



AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN



Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	02
Purpose	03
Affordability Definitions	03
Community and Stakeholder Engagement Summary	04
What is the Need?	06
Growth in Low-to Moderate-Paying Jobs	07
Future Housing Demand	08
Equity and Inclusion	11
Regional Housing Need	11
Crucial Partnerships: Public Housing Authorities	13
Past Efforts to Increase the Supply of Affordable Housing	13
Affordable Housing Goals	14
Key Actions to Support Community Values	19
Prevent Households from Being Priced Out of Austin	20
Foster Equitable Communities	22
Invest In Housing for Those Most In Need	25
Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin	29
Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs	36
Appendix A: Methodology of 10-Year Estimates	40
Appendix B: Implementation Matrix	42
Appendix C: NHCD 2016-2017 Department Goals	47
Appendix D: Glossary of Commonly Used Terms	48
Appendix E: Community and Stakeholder Survey Results, Outreach Materials, and Comments	See Attachment

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

to Address Austin's Most Pressing Affordability Challenges

Executive Summary

From 1970 to 1990, Austin was one of the most affordable cities in the country.¹ However, Austin has rapidly become less affordable in the last few years for many residents, including Austinites who embody the city's character and who provide critical services in the community. The city's growing economy and vibrant cultural assets continue to attract businesses and families, creating a steady population increase. Subsidies alone cannot close the growing affordable housing gaps or provide households with more affordable housing and transportation choices. While Austin's affordability issues are complex, implementing a Strategic Housing Plan can help the community address these issues in a more cost effective and efficient manner. By utilizing a multifaceted set of coordinated strategies, the City of Austin can work with partners to effectively address these challenges and reach our community's affordability goals.

In the broad community outreach undertaken to develop the Austin Strategic Housing Plan - including 30 public meetings, a statistically valid survey (available in English and Spanish), and outreach to underrepresented groups - Austinites noted that affordability is not just defined by the price of housing, but also by where one lives and if one has access to daily needs and opportunities. The Austin Strategic Housing Plan recommends thoughtful strategies and approaches to prevent displacement and foster equitable communities, invest in housing for those most in need, create new and affordable housing choices, while also helping Austinites reduce their transportation costs and other household expenses. By ensuring alignment with the City's Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan and other citywide initiatives to implement Imagine Austin, such as the CodeNEXT revision of the Land Development Code, the Austin Strategic Housing Plan seeks to address these interconnected issues comprehensively.

It is important to keep in mind that there are other issues that impact affordability - such as utilities, taxes, transportation, and healthcare costs - which may be outside of the scope of this plan, and rely on the actions of other governmental, non-profit and private entities. The Austin Strategic Housing Plan provides a roadmap for Austin to maximize the most impactful opportunities, sustainably achieve affordability goals and ensure Austin remains a great city for people with different needs, values and incomes. Austin's greatest assets are its diversity and its people, and that is why implementing the Housing Plan to address affordability is so important for all Austinites.

¹ Elvin Wyly, Norman Glickman, & Michael Laehr, "A Top List of Things to Know About American Cities," *HUD Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 1998.

Purpose

The purpose of the Austin Strategic Housing Plan is to help align resources, ensure a unified strategic direction, and facilitate community partnerships to achieve this shared vision. The Plan recommends new funding mechanisms, regulatory changes through CodeNEXT, and other creative approaches the City of Austin and community partners should utilize to achieve both market rate and affordable housing goals.

The City of Austin's most recent Comprehensive Housing Market study identified a gap of 48,000 housing units affordable to households earning at or below \$25,000 annually, or approximately 30% of the median family income (MFI). It is estimated that the cost to close that gap today with construction of new units would be \$6.48 billion.² By 2025, the cost to close the gap is estimated to grow to \$11.18 billion.³ Given the magnitude of the challenge, subsidies alone are not a realistic solution. As such, this plan proposes a combination of new funding mechanisms, regulatory changes through CodeNEXT, and other creative approaches to address specific housing issues the City of Austin and its residents face.

Affordability Definitions

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development defines **affordable housing** as: "Housing in which the occupant(s) is/are paying no more than 30% of his or her income for gross housing costs, including utilities." According to Imagine Austin, the City of Austin's comprehensive plan, **household affordability** includes not only housing costs, but also utilities and transportation costs. **Income-restricted affordable housing** refers to housing for which renters or buyers must meet specific income guidelines to be able to live in the unit. This guideline is generally defined in terms of a percent of median family income, or MFI. **Market-rate housing** generally refers to housing that is rented or owned by people who pay market rates to rent the property or paid market value when they bought the property. There is no subsidy for this type of housing, so there is no guarantee that the prices will remain stable over time. The table below shows the different income categories that will be discussed throughout the Plan, as well as the monthly rents that are considered affordable for households at these income levels.

TABLE 1:

INCOME CATEGORY*	1-PERSON	2-PERSON	3-PERSON	4-PERSON
Extremely low income (at or below 30% of MFI)	\$16,350	\$18,700	\$21,050	\$24,300
Monthly rent affordable to this household	\$409	\$468	\$526	\$608
Very low income (at or below 50% of MFI)	\$27,250	\$31,150	\$35,050	\$38,900
Monthly rent affordable to this household	\$681	\$779	\$876	\$973
Low income (at or below 80% of MFI)	\$43,600	\$49,800	\$56,050	\$62,250
Monthly rent affordable to this household	\$1,090	\$1,245	\$1,401	\$1,556
Middle income (at or below 120% of MFI)	\$65,350	\$74,700	\$84,000	\$93,360
Monthly rent affordable to this household	\$1,634	\$1,868	\$2,100	\$2,334

SOURCE: US Department of Housing and Urban Development Income Limits 2016

*Annual incomes listed for each income category

MFI = Median Family Income for Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

NOTE: The average household size in Austin is 2.3 persons

² Calculation: \$135,000 (estimated construction cost) x 48,000 units = \$6.48 billion.

³ Calculation: \$164,430 (estimated construction costs in 2015 dollars) x 68,000 units (continued rate of increase from 2008 through 2014) = \$11.18 billion.



Stakeholder engagement was one of the core components in the creation of the Strategic Housing Plan. Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department (NHCD) staff actively solicited input from residents, community leaders, local housing advocates, and board and commission members for this Plan. Citizens had multiple opportunities to provide input through a variety of methods. NHCD staff hosted 13 Community Conversation meetings (See Outreach Flyer in **Appendix E-VIII**), with at least one in each council district, as well as additional stakeholder meetings and presentations at multiple board and commission meetings in spring 2016. This outreach provided an opportunity for more than 400 stakeholders to discuss the difficult choices the city faces regarding household affordability. In these dialogues, citizens were asked to discuss various funding mechanisms, potential regulations, and other creative approaches the City could utilize to increase housing choices for a range of incomes. The activity was designed to foster constructive communication between community members about issues relating to affordability. Input gathered from this process informed the Plan (See **Appendix E-III**).

Additionally, a Housing Conversation Kit (See **Appendix E-VII**) was created so that individuals could host their own conversation with their neighborhood association, civic group, non-profit, or faith based organizations to discuss their perspectives on housing.

A majority of meeting participants agreed that affordable housing needs to be distributed as evenly as possible throughout the city to reduce any concentration, and that this housing should also be connected to transit and schools. Another commonly expressed view throughout the engagement process was that the City should focus affordable housing policy on both income-restricted units and on non-subsidized market rate construction. Some residents were concerned that affordable housing could have a detrimental impact on the neighborhoods where they are proposed.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT



In addition to the outreach meetings and information kits, NHCD partnered with Austin Energy's Data Analytics and Business Intelligence unit to design and distribute surveys soliciting citizen input on affordable housing during April 2016. The surveys were released in four separate methods: email in English, email in Spanish, online in English, and online in Spanish (See **Appendix E-1**). The email campaign was sent to approximately 400 citizens in each of the 10 council districts totaling about 4,000 citizens reached. The English email-based survey can be traced back to individual respondents within the Austin area and received more than 400 completed responses, making it a statistically valid sample. The data captured in this survey are representative of Austinites in demographic terms, with a slightly higher response rate of Caucasians, but the attitudes towards affordable housing can be generalized to represent the city as a whole (See **Appendix E-IV**).

The data indicates that a majority of the respondents are in agreement that people who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin. However, they are not all in agreement on the specifics of affordable housing, including how to pay for it and where it should be located. In terms of council district differences, it appears that District 4 is statistically more in favor of funding and legislation to support affordability in Austin. Districts 1 and 10 often showed less support for the need of funding and legislation to build affordable housing in Austin. Overall, citizens appear to understand the need for affordable housing in Austin.

A draft of this Plan was presented to the Austin City Council Committee on Housing and Community Development on June 6, 2016, followed by further stakeholder engagement during the summer and fall of 2016. Requests for public feedback on the Draft Plan were emailed to all stakeholders involved in the spring engagement process as well as non-profit, housing advocacy, and neighborhood group networks.

Stakeholders had the opportunity to email their comments and suggestions on the Draft Plan directly to NHCD, contribute to the discussion of the Plan on the SpeakUP! Austin online platform, and provide comments at all 22 public library locations, where physical copies of the Draft Plan were available for public review. Outreach was advertised through the City of Austin social media platforms, CityView resource, and Spanish-language media.

Two additional community-wide meetings were held as well as eight targeted meetings for low-income and minority communities in Council Districts 1, 2, and 3 (See **Appendix E-VI**). A total of 119 Individuals attended the meetings and 18 formal comment letters were submitted from individuals and organizations. The Feedback Login **Appendix E-VI** includes staff responses to more than 400 stakeholder comments on the draft plan.

What is the Need?

Austin's comprehensive plan, *Imagine Austin*, summarizes both the positives and negatives of the rapid population and economic growth the city has experienced in recent decades. While the economy has grown and diversified; downtown has been revitalized; transportation options have expanded; and new cultural and artistic opportunities have been created, negative impacts like traffic congestion and "Central Austin housing that is increasingly unaffordable" are also affecting quality of life in the city.⁴

As economic prosperity and Austin's frequent listing as one of the best places to live make it an increasingly attractive community, population increases have resulted in rising property values, such that longstanding residents in many neighborhoods are finding it difficult to remain in their homes or places of business. This process of gentrification - where more affluent people move into older, often disinvested areas, increasing property values and resulting in the displacement of lower-income residents - is occurring not just in Austin, but in cities throughout America. The issue has exacerbated urban affordable housing shortages to such an extent that the federal government published a toolkit of housing development strategies in September 2016 to address the growing lack of affordable housing units in cities. The toolkit recognizes the role that gentrification plays in a city's struggle to provide adequate numbers of affordable housing units, and the way it can interact with regulatory barriers that limit development of new housing:

When new housing development is limited region-wide, and particularly precluded in neighborhoods with political capital to implement even stricter local barriers, any new development tends to be disproportionately concentrated in low-income communities of color, causing displacement and concerns of gentrification in those neighborhoods, raising market rents ... while failing to reduce housing cost growth region-wide. As rents rise region-wide in response to insufficient housing supply, this displacement is exacerbated.⁵

⁵ White House, *Housing Development Toolkit*, Sept. 2016. http://www.whitehouse.gov/files/images/Housing_Development_Toolkit%20f.2.pdf

The increased competition (driven by sustained population growth) for the city's limited supply of housing, coupled with fewer federal and state funds dedicated to subsidized housing and widening income inequalities, have created an affordable housing shortage in Austin. This was evidenced in the City of Austin's most recent Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis, which estimated a 16.5%⁶ decrease in the number of rental units affordable to households earning \$25,000 per year when compared with 2012 inventory.

