poverty, and the acceptance that fueling improved work opportunities should be a priority of the City, housing development incentives (of all sizes and localities, both private or publicly funded) should target new and infill development initiatives along vibrant transportations corridors. In many ways the car is the greatest curse of the underprivileged while the most opulent waste of the wealthy. Defining and nurturing city growth and revitalization policies that get people out of cars and on to affordable public transportation is a critical need. Better yet, incentivizing people to walking down the street to one’s school, job, or park should be a city growth goal even if an idealistic pursuit.
5. **Property value taxes are the greatest challenge facing homeowners as they age**—Whether citizens are poor or well-off, the City’s demands for revenue are outpacing most property owner’s income earning capabilities. The City should be wiser in its expenditures of funds to the extent that it might move towards being better able to modulate tax hikes based on the kinds of necessities that benefit broader swaths of society while stimulating commercial development interests/revenues. Elected officials have to lead in more inspired, creative ways, and public servants work harder every day.

During my one “big idea” brain-storming moment during a working group meeting, I argued for a conviction that homeowners should not be able to borrow money against the equity built up in their homes across time. Yes, I know that this represents someone pining for bygone days (where governmental policies often acted to protect citizens from their unwise judgements), but I constantly see the train wrecks that family’s budgets have become and I wish that laws word serve to protect citizens against predatory lending operations.