TABLE 2:

THE CITY OF AUSTIN'S 2014 COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING AS TOP HOUSING NEEDS:

- A shortage of 48,00 deeply affordable rental units (primarily those renting for less than \$500/month) for renters earning less than \$25,000 per year.
- Geographically limited housing opportunities:
 - Affordable rentals are scarce west of I-35
 - Homes to buy for \$250,000 or less are concentrated in northeast, far south and southeast Austin.
- Rising housing costs in a handful of redeveloping neighborhoods, which could cause long-time residents to seek more affordable housing elsewhere.
- A growing need for affordable housing near transit and services-to enable seniors to age in place, to provide a wider array of housing choices for persons with disabilities and to mitigate the financial impact of rising transportation costs.

In addition, wages have not kept pace with rising housing costs (see **Figure 1** next page), increasing the likelihood of displacement of low- and middle-income households without significant intervention. Austinites want to be able to afford to stay in Austin; they are concerned that they will no longer be able to afford to live in the city, and that they would be unable to afford a home in today's market.

Growth in Low- to Moderate-Paying Jobs


The strongest employment growth during the past decade has mostly occurred in low- to moderate-paying jobs. Of the 100,000 new jobs in the Austin Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), 36,000 are in the Education and Health Services sectors, which pay about \$40,000 per year on average. Another 26,000 jobs are in the low paying Leisure and Hospitality sectors, paying less than \$20,000 per year on average. Workers in these and other low- and moderate-paying professions, such as the service industry, retail, and health attendants, struggle to find homes to rent or buy in Austin. Austin is expected to continue adding disproportionately more low- to moderate-paying jobs.⁷

⁶ City of Austin, *Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis*, 2014. 2012 Gap = 40,924; 2014 Gap (estimate) = 47,698; difference of 6,774 units or 16.5%.

⁷ Economic Modeling Specialists International (EMSI) Analyst Data, 2013.

FIGURE 1:

AUSTIN MEDIAN HOME PRICES AND RENTS VERSUS MEDIAN INCOME



SOURCE: National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB), Austin Opportunity Index, and Austin Investor Interests Data (2006-2016)

Future Housing Demand

The City of Austin's population is currently projected to increase at an annual rate of approximately 2%; however, the region is expected to grow at an even faster annual rate of 3.4%.⁸ Since more than 50% of the people who work in Austin live outside the city limits⁹ and many of them would like to live in Austin but cannot afford to do so,¹⁰ it is estimated that there is a need for the construction of 135,000 additional housing units in the City of Austin over the next decade. (see **Figure 6** for more detail about methodology). At the same time, the demographics in our community are changing, with an increased percentage of young people, retirees, and single people.¹¹ These households generally have fewer people, spurring an increased demand for smaller housing options. Arthur C. Nelson, urban planning professor at the University of Arizona, estimates that "half of all new housing demand will be for attached homes and the other half for small lot homes. Demand for large-lot homes will decline below 2011 levels."¹²

⁸ U.S. Census Data; City of Austin Demographer.

⁹ U.S. Census Bureau, *OnTheMap Application* and *LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics*, beginning of quarter employment, 2nd Quarter of 2002-2014. City of Austin Demographer.


¹⁰ City of Austin, *Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis*, 2014.

¹¹ Fregonese & Associates, *Austin Balanced Housing Model*, 2016.

¹² Arthur C. Nelson, "The Mass Market for Suburban Low-Density Development is Over," *The Urban Lawyer*, 2012.

Sixteen percent of Austin's households earn under \$25,000 (roughly 30% of MFI) per year, 19% earn between \$25,000 and \$39,000 per year (roughly 31% to 60% MFI), 12% earn between \$39,000 and \$52,000 per year (roughly 61% to 80% MFI), 27% earn between \$52,000 and \$78,000 per year (roughly 81% to 120% MFI), and 27% earn \$78,000 per year or more (roughly 120% MFI and above). While 25% of the city's households earn 60% MFI or below, only 15% of the city's housing stock is affordable to them, forcing those households to compete with higher income households for a limited supply of housing that is affordable to these lower income households (see **Figure 2**). This lack of affordable supply also results in lower income households having to rent more expensive housing units.


FIGURE 2:



SOURCE: 2014 ACS Census; Austin Balanced Housing Model, Fregonese & Associates, 2016

Population growth is expected at all income levels; however, there is not sufficient housing product for people with very low incomes. Therefore, these households are competing for a limited housing supply. New luxury product has been added in the last few years, but new housing affordable to low-income households has been limited to a few thousand subsidized units. Meanwhile, market rate units that used to be affordable have become more expensive.


FIGURE 3:



SOURCE: Austin Balanced Housing Model, Fregonese & Associates, 2016

When considering Austin's future housing demand, as seen in **Figure 3**, it is clear that much of new housing demand will be for multifamily or attached units. However, there are also large increases in demand for small lot single family and missing middle housing types, which include bungalow courts, side by side duplexes, stacked duplexes, triplex, fourplex, live/work and small multiplexes. In the Austin Area, households earning below \$35,000 annually, and especially those earning below \$15,000, are **housing cost-burdened**, which means they spend more than 30% of their incomes on housing costs. This impacts many Austinites in the broader community, including households living at or below the poverty level, seniors, persons with disabilities, and low wage workers such as childcare providers, nurses, aides, healthcare attendants, bus drivers, retail salespeople, cashiers, cooks, custodians, and artists.

FIGURE 4:



SOURCE: Paycheck to Paycheck, National Housing Conference, 2016

Equity and Inclusion

In February 2015, the Martin Prosperity Institute named the Austin metro area the most economically segregated area in the United States, stating that “[i]t is not so much the size of the gap between the rich and poor that drives segregation as the ability of the super-wealthy to isolate and wall themselves off from the less well-to-do.”¹³ An adequate supply of housing affordable to people working all types of jobs and integrated throughout the City is necessary to maintain a culturally rich, diverse, and livable city. Without this, people who work here are being forced to move out of the city, resulting in negative impacts not only for individuals and families, but also for the region as it increases traffic congestion, increases environmental degradation, and fragments communities. As such, housing affordability must be a cornerstone of the City’s commitment to greater equity and fairness for each individual and community that calls Austin home. Housing should be embraced as crucial infrastructure, and this should be planned for as other infrastructure investments require long range planning and investment strategies. Without sufficient housing for a range of incomes, Austin risks becoming a city accessible only to the affluent.

Studies have found that the odds of rising to another income level are notably low in cities with concentrated poverty, extensive traffic, and weak public transit systems, which make it difficult to get to a job.¹⁴ Therefore, policymakers have an opportunity to address inequality while also addressing affordability by expanding their efforts to include access to transportation and the costs of utilities, taxes, and health care.

¹³ Richard Florida and Charlotte Mellander, *Segregated City* (Toronto: Martin Prosperity Institute), 2015.

<http://www.martinprosperity.org/media/Segregated%20City.pdf>

¹⁴ David Leonhardt, “In Climbing Income Ladder, Location Matters,” *The New York Times*, July 22, 2013.


<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/22/business/in-climbing-income-ladder-location-matters.html>

Regional Housing Need

While housing in the City of Austin is becoming more expensive, surrounding areas face their own set of problems. As lower income households find themselves unable to afford to live in Austin, they are relocating to surrounding communities or unincorporated areas of Travis, Williamson, and Hays counties. While housing costs may be lower in areas outside central Austin, other costs, like transportation, can be higher due to increased distances traveled and a lack of infrastructure or nearby services and amenities.

The Austin metro region encompasses part or all of Bastrop, Caldwell, Hays, Travis, and Williamson counties. Population projections for these five counties show sustained growth across the area, with especially high rates of growth projected for Travis and Williamson counties over the next several decades.

FIGURE 5:



SOURCE: Capital Area Council of Governments, 2016, <http://www.capcog.org/data-maps-and-reports/central-texas-regional-data/>

In order to accommodate this growth, municipalities across the region will need to increase supply of housing for residents across income categories. This Housing Plan focuses on what Austin can do to retain its current residents and prepare for future growth; however, it is important to recognize the regional context in which Austin's growth is occurring. Furthermore, to effectively accommodate the projected population growth, the City of Austin will need to work collaboratively with other municipalities and counties in the region in a variety of areas, including transportation, economic, and water resources planning.

Crucial Partnerships: Public Housing Authorities

Austin is served by two public housing authorities: the Housing Authority of the City of Austin (HACA) and the Housing Authority of Travis County (HATC). HACA maintains 18 public housing properties totaling 1,838 affordable units for low-income households. As of Fiscal Year 2015-2016, more than 8,000 families were on the waiting list to move into one of these public housing units. HACA administers several rental voucher programs, including Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH), Homeless Program Grant, Family Unification, Mainstream, and Non-Elderly with Disabilities. Its largest program is the Housing Choice Voucher program with over 5,350 rental vouchers supporting an estimated 14,500 people. Its second largest rental assistance program is VASH, serving 464 transitioning homeless veterans. As of Fiscal Year 2015-2016, there were over 2,000 families on the waiting list for a Housing Choice Voucher. HACA also receives funding through the City of Austin for a Tenant Based Rental Assistance voucher program, which assisted 101 households during Fiscal Year 2015-2016.

Through its subsidiary, Austin Affordable Housing Corporation (AAHC), HACA also owns and operates 2,436 additional high-quality affordable housing units at 12 apartment communities across Austin. HACA is also currently developing an additional 3 communities with 702 affordable units. All AAHC accept and actively welcome residents who use Housing Choice or other rental assistance vouchers.

HATC serves Travis County and parts of Austin. The authority manages five housing properties totaling 105 affordable units. HATC also administers eight housing services programs. The largest program is the Housing Choice Voucher program, with 568 vouchers and approximately 800 households on the waiting list to receive a voucher. HATC also receives funding through a Shelter Plus Care grant to provide 95 units for homeless families or individuals in the area.

Public housing authorities must create five-year comprehensive plans, as well as annual plans according to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines. These comprehensive plans encompass policies, programs, and strategies to help the housing authorities meet their communities' housing needs and goals. HACA's 2016 Annual Plan and 2015-2019 Five-Year Plan and HATC's 2016-2017 Annual Plan provide the most recent discussions of the authorities' policies, accomplishments, and goals. By state law, HACA's work is focused within the City of Austin while HATC prioritizes areas of Travis County outside of the city limits.

It is important to continue the sustainable partnerships between the City of Austin, HACA, AAHC, and HATC in planning efforts to align goals and targeted investment strategies. There are many opportunities to leverage resources to achieve the goals outlined this plan.

Past Efforts to Increase the Supply of Affordable Housing

Although this Housing Plan marks the first city-wide effort to strategically align resources to increase the supply of affordable units in the city, the City of Austin has focused funding and policy to address affordable housing issues in the past. These efforts include two Housing Market Study analyses, in 2008 and 2014, to identify existing and future housing needs and support the creation of a plan to meet those needs. In 2008, the City also conducted an Affordable Housing Preservation Study that included recommendations for proactively preserving existing affordable units in the face of declining or expiring federal subsidies and significant projected population growth. This study led to the development and adoption of preservation goals in 2014. Affordable housing strategies were developed for the downtown area (2009) and for Permanent Supportive Housing for people experiencing chronic homelessness (2010). Analysis of the fee-in-lieu option allowed under certain density bonus programs has been conducted, with recommendations delivered to City Council in 2016. Updates to the S.M.A.R.T. Housing program are also being considered with the purpose of making the program more effective at creating longer term affordable housing units.

NHCD's Rental Housing Development Assistance and Acquisition & Development programs have provided funding to private developers to create affordable rental and ownership units for over a decade. General obligation bonds for affordable housing were approved by Austin voters in 2006 and 2013, allocating \$120 million and creating over 3,500 affordable housing units to date (with \$20 million from the 2013 bond still remaining as of October 2016).

Affordable Housing Goals

Goals for 10-year housing production of both affordable and market rate housing were established by examining data on past housing production and population growth in both Austin and the Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), consultation with the City's Demographer, and examination of a range of potential scenarios with regard to the national and local economy over the next 10 years. As depicted in **Figure 6** above, housing unit goals were set by calculating the percentage of households falling within the various income categories in Austin today. Achieving these goals would help ensure households within each income category are able to find affordable housing choices they can afford, minimizing the risk of displacement. This will require strategy that focuses both on preservation of existing homes and the production of housing supply at all income levels.

FIGURE 6:

METHODOLOGY

STEP 1: Multiply the 2015 City of Austin Total Housing stock by the 2025 MSA Population Percent Change. This shows the number of new housing units that need to be added to keep pace with population growth.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 397,637 & \times & 34\% & = & 135,197 \\
 \text{2015 \# Housing Units} & & \text{2025 MSA Population \%} & & \text{2025 \# New Housing Units Needed} \\
 \text{(City of Austin)} & & \text{Change (est.)} & & \text{to Keep Pace with Population Growth}
 \end{array}$$

MFI Range	Income Ranges	Percent of Households by MFI Range*	2025 # New Housing Units Needed by MFI Range
0-30% MFI	< \$22,600	16.6%	22,417
31-60% MFI	\$22,601-\$45,240	18.4%	24,963
61-80% MFI	\$45,241-\$60,300	11.7%	15,822
0-80% MFI Unit Goal			63,201
			ROUNDED 60,000

STEP 2: Proportionally distribute the number of new units needed to keep pace with population growth by the percent of Austin households at various income levels.


81-120% MFI	\$63,301-\$90,480	19.2%	25,959
121%+ MFI	\$90,481+	34.1%	46,037
81% + MFI Unit Goal			71,995
			ROUNDED 75,000

* The percent column has been rounded for display purposes.

As depicted in **Figure 6** on the previous page, housing unit goals were set by calculating the percentage of households falling within the various income categories in Austin today. Achieving these goals would help ensure households within each income category are able to find affordable housing choices they can afford, minimizing the risk of displacement. This will require strategy that focuses both on preservation of existing homes and the production of housing supply at all income levels.

FIGURE 7:

HOLISTIC APPROACH TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING




SOURCE: City of Austin

Appendix B features an implementation matrix that prioritizes each recommended policy action; identifies implementation partners; and provides a time horizon for Implementation. Any approach will need to be multifaceted and will require increases to the supply of both the subsidized housing units and the unsubsidized, market-rate housing units.

AUSTIN COMMUNITY 10-YEAR AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS

135,000 HOUSING UNITS IN 10 YEARS



- At least 75% of new housing units should be within 1/2 mile of Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors
- Preserve 10,000 affordable housing units over 10 years
- Produce 100 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units each year through 2018, with half of those units (25) being Housing First

EACH CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT SHOULD CONTAIN:

- At least 10% of rental housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 30% MFI (\$24,300 or less for a 4-person household in 2016); and
- At least 25% of ownership housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 120% MFI (\$93,360 or less for a 4-person household in 2016).

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 10-YEAR TARGETS

**HOUSING FOR ALL**

- Serve at least 20 people without a voucher and under 20% MFI each year in non-PSH housing
- 100% of ground floor units in new developments funded by NHCD will be adaptable and 25% of all affordable units will be accessible
- Support the production of 50 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units each year, with half of those being Housing First

**FAMILY FRIENDLY HOUSING**

- 25% of affordable housing units that are created or preserved should have two or more bedrooms AND a preference for families with children

**LINKING HOUSING WITH TRANSPORTATION**

- 25% of affordable housing created or preserved to be within ¼ mile of high frequency transit (this is transit service that provides service every 15 minutes or better throughout most of the day, on weekdays and weekends)
- 90% of affordable housing created or preserved within ¾ mile of transit service, ensuring Metro Access service for eligible persons with disabilities.

**HOME REPAIR**

- Assist 600 low-income households per year with home repair programs with the objective to help preserve existing housing stock.


AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS IN MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS

Several areas throughout Austin have district or master plans specifying that a certain percentage of units should be affordable to people at lower incomes. These percentages will be achieved through mechanisms like Tax Increment Finance Districts, Density Bonuses, direct investments of local and federal funds, and other resources. These areas include:

<p>COLONY PARK</p> <p>20% of units affordable to households at 60% MFI or below (rental) and 80% MFI or below (owner)</p>	<p>MUELLER</p> <p>25% of units (approximately 1,425 units at buildout) affordable to households at 60% MFI or below (rental) and 80% MFI or below (owner)</p>	<p>SOUTH CENTRAL WATERFRONT</p> <p>20% of all new units affordable to households at 60%-80% MFI</p>
--	--	---

FIGURE 8:

FUNDING MECHANISMS AND TOOLS FOR 60,000 AFFORDABLE UNITS (UP TO 80% MFI) IN 10 YEARS



*Estimate methodology is featured in Appendix A.

NOTE: These strategies and activities are in addition to the existing efforts already underway amongst the City and its partners.

Key Actions to Support Community Values

Achieving the aggressive community goals outlined in the Plan will require the continuation of existing funding, as well as significant new funding, new regulations, new programs, legislative changes, land development code changes, and participation from the private sector at a level not previously experienced in Austin. To make significant progress in altering the current trajectory of Austin becoming a city available to only certain income households, policymakers will have to make difficult decisions including redirecting funds from other uses toward affordable housing and changing city policies to address housing needs and ensure that the needs of vulnerable populations are addressed.

Analysis by University of California researchers about the relationship between housing production, affordability, and displacement in the San Francisco Bay Area found that although subsidized housing has over double the impact of market-rate units, both market-rate and subsidized housing work together to reduce displacement pressures at the regional level. The research notes the importance of increasing spending on subsidized housing to ensure both neighborhood stability and income diversity into the future. However, the findings also support the need for the production of more housing at all levels of affordability in strong-market regions like Austin to ease housing pressures. When there is a lack of housing units relative to demand for housing, prices for all types of housing rise. Thus, this Housing Plan incorporates goals and strategies to increase not just the supply of subsidized units, but the supply of housing units in general.

Continuation of level funding for affordable housing in Austin (including new General Obligation Bonds when the funds from the current bonds are expended) would result in the production of approximately 5,900 income-restricted affordable units over the next ten years; however, the need for both income-restricted affordable housing and market-rate housing over those ten years is estimated to be approximately 135,000 units, using the growth rate of the Metropolitan Statistical Area. Aggressive implementation of the policies, programs and tools described below will be necessary to move the needle toward making Austin a more equitable and inclusive city.

It is important to note that, in any given year, a certain number of income-restricted affordable housing units are lost due to the expiration of their subsidies or affordability periods (i.e., the length of time they must remain affordable to meet contractual or funding agreements). Market-rate units with affordable rents can also be lost due to increasing rents or redevelopment. Strategies to deal with this natural attrition are discussed in the “Make Strategic Investments to Minimize Displacement” subsection below.

¹⁵ Miriam Zuk and Karen Chapple, Housing Production, Filtering and Displacement: Untangling the Relationships,” *Institute of Governmental Studies Research Brief* (Berkeley: UC Berkeley), 2016.



SUCCESS STORY: HOUSING GO BOND DEVELOPMENTS

In 2006, voters approved \$55 million in general obligation bond funding for affordable housing development, a historic first in Austin. All of this funding has been expended and has built, preserved, or repaired 2,593 rental and ownership units throughout the city. 73% of these units are affordable to households earning up to 50% MFI. The housing developments funded with 2006 bond fund have yielded a high return on investment: for every \$1 of City funding, \$4 of other funding was leveraged, enabling seniors, persons with disabilities, and very low-income families to obtain affordable housing throughout the community. In 2013, Austin voters approved an additional \$65 million for affordable housing.

Prevent Households from Being Priced Out of Austin

Preserve communities through legislative changes, local policies, programs and targeted investments.

*(*Indicates a strategy with the highest impact)*

***Support Legislation to Allow a Flat Dollar-Amount Homestead Exemption for all Local Taxing Entities**

Current state law only allows cities to offer a homestead exemption equaling a percentage of the appraised value of a property, which disproportionately benefits owners of high value homes while offering little relief to owners of low value homes. A flat dollar-amount homestead exemption would offer more substantial relief to homeowners who are most in need.

***Target a Preservation Property Tax Exemption to Communities at Risk of Displacement:**

Austin needs a tool that can mitigate the pressure on its existing housing stock, which is causing rent increases and displacing low-income renters to outside the city. A Preservation Property Tax Exemption geared toward preservation of affordability would provide a City of Austin tax exemption (regardless of the age of a property) in exchange for guaranteeing continued affordability. The City will develop a strategy to implement this tool in areas most at risk of displacement of low-income renters.

*Expand the use of Community Land Trusts (CLT) and other forms of Shared Equity Ownership:

Between rental and conventional homeownership, shared equity ownership ensures that homes remain affordable to lower income households on a long-term basis. One form of this, community land trusts enable eligible households to purchase a home and lease the land underneath it (**Figure 9**). By taking the cost of the land out of the real estate transaction, homes in a community land trust are much more affordable than houses on the open real estate market. Dedicated additional resources to the program could help expand it. Combining the land trust tool with regulatory changes through CodeNEXT that allow for a range of multifamily housing types such as missing middle housing could result in greater homeownership opportunities at an even lower cost to prospective income-eligible buyers.

FIGURE 9:



Prevent Displacement of Low- and Moderate-Income Homeowners:

Buying a home in Austin during a time of rising home prices is out of reach for most low-income families, and being able to continue to afford property taxes, especially in central Austin, has become very challenging for many. That means it is even more critical to prevent displacement of existing low-and-moderate-income homeowners. The City will continue exploring ways to help stabilize low-income homeowners, build on the success of existing repair and weatherization programs, and pursue policies to provide assistance to homeowners with financial hardships that threaten their housing.

Preserve and Create Ownership Options for Households at 80% to 120% MFI:

In response to City Council direction to provide recommendations on strategies to create more homeownership options for households earning from 80% to 120% MFI, staff and stakeholders developed a list of potential strategies to support households in this income range, including exploring the potential for new funding sources for this income category, potentially having higher income limits

in future General Obligation Bond elections, incorporating land development code changes through the CodeNEXT process, and expanding the City's S.M.A.R.T.™ Housing Program for higher incomes, among others. (Assuming 0% down, an interest rate of 3.62% and an annual effective property tax rate of 2.5% an affordable home purchase price at 80% MFI for a 4 person household would be approximately \$225,000 and at 120% MFI would be \$348,000. These estimates could change based on the underlying assumptions and interest rates).

Coordinate Preservation Strategies with Infrastructure Investments:

Proactive preservation strategies can be particularly helpful if undertaken early and in coordination with infrastructure improvements. These activities can often lead to increases in property values and rents; therefore, working with building owners early in the process to help preserve the affordability of properties will help stabilize the neighborhood and allow existing tenants to remain in their communities.

Use Incentives to Support the Production of Living Wage Jobs:

Incentives should be focused on improving the economic conditions of current lower income unemployed or underemployed residents to spur opportunities that enable them to better afford to live in Austin. Increasing the number of "living wage" jobs (jobs that pay a high enough wage for a person to meet the basic living expenses for an area) would enable residents who currently work in minimum wage jobs to earn enough to meet the cost of living in Austin. The living wage for City of Austin employees was \$13.50 per hour as of October 2016. Greater coordination with relevant city departments, should be pursued to identify potential incentives for the creation of more living wage jobs.

Make Strategic Investment to Minimize Displacement:

Displacement is happening throughout Austin, and low-income communities in particular are at high risk of displacement. Austin will make robust investments to anchor and strengthen these communities, including investments in new development and affordable housing preservation, and coordinate targeted investments in economic development, transit, and education. Additionally, tracking which income-restricted units are set to expire in a given year can help the City identify opportunities to preserve its affordable housing stock. Targeting those affordable units that will be lost through attrition with strategies like the Strike Fund, Community Land Trust (page 21), and others in this plan can help extend the affordability periods of these units.

Allow Homeowners to Rent a Portion of Their House as a Separate Housing Unit:

Pursue code changes to allow homeowners to convert existing interior residential space into accessory dwelling units they could rent out to help them afford to stay in place.

Foster Equitable Communities

Promote strategic investments and create protections for low-income renters.

(indicates a strategy with the highest impact)*

*** Develop a Strike Fund:**

In 2014, as part of Resolution No. 20141016-034, the Austin City Council recommended implementation of a strike fund as a strategy to achieve a goal of preserving 20,000 affordable housing units over 20 years. A collaborative is designing the development of a sustainable economic model for the fund to include: a determination of a fund structure, a framework for the housing portfolio, and options for seeding the fund. The fund would strategically acquire, renovate, and manage existing multi-family buildings to make them affordable for the long term. ***It is estimated that 10,000 affordable housing units could be preserved through the development of a strike fund over the next 10 years.***

***Implement the City of Austin's Fair Housing Action Plan and Bolster Enforcement of Existing Fair Housing Requirements:**

The *City of Austin's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice* includes a *Fair Housing Action Plan* with specific actions to affirmatively further fair housing choice. These actions include several opportunities through the city's zoning code. It is recommended that the City of Austin pursue implementation of the Fair Housing Action Plan in its entirety. All units and projects which use City of Austin funding must comply with Fair Housing, Section 504 and the City's Visitability requirements.

TABLE 2:

TOP FIVE HIGH PRIORITY FAIR HOUSING BARRIERS IN AUSTIN

1	Lack of affordable housing disproportionately impacts protected classes with lower incomes and higher poverty rates.
2	Lack of affordable housing citywide exacerbates segregation created through historical policies and practices.
3	The city is limited in its ability by state law to use inclusionary zoning as a tool to broaden housing choice.
4	Information on housing choice is not widely available in language other than English and/or in accessible formats. Information for people who are members of protected classes about possibilities to live in housing that was created in higher opportunity areas through city incentive and developer agreement programs is limited.
5	Complaint data signals non-compliance of property owners and builders with accessibility requirements.

SOURCE: City of Austin 2015 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing

***Undertake Strategic Land Banking:**

Land banks and other real estate acquisition initiatives help affordable housing developers meet one of their greatest challenges: securing properties and sites on which to build affordable and/or mixed income housing. The City of Austin should strategically acquire and hold land in underdeveloped activity centers and corridors, making it available to private or non-profit developers for the construction of affordable housing as the areas develops.

Implement Tenant Relocation Assistance Program:

Austin City Council approved an ordinance establishing requirements for property owners or developers to provide advance notice to tenants when the apartment buildings or mobile home parks they live in will be demolished or closed. The ordinance also created a *relocation assistance program* for low-income renters and mobile home park tenants who are displaced by new development. The City will need to identify funding for this program to provide education and tenant assistance to vulnerable populations, particularly those with language or other barriers to gaining the assistance they need. The City will also conduct an impact study to determine relocation fees that can be charged to developers in certain cases when redevelopment will displace low-income tenants.

Protect Renters from Discrimination Based on Source of Income:

Renters who receive income from Social Security, veteran's benefits, child support, Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Housing Choice (Section 8) Vouchers should not face barriers to housing based on their income type. Austin City Council unanimously passed an ordinance in 2014 prohibiting landlords from discriminating against renters based on their use of Housing Choice Vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, or other vouchers; however, state law now prohibits this protection, except for veterans. The City will continue to support legislation to expand anti-discrimination

laws that include verifiable sources of income for all people, and modify voluntary developer incentive programs, including the S.M.A.R.T.™ Housing Program and density bonus programs to include that requirement. The City should also explore mechanisms to encourage landlords to accept vouchers or proactively maintain their properties. This could include a risk mitigation fund for landlords who rent to vulnerable or hard-to-house tenants.

Implement Recommendations in the Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable Report: Locked Out

Increased partnerships, education, and accountability are important to address barriers to housing for persons with criminal backgrounds. Review and revise policies for recipients of city funding to ensure they have reasonable look-back periods for both misdemeanors and felonies, and that there is an appeals process built into the admissions policies.

Add Flexibility to Occupancy Limits:

On March 20, 2014, the City of Austin amended its city code regarding dwelling unit occupancy to reduce the maximum occupancy limits for single family homes in certain zoning districts and for duplexes from six unrelated adults to four. The ordinance has a provision excluding rooming or boarding house-type settings from the limit. This occupancy change could raise the cost of housing for unrelated roommates since housing costs will be split among fewer occupants. The limits are most likely to affect the city's student population and co-ops but could also have implications for persons with disabilities who reside together in a group setting that is not a licensed rooming or boarding house. In this case, the city would need to make a reasonable accommodation to the ordinance to avoid fair housing violations.

Pursue Legislation to Allow Inclusionary Zoning:

Inclusionary zoning allows local governments to require developers to dedicate a certain portion of new housing units as affordable to low income residents. Texas state law limits municipalities' abilities to implement mandatory inclusionary zoning policies. However, the law does make exceptions for sales that are part of homestead preservation districts and for a requirement in an optional density bonus program. The City of Austin should implement inclusionary zoning as allowed and seek to expand inclusionary zoning powers as a means to increase the affordable housing supply in Austin.

Pursue Legislation to Allow Rent Control:

The State of Texas has laws limiting municipalities' abilities to enact rent control policies. Rents are determined by property owners and are typically market-driven. By pursuing legislation that allows rent control, rent price ceilings could be established for specific apartments, providing a greater inventory of affordable housing for those in need.

Fully Utilize Homestead Preservation District Tools:

Homestead Preservation Districts (HPDs), in combination with Homestead Preservation Reinvestment Zones, can provide a dedicated funding stream to reinvest in affordability within the most impoverished areas of Austin. Tax Increment Reinvestment Zones or Tax Increment Financing (TIFs) can be set up under the state's Homestead Preservation District law to ensure property tax dollars from economic development are reinvested in affordability for that area. The Homestead Preservation Districts and Reinvestment Zones do not establish new taxes or increase existing taxes on residents.

Develop Programs, Resources, and Guides to Aid with Small Scale Preservation:

Cities like Seattle offer guides, tools, and programs specifically geared toward helping small landlords preserve the affordability and safety of their rental housing, without selling the property to be redeveloped, resulting in a loss of affordability. The City of Austin should identify funding sources and programs to help retain this small scale multifamily rental housing stock. Many of these owners are long term Austinites that care deeply about the housing they own and the opportunity to both preserve the character of the structure and to serve Austinites who help Austin retain its character.

Invest In Housing for Those Most in Need

Adopt a balanced approach to provide affordable housing resources for low-income workers, seniors, people with disabilities and the thousands of people experiencing homelessness.

(indicates a strategy with the highest impact)*

***Pursue Future General Obligation Bond Elections for Affordable Housing:**

Seeking new voter approved General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds in the future will build and preserve thousands of quality, affordable homes for the most vulnerable families and individuals and for low wage workers in our community. G.O. Bonds for affordable housing have been approved twice by Austin voters and have created affordable housing with services to support at-risk families, seniors, and people with disabilities; provided rental assistance to prevent homelessness; and preserved housing to prevent displacement of long-term residents. ***It is estimated that over 1,900 affordable housing units could be created through additional voter approved G.O. Bonds over the course of the next 10 years.***

***Provide Additional Local Fund Appropriations for Affordable Housing:**

As **Figure 8** (Funding Mechanisms and Tools) shows, a variety of funding sources will be needed to reach the goal of creating 60,000 income-restricted housing units in the next 10 years. Funding from the City's General Fund, in addition to funds from General Obligation Bonds, the Housing Trust Fund, or the federal government, would help the City create much-needed income-restricted units for people at deeper levels of affordability. If affordability is to be a priority, the City should consider allocating more of its resources to the creation of long-term and deeply affordable housing units.

***Leverage Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and Seek Legislative Changes for the City of Austin:**

The LIHTC program directs private capital toward the development and preservation of affordable rental housing for low-income households. Tax credits are awarded to eligible participants to offset a portion of their federal tax liability in exchange for the production or preservation of affordable rental housing. Both the 9% and 4% credits can be pursued for affordable housing. The City of Austin should continue to leverage these funds, and also seek legislative changes to have a portion of the state's LIHTC allocation dedicated to the City of Austin to focus the funding to meet local goals. The City should also consider strategically prioritizing support for applications based on community priorities.

Challenge the Private Sector to Participate in a Fund for Affordable Housing and/or Workforce Housing:

It is essential for our regional economy and good for business when workers of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs. Employers can be part of the solution. The City should partner with local employers to contribute to a revolving housing fund to help finance the construction and preservation of rental workforce housing. This model has proven successful in other high cost areas, including in Silicon Valley, where scores of employers, employer foundations, state and federal housing agencies and private citizens have voluntarily donated to a trust fund for over a decade to address the community's full range of affordable housing needs, including but not limited to the needs of their employees. Building on successful models in other cities, the City should also explore partnering with major local employers and institutions to collaborate on innovative co-developments or social investment platforms.



SUCCESS STORY: HOUSING TRUST FUND

The City of Austin Housing Trust Fund was created in 1999 to assist in preserving and creating reasonably priced housing for Austinites, revitalizing neighborhoods, and building the city's tax base. Before the creation of the Housing Trust Fund, affordable housing had been funded through federal grants, the marketplace, occasional tax-free bond sales, or by tax credits and other incentives. The Trust is funded through tax revenues generated by property previously owned by the city. The Trust Fund has received \$16 million in revenues from a variety of sources, including the City's Sustainability Fund, Tax Increment Financing transfers from the Capital Improvement Program, and property sales. This resource has helped to fund the creation or preservation of 1,418 affordable units since inception. The Trust Fund will continue to serve as an integral component of Austin's strategy to meet the needs of low income residents.

Maximize Public Property to Build or Include Affordable Housing:

Intense competition for limited land drives up cost and makes it challenging to build affordable homes for low-income residents. Publicly owned land is a public asset that must be used strategically to achieve multiple public benefits, including the creation of affordable homes in our community. In order to do this, the Austin City Council must decide to make siting affordable housing on public land a priority by setting policy that construction of affordable housing will always be considered when the City makes decisions regarding its publicly owned land. The City should also consider proposals, bids and partnerships with other public entities who have underutilized land, including but not limited to Travis County, AISD, Capital Metro and the State of Texas. Building affordable housing on developable public land in key locations near transit and job centers is invaluable in helping low-income workers and families live close to jobs and schools, while decreasing congestion and pollution. The City should also consider co-locating affordable housing with other public facilities including fire stations, libraries, community centers, offices, etc.

Utilize Tax Increment Financing (TIFs) for Affordable Housing:

Austin is limited in the range of tools it can legally use to achieve affordable housing. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) for affordable housing is allowed by state law, but the law restricts the amount of property that can be included within TIF districts to 10% of a city's assessed value. City policy should strive for a balance approach enabling TIF policy to be an effective tool. Many cities have maintained a high credit rating while using TIF districts to achieve policy objectives, such as affordable housing. The City should consider increasing the self-imposed limit of 5% of assessed value within TIF districts. The potential of a responsibly employed TIF program could outweigh the potential risk to the City's credit rating. This is a critical tool the City of Austin has in its toolbox that it needs to start utilizing effectively to address affordability.

Utilize Social Impact Bonds/Pay for Success Models for Services for People Experiencing Homelessness:

The use of social impact bonds, also known as social impact finance or Pay for Success, is a method of funding the provision of social services in which private investors provide upfront funding to high-performing service providers delivering effective services to targeted populations, with reimbursement by governments when cost reductions are evidenced. A coalition of community partners is implementing a pilot project that will target the highest utilizers of the criminal justice and emergency medical systems who are also experiencing homelessness, providing these individuals with Permanent Supportive Housing and supportive services. The five-year project is anticipated to result in cost reductions of millions of dollars across the health care, criminal justice, and social service systems.

Utilize the National Housing Trust Fund:

The National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) is a dedicated fund intended to provide revenue to build, preserve, and rehabilitate housing for people with the lowest incomes. The NHTF will provide communities with funds to build, preserve, and rehabilitate rental homes that are affordable for very low and extremely low income households. It is recommended that the City of Austin work with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) to ensure that state priority needs and target populations are more narrowly and clearly defined in the Five Year State Consolidated Plan.

Support the Creation of Deeply Affordable Units Serving People at 20% MFI and Below:

The term “deep affordability” refers to the level of affordability needed to serve extremely low income households. Focusing resources and funding on housing that is affordable to this income bracket would ensure that the most vulnerable receive assistance in obtaining housing. However, in order to achieve rents affordable to households in this extremely low income bracket, more funding is required per household than for assistance targeted to higher income households, especially in light of the fact that some of these households may not have rental subsidies to help them pay rent. Resources like the Housing Authority of the City of Austin’s Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) program are in high demand, with the number of applicants far exceeding the number of available vouchers.

Support Efforts to Prevent and End Homelessness:

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is housing for extremely low-income people at or below 30% MFI (\$24,300 or less for a 4-person household in 2016) with voluntary supportive services available, and targets households that are experiencing chronic homelessness and have multiple barriers to housing stability (such as substance abuse issues, no income, medical or mental health issues, etc.). Housing First PSH focuses on quickly housing people who are experiencing homelessness first, and then providing supportive services as needed. Core elements of the model include lower screening criteria regarding sobriety, criminal history, credit history, or other behaviors generally held to indicate a lack of “housing readiness.” All newly created PSH is expected to align with the local Continuum of Care’s Coordinated Assessment system to ensure those households identified as most vulnerable will be prioritized. Working with private landlords to accept chronically homeless residents is one way to increase the supply of PSH. Different funding sources can be layered or leveraged together in order to fund new PSH units as well, including funding from the Housing Trust Fund, Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and Pay for Success models. This type of layering is especially effective for PSH development, due to these units’ deep affordability, which requires a greater subsidy than units focused on residents at higher MFI levels.

Other programs that provide housing and supportive services for residents who may not need PSH but are still experiencing homelessness would also benefit from increased funding, due to high demand that will continue to outstrip the resources available. One example of this type of program is Best Single Source (BSS) Plus, which provides comprehensive case management and basic needs services to individuals and families so they can establish housing and financial stability. Maintaining funding for services foundational to homelessness prevention is a critical continued action in the Plan.



SUCCESS STORY:

MAYOR'S CHALLENGE TO END VETERAN HOMELESSNESS

In August 2016, Austin was certified as one of the few cities in the nation to achieve “functional zero” for veteran homelessness. This means that the community has established a system in which the number of veterans experiencing homelessness is no greater than the current monthly rate for placing veterans into housing. Using the “Housing First” approach, a mitigation fund for landlords spearheaded by the Mayor’s Office, and targeted coordination among multiple local real estate, service, and housing providers and the Veterans Administration, 682 homeless veterans were housed in 18 months. Several valuable lessons were learned from the veteran homelessness initiative that will be used to help the community address homelessness for youth, families, and the chronically homeless in the coming years.

Expand the Supply of Housing for People with Disabilities:

While residents with disabilities can be found in any income category, those who earn at or below 30% MFI face unique challenges to obtaining housing that is affordable and meets their needs. While Permanent Supportive Housing may be the right choice for some individuals (including those that have experienced chronic homelessness and who have multiple barriers to housing), accessible housing units that are not linked to supportive services may be more appropriate for other households. To that end, this Housing Plan includes a goal of creating 20,000 housing units affordable to people making at or below 30% MFI (see page 16). 100% of ground floor units that are funded by the City (through the Neighborhood Housing & Community Development Office or the Austin Housing Finance Corporation) will be adaptable and 25% will be accessible. For units not funded by the City, federal Fair Housing Act requirements apply. For new buildings with four or more housing units, all units must meet Fair Housing Act requirements if the building has an elevator. If the building does not have an elevator, all ground floor units must comply with the Act’s requirements. This means that these “covered units” must be accessible to and usable by people with disabilities. New single family homes and duplexes must also comply with the City’s visitability ordinance, which mandates that at least one building entrance and ground floor bathrooms and light switches/environmental controls must be accessible to people with mobility disabilities.

Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin

Harness new development to create affordable homes and diversify housing choices for current and future residents.

(indicates a strategy with the highest impact)*

***Adopt Affordable Housing Goals to Guide Policy.**


These goals should guide decisions to reach the goal of having each city council district contain at least 10% of **rental housing** units that are affordable to households earning at or below 30% MFI (\$24,300 or less for a 4-person household in 2016) and at least 25% of **ownership housing** units that are affordable to households earning at or below 120% MFI (\$93,360 or less for a 4-person household in 2016).

***Implement Consistent Density Bonus Programs for Centers and Corridors:**

Several of Austin's existing density bonus programs (University Neighborhood Overlay, Vertical Mixed Use, and Downtown Density Bonus Program) have successfully leveraged new development to create units affordable for households earning between 60% and 80% MFI, depending on the program (see **Figure 10**). This is consistent with Imagine Austin Land Use Transportation (LUT) Policy 10 and Housing and Neighborhoods (HN) Policy 1. The revised Land Development Code should implement a consistent density bonus program for Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors where larger buildings are deemed acceptable. These centers and corridors allow people to reside, work, shop, access services, people watch, recreate, and hang out without traveling far distances. Economic modeling is being conducted in conjunction with the CodeNEXT process to determine where such programs would be financially feasible while also producing affordable housing benefits. Any increase in development capacity will be tied to an affordability requirement. The City should incentivize and provide additional opportunities for housing units with two bedrooms or more, particularly in high opportunity areas. The existing density bonus programs have resulted in income-restricted affordable units in high opportunity areas along transit corridors with no subsidy by the City of Austin.

MAP OF EXISTING DENSITY BONUS PROGRAMS WITH IMAGINE AUSTIN ACTIVITY CENTERS AND CORRIDORS

FIGURE 10:





SUCCESS STORY: DENSITY BONUS PROGRAM

The City of Austin has 10 density bonus programs that allow additional “entitlements,” such as taller buildings or more units on a site than is allowed by base zoning, when a developer provides community benefits like affordable housing. State law limits the City of Austin’s ability to require affordable housing as part of new developments; density bonus programs are one of the few tools the City has to create income-restricted affordable units without monetary subsidy. Density bonus programs contribute to the geographic dispersion of affordable housing and foster public-private collaborations that yield affordable housing without the use of public subsidies. As of June 2016, the City’s density bonus programs have created 1,653 units, predominantly for households earning less than 80% of the median family income. For perspective, if the City of Austin had to subsidize these units, the cost would have been approximately \$62.8 million. This assumes a per unit subsidy of \$38,000, which is the average for the 2013 Affordable Housing Bond Program to date. Ninety-six developments have participated in a density bonus program, with the University Neighborhood Overlay program producing the most units. Currently, some programs allow developers to pay a fee in lieu of providing affordable housing on-site. Fees are utilized to help subsidize additional income-restricted units throughout the city and to date, over \$4 million in fees-in-lieu payments have been generated from the density bonus programs.

***Streamline City Codes and Permitting Processes:**

The time and complexity involved in obtaining the necessary City approvals to build new housing can be a significant cost driver for development. To make meaningful progress toward a more efficient system, the City will be proactive and persistent in its efforts to integrate and coordinate permitting processes across all departments. Developments including income-restricted affordable units should have expedited review. This continues to be feedback from the development community as the most effective measure to incentivize participation in the City’s incentive programs

***Provide Additional Funding to Monitor Austin’s Affordable Housing Investments:**

NHCD continues to strengthen its monitoring function and identify opportunities for process improvement. Staff estimate that approximately 3,200 affordable units will require monitoring in FY 2016-17.

¹⁶ Imagine Austin: LUT P10. “Direct Housing and employment growth to activity center and corridors, preserving and integrating existing affordable housing where possible.”

¹⁷ Imagine Austin: HN P1. “Distribute a variety of housing types throughout the City to expand the choices available to meet the financial and lifestyle needs of Austin’s diverse population.”

To augment existing staff capacity, NHCD will look to third-party vendors to assist performing physical inspections for a subset of the portfolio. As part of the FY 2016-17 City of Austin Budget, NHCD also will address its monitoring requirements with appropriate staffing levels and elevate staffing needs as required. As the portfolio of income restricted units grows, there will be a corresponding need to invest in monitoring and compliance. This will ensure adherence to federal and local regulatory requirements including visitability/accessibility.

Better Utilize Land for Affordable Housing:

The City should continue to offer density bonuses as well as reduced parking and lot width and setback requirements for developments that include units that are required to be affordable to very low-, low- or moderate-income households for at minimum 40 years.

Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program:

The City should revise the S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program to both offer greater incentives to developers, and lengthen the affordability period. This program is producing positive results; however, after almost two decades it needs modification in order to help the City of Austin achieve affordability goals.

Implement Density Bonus Program for Missing Middle Housing:

A second type of density bonus program might be more appropriate at the edges of centers and corridors or on collector streets where residents are more sensitive to building height and building size. In this type of bonus program, the “density” could take the form of units (rather than height or bulk), allowing more units within the same size building. This program could effectively provide missing middle affordable units. Relaxation of parking requirements could promote affordability and potentially maintain neighborhood character. Economic modeling has confirmed that such programs would be financially feasible while also producing affordable housing benefits. Any increase in development capacity will be tied to an affordability requirement. Incentivize and provide additional opportunities for housing units with two bedrooms or more, particularly in high opportunity areas.

Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots:

Land values are increasing in Austin, particularly in neighborhoods near Austin’s core. This is due to a number of factors, but most notably to more households valuing reduced distances between their work, home, and other destinations, which minimizes time spent in traffic. With increased demand for housing in central locations, land prices are likely to continue to rise. One potential way to enable more people to be able to afford to live in these location-efficient areas is to make it easier to build smaller houses on smaller lots through land development code changes considered during the CodeNEXT process. This would help produce more housing choices that are more likely to be affordable than houses built on larger lots. Small lot regulations can be revised utilizing a context sensitive approach to require a higher level of design and improved compatibility with neighboring properties.



SMALLER HOUSES ON SMALLER LOTS



To enable more people to be able to afford to live in location-efficient areas is to make it easier to build smaller houses on smaller lots through land development code changes considered during the CodeNEXT process.

This would help produce more housing choices that are more likely to be affordable than houses built on larger lots.

Create Pre-Approved Standard Plans for Infill Development:



Utilize community resources (builders, architects, and neighborhood residents) to develop a comprehensive menu of high quality housing designs that are compatible with a variety of neighborhoods and meet the needs of median-income and entry-level buyers. The catalog of pre-approved plans could include a wide range of options including plans to meet a variety of site conditions, prefabricated or modular homes, or other options. Once pre-approved, homeowners could easily access the pre-approved plans by selecting from a catalogue or online resource, and they could be potentially provided at no cost. Pre-approved plans would allow a homeowner to receive a permit 'over-the-counter' and reduce costs of construction and development often passed on to the resident.

Relax Regulations on both Internal and External Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs):

Accessory dwelling units are a way to increase the supply of smaller housing units while also providing homeowners with a way to increase their income by renting out the unit. Reducing restrictions in more parts of Austin to allow internal and external ADUs to be built may not result in every ADU being rented at an affordable rate, but ADUs do exhibit lower per unit and infrastructure costs and "offer the opportunity to increase the number and variety of housing units throughout the community." 18 HUD notes that ADUs can help increase a community's housing supply, and as they cost less than a new single-family home on its own lot, they can also be a more affordable housing option for some households. Numerous regulations should be relaxed for both internal ADUs, which are created by converting interior residential space into a separate unit, and external ADUs, which are separate structures. Regulations should also ensure accessibility and/or visitability.

FIGURE 12:

ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT: FOR FAMILY & HOUSING NEEDS




Relax Regulations on More Affordable Housing Products:

Smaller homes, micro-units, including tiny houses (including those on wheels), typically less than 700 square feet, offer a more affordable housing product. These homes could be utilized as an infill option or allowed as an ADU to offer homeowners a way to increase income.

FIGURE 13:

EXAMPLES OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUs)



SOURCE: City of Minneapolis

Relax Regulations on Housing Cooperatives (Co-ops):

Zoning barriers, density restrictions and mandatory parking requirements can be a barrier to shared housing communities, and cooperatives. Collaborative living arrangements where residents actively participate in the design and operation of everyday living provide another affordable housing choice in Austin. Relaxing these standards or providing a specific zoning designation for cooperatives will ensure an increase in viable options for those wishing to live together in Austin.

Utilize Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) to Provide a Range of Affordability:

PUDs present a unique opportunity to provide a range of affordability through increased housing diversity and improved transportation choices. Programs and regulations should continue to provide incentives to developments that help address affordability goals in PUDs.

Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions:

New subdivisions (especially those in and around Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors) also present an opportunity to increase housing diversity. Subdivision regulations should incentivize the development of a range of housing types, including missing middle housing and co-housing formats (where smaller housing units are organized around shared common space). The regulations should also incentivize a connected street grid and promote a range of more affordable transportation choices. These centers and corridors allow people to reside, work, shop, access services, and recreate without traveling far distances.

Create a Multifamily Property Tax Exemption Program:

Multifamily Property Tax Exemption Programs are effective incentive programs used in other cities that ensure a percentage of housing in participating new developments is affordable for low-and moderate-income people. In exchange for on-site affordability, the city provides a partial property tax exemption for a number of years. The new program should allow all unit types to participate and should incorporate an incentive for building larger units so that families have more affordable housing choices throughout the city. Multifamily Property Tax Exemption housing can provide housing to retail and service workers, entry level professionals, and retirees on fixed incomes.

Complete an Affordable Housing Nexus Study:

The Austin City Council approved a resolution in 2016 directing the City to conduct a study to determine whether a relationship exists between new development and the city's affordable housing needs. The study would also assess potential market and economic impacts of setting different fees on new types of development. The fees would be used to fund the construction of new affordable housing units generated by the new workers employed by new commercial developments, or the new workers needed to provide services to households at the new residential developments. After assessing the results of the study, City Council can decide to establish these "linkage fees" for types of new residential or non-residential development.

Consider Building and Fire Code Modifications to Allow Six Stories of Wood Frame Construction:

The City should review the possibility of increasing the allowable height for economical wood frame construction. This could take the form of building code changes to increase the height limit or allowed number of wood frame stories. This action needs careful vetting to ensure fire and life safety protection. For example, this could be accomplished by expediting review and approval of emerging building technologies as is being done in other cities around the world.

Develop a Real-Time Database of Housing:

The goal of creating a "real-time" database of available affordable housing units, services, resources, and incentives to better connect buyers and renters with affordable housing was identified in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan. At the department level, additional local funding for staffing and administration will be necessary to create and monitor this database.



SUCCESS STORY: MUELLER

One of the most successful public-private partnerships for the City has been the redevelopment of the former Robert Mueller Municipal Airport into a 700 acre, compact, pedestrian-oriented, master-planned community that contains truly interwoven affordable and market-rate housing. At least 25% of all new housing units built here are affordable (an estimated 1,475 total units at build out). This means that for-sale homes are available for Austinites at or below 80% MFI, with a shared equity approach designed to preserve the units for long-term affordability. Rental units are available at or below 60% MFI, with some units reaching 30% MFI and other opportunities up to 80% MFI, with an affordability period of 50 to 99 years, helping to preserve a wider range of affordable rental housing in the area. With a variety of housing types built and underway and connected to numerous parks, retail, commercial spaces, and civic uses, the build out of Mueller is now approaching 50% completion. An estimated 100 homes for families earning up to 120% MFI will soon be built, which will be in addition to the 25% affordable housing requirement.

Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs

Encourage development in a compact and connected manner so households of all incomes have access to a range of affordable housing choices, transportation choices and can easily access jobs, basic needs, health care, educational opportunities, and public services. Other household expenses such as healthcare costs, utilities, food and telecommunications must also be considered.

(indicates a strategy with the highest impact)*

***Strengthen Scoring Criteria and Develop Policies to Prioritize Affordable Housing Near Current and Future Transit Service:**

The City of Austin Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Office (NHCD) awards Rental Housing Developer Assistance (RHDA) and other programs through a scoring criteria with points awarded according to various community values and objectives. RHDA can be utilized for developments of all sizes, even those that may be too small to participate in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program. These scoring criteria and other policies should be amended to prioritize a greater percentage of assistance in areas currently serviced by public transportation. Changes like this would help NHCD reach its goal of 25% of affordable housing units created or preserved within 1/4 mile of a transit stop. The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Connections 2025 Plan and new Transit Orientated Development (TOD) Tool (an assessment of built form and market readiness for all MetroRapid and MetroRail Stations) present new opportunities to align housing programs with transportation choices, thereby encouraging a mix of housing at all income levels near station areas.

***Minimize the Displacement of Core Transit Riders:**

Redevelopment and major rehabilitation threaten the stock of market rate affordable rental housing (housing built by private developers that is affordable without a subsidy due to size, location, age, quality, maintenance, or other factors), where many residents may depend on transit. When developing in transit corridors and nodes, every attempt should be made to ensure that development does not reduce transit ridership. A common pattern is that as transit is added, housing becomes more expensive. Wealthier residents move into the neighborhood, often pricing out existing core transit riders, while vehicle ownership becomes more common and transit ridership is actually reduced despite increases in density. Policies should encourage the preservation of affordable housing near transit corridors.

***Link Housing Choices with Transportation Choices:**

There are several strategies that can be undertaken to better align regulations/entitlements, infrastructure, and policies.

- Support CodeNEXT in amending regulations and entitlements to ensure density is supported around transit stations.
- Support CodeNEXT in utilizing tools such as density bonuses and parking reductions when income-restricted affordable housing is provided in and around transit stops.
- Strengthen policies to direct public subsidies for the preservation and creation of income-restricted affordable housing within 1/4 mile of a transit stop.
- Prioritize infrastructure investments in activity centers and along activity corridors. Infrastructure is critical to developing a transit supportive environment and thus ridership.

***Comprehensive Parking Reform:**

High parking standards increase impervious cover due to parking lots or parking garages, increasing the area on a site that cannot absorb rainfall. By right-sizing parking requirements based on a project's location, walkability, and transit service, the City of Austin can address several important City goals such as lower construction costs, reduced dependence on automobiles, mitigation of flood and erosion, and water quality protection. Requirements that new development include significant off-street parking add to the cost of constructing a unit and limit the number of units possible on a site - Indirectly limiting the density of housing and precluding opportunities to develop more affordable housing. The City should reform its parking policies to support housing affordability and access by: (1) clarifying the definition of frequent transit service to reduce parking requirements in transit areas; (2) reducing parking requirements for multifamily housing that are within 1/4 mile of frequent transit service; and (3) minimizing parking requirements for accessory dwelling units and other small-scale housing types in single family areas. Parking reductions for multifamily or mixed-use developments could be tied to the creation of income-restricted affordable housing units.

Increase Bikeability and Walkability:

Increasing bicycle infrastructure, bike lanes, and bike share facilities near affordable housing developments and end-of-the-line transit stops can provide critical first-mile and last-mile connections for households dependent on public transit. Funding should also be increased for sidewalks, and/or the Sidewalk Master Plan scoring criteria should be amended to award points for filling in gaps in sidewalks between affordable housing developments and transit.


Align Sidewalk Master Plan with Imagine Austin:

Currently, points are not awarded in the Sidewalk Master Plan for the repair or construction of sidewalks in Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors. The scoring criteria should be amended to ensure points are awarded to direct investment in sidewalks within these centers and corridors where there is (or is likely to be) higher frequency transit service. This will help ensure riders who depend on transit can get safely to their destinations anywhere along a route. Highest frequency routes should be prioritized to increase potential ridership.

FIGURE 14:

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARKING REQUIREMENTS & AFFORDABILITY


No On-Site Parking



Income Required to Afford Rent

\$36,000


0.5 Spaces/Unit



Income Required to Afford Rent

\$39,000


1 Spaces/Unit



Income Required to Afford Rent

\$43,000


1.5 Spaces/Unit



Income Required to Afford Rent

\$47,000

2.5 Spaces/Unit



Income Required to Afford Rent

\$51,000

SOURCE: Fregones and Associates

NOTE: Analysis based on a fixed profit margin of 8%

Ensure Access to Affordable Care and a Healthful Environment:

Strengthen and expand accessible preventative care for all residents, locate affordable housing development in areas with access to affordable healthcare, and utilize CodeNEXT to ensure a healthy built environment for Austin residents to reduce pollution and encourage regular exercise.

Increase Opportunities for Households to Reduce Utility Costs:

The City should review existing programs which encourage weatherization as well as efficient household appliances, fixtures and mechanical systems. Programs should be explored that reduce initial costs for sustainable features such as solar energy. Incentives should be provided to actively seek participation from both renters and landlords.

Increase Access to Healthy, Affordable Food for All Residents:

Work with efforts to decrease areas experiencing food insecurity due to lack of grocery stores or markets and work with grocery chains, farmers' markets and local lenders to fill gaps. Ensure affordable housing is developed in locations that have access to healthy, affordable food choices.

Improve Access to Affordable Quality Communications and Digital Services:

Continue to expand support for the City's Digital Inclusion Plan and Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan and ensure access to such services in the development of all affordable housing, new and rehabilitated.

APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY FOR AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN 10-YEAR ESTIMATE*

TOOL	HOUSING PLAN STARTS 10-YEAR ESTIMATE - AFFORDABLE UNITS	METHODOLOGY
Federal Funds (Affordability Period: 10-20 Years)	272	1) Includes Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME). Program Income, CHDO, and Revolving Loan excluded. 2) Assumes NHCD will dedicate \$1,032,812 per year to Housing Developer Assistance over the next ten years. This value was calculated from the previous 5-Year Average (FY 2011-12 to FY 2015-16). 3) Assumes a per unit subsidy of \$38,000 based on 2013 Affordable Housing Bond Program data from September 2016. 4) 10 Year affordability period is the minimum per federal regulations.
Remaining Funding from 2013 Affordable Housing Bond Program (Affordability Period: 40-99 Years)	450	1) \$14 million from this fund source is projected for FY 2016-17 and \$6 million in FY 2017-18. 2) 85% is dedicated to Housing Developer Assistance (RHDA or AD) or \$12 million in FY 2016-17 and \$5.1 million in FY 2017-18. 3) Assumes a per unit subsidy of \$38,000 based on 2013 Affordable Housing Bond Program data from September 2016. 4) 40 Year affordability period is the minimum.
Density Bonus Programs (Affordability Period: 15-60 Years)	1,450	1) Includes the following density bonus programs: University Neighborhood Overlay, Transit Oriented Development, Vertical Mixed Use. Rainey excluded because it has no minimum affordability period requirement. 2) Assumes average annual production of 145 units per year based on program production between 2005 and 2015. Breakdown: 1,165 (program production) / 8 Years (time period from sample) = 145 units per year. 3) Affordability Periods vary, e.g. TOD = 40, UNO = 15-40, VMU = 40-60.
Strike Fund (Affordability Period: 40 Years)	5,000	Estimate provided by stakeholder. The Strike Fund is expected to produce 5,000 units for households earning up to 80% of the Median Family Income (MFI). Estimated production above 80% MFI is not included.
Austin Housing Trust Fund (Affordability Period: 20-99 Years)	1,795	On December 17, 2015, the Austin City Council passed Resolution No. 20151217-074 increasing the percentage of tax revenue dedicated to the Housing Trust Fund derived from developments built on formerly-owned City property from 40% to 100%. 1) Estimate assumes \$68.2 million in funding from the Housing Trust fund will be available between 2017 and 2026 as outlined in the Fiscal Note appended to City Council backup on December 17, 2015. 2) Assumes a per unit subsidy of \$38,000 based on 2013 Affordable Housing Bond Program data from September 2016. 3) No minimum requirement for affordability period. 4) Funding is contingent on annual budget deliberations.
HACA / AAHC (Affordability Period: 20 Years)	1,384	Estimate provided by the Housing Authority of the City of Austin (HACA) through its non-profit subsidiary, the Austin Affordable Housing Corporation (AAHC). The estimate reflects the 2017-18 production pipeline. Data for future years is not yet available. Properties included will serve tenants earning 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI), and have a 20-year affordability period.
NEW Affordable Housing Bond Program (Affordability Period: 40-99 Years)	1,932	1) Assumes voter approval of GO Bond funding equal to \$10.8 million annually through FY 2025-26. Breakdown: \$65 million / 6 years = \$10.8 million per year. 2) 85% is dedicated to Housing Developer Assistance. 3) Assumes a per unit subsidy of \$38,000 based on 2013 Affordable Housing Bond Program data from September 2016. 4) 40 Year affordability period is the minimum.
Other Tools (Affordability Period: 10-40 Years)	47,716	Reflects 60,000 (affordable unit goal) - 21,027 (sum of all other estimates featured). Other Tools may include, but are not limited to: Tax Increment Financing, Homestead Preservation Districts, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), Expanded Density Bonus Programs, and a restructured S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program with extended affordability periods maintaining use of impact fees in accordance with state statutes The existing S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program was established in 2007, and calls for a 1-5 year affordability period.

APPENDIX B: IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX FOR PROPOSED STRATEGIES

NOTE: These strategies and activities are in addition to the existing efforts already underway by the City and its partners.
 * Indicates a strategy with highest impact.

PROPOSED AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX					
Community Value	Action <i>*Denotes Highest Impact</i>	Policymaking Required	Supports Renters, Owners, or Both	Lead Partners	Timeframe
PREVENT HOUSEHOLDS FROM BEING PRICED OUT OF AUSTIN	*Support Legislation to Allow a Flat Dollar-Amount Homestead Exemption for all Local Taxing Entities	State - Legislation	Homeowners	Intergovernmental Relations (IGR)	5 years - plus
	*Target Preservation Property Tax Exemption to Communities at Risk of Displacement	Local - City Council Action	Homeowners	Neighborhood Housing and Community Development (NHCD), Finance Department (FD)	3-5 years
	*Expand the Use of Community Land Trusts (CLT) and other forms of Shared Equity Ownership	Local - City Council Action	Homeowners	NHCD, Austin Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC)	Ongoing
	Prevent Displacement of Low- and Moderate-Income Homeowners	Local - City Council Action State - Legislation	Homeowners	NHCD	3-5 years
	Preserve and Create Ownership Options for Households at 80% to 120% MFI	Local - City Council Action	Homeowners	NHCD, Planning and Zoning (PAZ)	3-5 years
	Coordinate Preservation Strategies with Infrastructure Investments	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, CPO, Austin Transportation Department (ATD)	3-5 years
	Use Incentives to Support the Production of Living Wage Jobs	Local - City Council Action State - Legislation	Both	Economic Development Department (EDD), Equal Employment and Fair Housing Office (EE/FHO)	3-5 years
	Make Strategic Investments to Minimize Displacement	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD	3-5 years
	Allow Homeowners to Rent a Portion of their Houses	Local - City Council Action	Homeowners	PAZ	3-5 years

PROPOSED AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX					
Community Value	Action <i>*Denotes Highest Impact</i>	Policymaking Required	Supports Renters, Owners, or Both	Lead Partners	Timeframe
FOSTER EQUITABLE COMMUNITIES	*Develop a Strike Fund	Local - Community Action	Both	Affordable Central Texas	3-5 years
	*Implement the City of Austin's Fair Housing Action Plan and Bolster Enforcement of Existing Fair Housing Requirements	Local - Department Action	Both	NHCD, EE/FHO	3-5 years
	*Undertake Strategic Land Banking	Local - City Council Action	Both	Office of Real Estate Services (ORES)	3-5 years
	Implement Tenant Relocation Assistance Program	Local - Department Action	Renters	NHCD, Development Services Department (DSD), PAZ	1-2 years
	Protect Renters from Discrimination Based on Source of Income	State - Legislation	Renters	NHCD, EE/FHO	5 years - Ongoing
	Implement Recommendations in the Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable Report: Locked Out	Local - City Council Action State - Legislation	Renters	NHCD	5 years - Ongoing
	Add Flexibility to Occupancy Limits	Local - City Council Action	Renters	DSD, PAZ	5 years - Ongoing
	Pursue Legislation to Allow Inclusionary Zoning	State - Legislation	Both	IRG	5 years - Ongoing
	Pursue Legislation to Allow Rent Control	State - Legislation	Renters	IGR	5 years - Ongoing
	Fully Utilize Homestead Preservation District Tools	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, FD	1-2 years
	Develop Programs, Resources, and Guides to Aid with Small Scale Preservation	Local - Department Action	Renters	NHCD, EDD	3-5 years

PROPOSED AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX					
Community Value	Action <i>*Denotes Highest Impact</i>	Policymaking Required	Supports Renters, Owners, or Both	Lead Partners	Timeframe
INVEST IN HOUSING FOR THOSE MOST IN NEED	*Pursue Future General Obligation Bond Elections for Affordable Housing	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD	3-5 years
	*Provide Additional General Fund Appropriations for Affordable Housing	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, FD	3-5 years
	*Leverage Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and Seek Legislative Changes for the City of Austin	Local - City Council Action State - Legislation	Both	NHCD, IGR	5 years - Ongoing
	Challenge the Private Sector to Participate in a Fund for Affordable Housing and/or Workforce Housing	Local - Community Action	Both	NHCD, EDD	5 years - Ongoing
	Maximize Public Property to Build or Include Affordable Housing	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, ORES	5 years - Ongoing
	Utilize Tax Increment Financing (TIFs) for Affordable Housing	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, FD	3-5 years
	Utilize Social Impact Bonds/ Pay for Success Models for Services for People Experiencing Homelessness	Local - Community Action	Renters	Travis County	1-2 years
	Utilize the National Housing Trust Fund	Local - Department Action	Both	NHCD	3-5 years
	Support the Creation of Deeply Affordable Units Serving People at 20% MFI and Below	Local - City Council Action	Renters	NHCD	3-5 years
	Support Efforts to Prevent and End Homelessness	Local - Department Action	Renters	ECHO, Austin Public Health (APH)	3-5 years
	Expand the Supply of Housing for People with Disabilities	Local - Department Action	Both	NHCD	3-5 years

PROPOSED AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX					
Community Value	Action <i>*Denotes Highest Impact</i>	Policymaking Required	Supports Renters, Owners, or Both	Lead Partners	Timeframe
CREATE NEW AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING CHOICES FOR ALL AUSTINITES IN ALL PARTS OF AUSTIN	*Adopt Affordable Housing Goals to Guide Policy	Local - City Council Action	Both	Austin City Council	1-2 years
	*Implement Consistent Density Bonus Programs for Centers and Corridors	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, PAZ	3-5 years
	*Streamline City Codes and Permitting Processes	Local - City Council Action	Both	DSD, PAZ	3-5 years
	*Provide Additional Funding to Monitor Austin's Affordable Housing Investments	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, FD	3-5 years
	Better Utilize Land for Affordable Housing	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, ORES, AISD	3-5 years
	Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD	1-2 years
	Implement Density Bonus Program for Missing Middle Housing	Local - City Council Action	Both	NHCD, PAZ	3-5 years
	Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots	Local - City Council Action	Both	DSD	3-5 years
	Create Pre-Approved Standard Plans for Infill Development	Local - Department Action	Both	PAZ	3-5 years
	Relax Regulations on Both Internal and External Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	Local - City Council Action	Both	DSD	3-5 years
	Relax Regulations on More Affordable Housing Products	Local - City Council Action	Both	PAZ	3-5 years
	Relax Regulations on Housing Cooperatives (Co-ops)	Local - City Council Action	Both	DSD	3-5 years
	Utilize Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) to Provide a Range of Affordability	Local - City Council Action	Both	PAZ	3-5 years
	Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions	Local - City Council Action	Both	DSD	3-5 years
	Create a Multifamily Property Tax Exemption Program	Local - City Council Action	Both	FD	3-5 years

PROPOSED AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX

Community Value	Action <i>*Denotes Highest Impact</i>	Policymaking Required	Supports Renters, Owners, or Both	Lead Partners	Timeframe
CREATE NEW AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING CHOICES FOR ALL AUSTINITES IN ALL PARTS OF AUSTIN	Complete an Affordable Housing Nexus Study	Local - Department Action	Both	NHCD	1-2 years
	Consider Building and Fire Code Modifications to Allow Six Stories of Wood Frame Construction	Local - City Council Action	Both	DSD	3-5 years
	Develop Real-Time Database of Housing	Local - Department Action	Both	NHCD	1-2 years

Community Value	Action <i>*Denotes Highest Impact</i>	Policymaking Required	Supports Renters, Owners, or Both	Lead Partners	Timeframe
HELP AUSTINITES REDUCE THEIR HOUSEHOLD COSTS	*Strengthen Scoring Criteria and Develop Policies to Prioritize Affordable Housing Near Current and Future Transit Service	Local - Department Action	Both	NHCD	1-2 years
	*Minimize the Displacement of Core Transit Riders	Local - Department & City Council Action	Both	CapMetro, NHCD	Ongoing
	*Link Housing Choices with Transportation Choices	Local - Department & City Council Action	Both	CapMetro, NHCD, ATD	5 years - Ongoing
	*Comprehensive Parking Reform	Local - City Council Action	Both	DSD, PAZ	5 years - Ongoing
	Increase Bikeability and Walkability	Local - Department Action	Both	ATD	5 years - Ongoing
	Align Sidewalk Master Plan with Imagine Austin	Local - City Council Action	Both	Public Works, ATD	1-2 years
	Ensure Access to Affordable Care and a Healthful Environment	Local & State Action	Both	APH	5 years - Ongoing
	Increase Opportunities for Households to Reduce Utility Costs	Local - City Council Action	Both	Austin Energy (AE), Austin Water Utility (AWU)	5 years - Ongoing
	Increase Access to Health, Affordable Food for All Residents	Local & State Action	Both	Sustainability	5 years - Ongoing
	Improve Access to Affordable Quality Communications and Digital Services	Local & State Action	Both	Telecommunications and Regulatory Affairs (TRA)	5 years - Ongoing

**APPENDIX C: NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 2016-2017
DEPARTMENT GOALS**

	GOAL FY 2016-17 Households Served
HOMELESS/SPECIAL NEEDS ASSISTANCE	
Child Care Services	241
Senior Services	275
Youth Support	159
SUBTOTAL, Homeless/Special Needs Assistance	675
RENTER ASSISTANCE	
Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	75
Architectural Barrier Rental	15
Fair Housing and Tenant Counseling	586
SUBTOTAL, Renters Assistance	676
HOMEBUYER ASSISTANCE	
Down Payment Assistance	15
SUBTOTAL, Homebuyer Assistance	15
HOMEOWNER ASSISTANCE	
Architectural Barrier Removal - Owner	76
Emergency Home Repair Program	320
Homeowner Rehabilitation Loan Program	15
GO Repair! Program	139
Lead Hazard Reduction	91
SUBTOTAL, Homeowner Assistance	641
HOUSING DEVELOPER ASSISTANCE	
Rental Housing Development Assistance	220
Acquisition and Development	15
CHDO Operations	3
SUBTOTAL, Housing Developer Assistance	238
SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE	
Community Development Bank	6
Microenterprise Technical Assistance	31
SUBTOTAL, Small Business Assistance	37
TOTAL PROGRAMS	2282

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY OF COMMONLY USED TERMS

Accessory Dwelling Unit is a small dwelling on the same grounds as and ancillary to a single-family home.

Affordable Housing is housing in which the household pays no more than 30% of its income for gross housing costs, including utilities.

Affordability Period is the length of time that a housing unit is required to maintain its below-market rent or sales price.

Austin Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) is a public, non-profit corporation and instrumentality of the City of Austin under the provisions of the Texas Housing Finance Corporation Act, Chapter 394, and Local Government Code. The Austin City Council serves as the AHFC's Board of Directors. AHFC's primary functions are to issue single-family and multi-family bonds for the financing of reasonably priced housing and assist the City in the delivery of reasonably priced housing programs using federal funds.

CodeNEXT is the City's first comprehensive rewrite of its Land Development Code in over 20 years. The new code will determine how land can be developed or zoned throughout the city.

Cooperative (co-op) Housing is housing where residents own shares and occupy a specific unit.

Deep Affordability is the level of affordability needed to serve extremely low income households.

Density Bonus is a regulation that allows more (height, density, etc.) than is permitted by base zoning in exchange for certain public benefits.

Extremely Low Income describes households whose income is at or below 30% of the area median family income.

Fair Housing Act is a 1968 federal act intended to protect the buyer or renter of a dwelling from seller or landlord discrimination. Its primary prohibition makes it unlawful to refuse to sell, rent to, or negotiate with any person because of that person's Inclusion in a protected class (such as race, color, religion, etc.).

High Frequency Transit are routes providing service every 15 minutes (or better) throughout most of the day on weekdays and Saturdays.

High Opportunity Areas typically include access to jobs, transportation, education, and a healthy environment. These factors can affect a person's social mobility, health, and access to employment.

Homestead Preservation Districts (HPDs) are areas in which taxes are reinvested to create or preserve affordable housing.

Homestead Preservation District Tax Reinvestment Zones are financing tools that can be used in HPDs to fund the creation or preservation of affordable housing by setting aside a portion of the HPD's increased assessed tax value over a certain baseline.

Housing First is an approach to housing that focuses on quickly housing people who are experiencing homelessness first, and then providing support services as needed. A core element is lower tenant

Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan is the city's 30-year plan for growth and development. The plan was developed based on extensive community input and includes goals for issues beyond land use, including the economy, health, affordability, transportation, and the environment.

Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors are areas identified in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan as appropriate for increased concentrations of jobs, residents, and services.

Inclusionary Zoning is a regulation that mandates the provision of housing units at below-market prices.

Income-Restricted Affordable Housing refers to housing for which renters or buyers must meet specific income guidelines to be able to live in the unit. This guideline is generally defined in terms of a percent of median family income (MFI).

Low Income describes households whose income is at or below 80% of the area median family income.

Market-rate is the price one must pay to purchase or rent a home on the open real estate market.

Median Family Income (MFI) is the amount of money earned by a family in a metropolitan statistical area that divides the income distribution of all families in that area into two equal parts - half having incomes above that amount and half below.

Micro-Unit is a small, self-contained living space designed to accommodate basic human needs.

Missing Middle is the range of dwelling types between detached homes and mid-rise apartments.

Moderate Income describes households whose income is between 81% and 120% of the area median family income.

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development (NHCD) is a City of Austin department focusing on the production of affordable housing and community development.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is housing that pairs supportive services with a housing unit and is especially effective for people who have been experiencing chronic homelessness and have multiple barriers to housing (like mental illness, addiction, disabilities, etc).

Planned Unit Development (PUD) is a zoning district that describes large or complex developments being planned as a single continuous project, or projects that require greater design flexibility than typical zoning allows.

S.M.A.R.T. Housing stands for safe, Mixed Income, Accessible, Reasonably Priced, Transit-Oriented housing. This City of Austin policy is designed to stimulate the production of housing for low- and moderate-income residents by providing fee waivers and expedited permit review to developers in exchange for building housing that meets the program criteria.

Subsidized Housing is housing assisted with public funding for low-to moderate-income persons and families.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a financing tool that can be used to encourage development within a certain area. A property tax baseline is set for the area and the increment of taxes that are collected each year above that baseline is used to fund development in the area.

Workforce Housing is housing affordable to households earning 60% to 100% of the area median family income.



AUSTIN STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN
www.austintexas.gov/housingplan

City of Austin
Neighborhood Housing and Community Development
P. O. Box 1088 | Austin, Texas 78767



APPENDIX E

Community and Stakeholder Survey Results, Outreach Materials, and Comments

Table of Contents

I.	Affordable Housing Online Survey Results	E-1
	Executive Summary.....	E-2
	Email English Version.....	E-10
	Email Spanish Version.....	E-60
	Online English Version.....	E-89
	Online Spanish Version.....	E-173
II.	Paper Survey Responses	E-204
III.	Community and Stakeholder Meeting Comments	E-221
IV.	Comparison of Responses from Statistically Valid Email Survey and Community/Stakeholder Meetings	E-238
V.	Other Input Received	E-241
VI.	Feedback on June 6, 2016 Draft.....	E-274
	Feedback Log from Received Comments.....	E-275
	Other Received Comments.....	E-380
VII.	Conversation Kit.....	E-457
VIII.	Outreach Flyer	E-471

I. Affordable Housing Online Survey Results

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

Affordable Housing Survey Research

Executive Summary

April 2016

Executive Summary

The surveys were released in four separate methods: email in English, email in Spanish, online in English and online in Spanish. Both Spanish version surveys had only 13 responses each so cannot be used for statistical or decision-making purposes. The two English version surveys are similar across most responses with a few exceptions that will be noted below. It is important to note that the online surveys cannot be validated in terms of respondent. In other words, because the survey was open to the public and not sent to a specific recipient, the validity of the responses are not the same as those tracked to a specific IP address. While the data is valuable, it should be used in conjunction with or as a companion to the email-based survey. The email-based survey can be traced back to individual respondents within the Austin area. Each survey is provided in a separate report.

The demographics of the surveys were fairly reflective of the demographics of Austin (with the exception of a slightly higher response rate of Caucasians). The email responses are proportional to the emails available, thus the survey results can be generalizable to Austin as a whole. The online survey had slightly more females, more homeowners, and more persons in single family homes responding. These data points could impact the results of the online surveys.

The data indicates that a majority of the respondents are in agreement that people who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin and that it is important that there is affordable housing in Austin. However, they are not all in agreement on the specifics of affordable housing, including how to pay for it and where it should be located. This is not an uncommon finding. We often see in the research that citizens are in support of socially-responsible and socially-minded issues but are not as willing to be financially supportive.

Differences between the email survey and the online survey can be seen in some of the specific questions in terms of where to build affordable housing and how to fund affordable housing. Again, the reader should be cautioned to use the online survey results as a companion piece to the email survey data. Because the online surveys could not be controlled, in that respondents could reply more than once or may not be from the Austin area, the data should be used as informational rather than as a decision-making tool. The data in the email surveys is based on a controlled protocol to ensure data security and validity to provide statistically valid results.

In terms of council district differences, it appears that District 4 is statistically more in favor of funding and legislation to support affordability in Austin. Districts 1 and 10 often showed less support for the need of funding and legislation to build affordable housing in Austin. Following the Survey Methodology section are the cross tabulations for questions where this type of analysis was found to be meaningful.

It is important to read the comments for the open ended responses of Questions 19 and 22. These responses can give deeper insight to the issues. However, the reader should be cautioned. The responses have been uncensored and unedited to maintain the integrity and impartiality of the data. Some readers may find the responses offensive but they are as written by the survey respondents.

Overall, citizens appear to understand the need for affordable housing in Austin. The challenge remains how to fund and where to locate.

Survey Methodology

Austin Energy's Data Analytics and Business Intelligence group worked with the City of Austin's Neighborhood Housing and Community Development (NHCD) group to design and distribute a survey soliciting citizen input on affordable housing in Austin. The surveys were released in four separate methods: email in English, email in Spanish, online in English and online in Spanish.

The email campaign was sent to approximately 4,000 citizens on April 5th with the email containing an invitation to take the survey and a hyperlink unique to each email to ensure that each invitee could take the survey only one time. Staff sent 400 emails to citizens living in each of the 10 City Council districts in an effort to receive input from each district.

Considering a population of roughly 800,000 residents, and to achieve a 95% confidence level, the sample size necessary to achieve statistical significance is 384. For this survey, over 400 completed survey responses were received, exceeding the target for satisfying the statistically valid sample size. Although 400 email invitations were sent to each Council district, return rates varied by district. However, return rates were very closely proportional to the number of email addresses staff has for each district. So the districts for which staff has a larger number of email addresses saw higher rates of return which was a measured correlation.

Additionally, the data demonstrates a representation of Austin by demographics. This would indicate that the data is both statistically and representationally generalizable, meaning that the findings from the survey samples can be inferred to the population.

The cross-tabular analysis in the report breaks out responses to the housing questions in the emailed survey by individual Council district. No cross-tabular analysis was conducted on the demographic questions in the survey.

NHCD staff also posted an open link on their website open to anyone to take the survey in an effort to solicit additional input. Responses collected from those that took the survey by clicking on the link on the NHCD website cannot be tracked by Council district and also may contain more than 1 response from a single citizen. Without knowing in which Council district respondents reside, no cross-tabular analysis of responses by district was conducted on these responses.

The response rate for each of the surveys is found in Table 1 below. Reports and analysis consider responses from both completed and partially completed surveys, so the total number of responses to each question will vary. Completed answers in an incomplete survey are included to gather as much input as is possible and because the answers themselves are valid. Respondents also may have simply skipped a question which also leads to different response rates for individual questions.

Table 1. Response Rates

Survey Version	Total Completed	Partially Completed	Total
Email invite-English	421	77	498
Email invite-Spanish	10	4	14
Online open link-English	905	131	1,036
Online open link-Spanish	13	11	24

Cross Tabulations By District

Below are the cross tabulations by district for questions that were most appropriate for this type of analysis. The mean score at the bottom of each table is the mean for the rating of 8-10 by district. The color coding indicates the Council Districts that were one standard deviation above or below the mean, indicating a statistically significant difference. Districts noted in orange are significantly lower. Districts highlighted in blue are significantly higher.

6. People who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin.											
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	District 8	District 9	District 10	Total
Total disagreement 1	2.20%	0.00%	6.30%	4.30%	2.60%	4.30%	5.10%	0.00%	7.70%	3.30%	3.90%
2	0.00%	3.10%	0.00%	2.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%
3	0.00%	3.10%	4.20%	0.00%	2.60%	0.00%	5.10%	0.00%	1.50%	3.30%	2.00%
4	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.90%	0.60%
5	6.70%	3.10%	2.10%	2.10%	7.70%	6.40%	1.70%	6.70%	0.00%	8.20%	4.30%
6	0.00%	0.00%	2.10%	0.00%	2.60%	2.10%	3.40%	4.40%	1.50%	3.30%	2.00%
7	2.20%	0.00%	2.10%	0.00%	5.10%	2.10%	5.10%	2.20%	6.20%	14.80%	4.50%
8	8.90%	0.00%	2.10%	8.50%	17.90%	4.30%	6.80%	11.10%	9.20%	6.60%	7.60%
9	6.70%	3.10%	6.30%	6.40%	5.10%	2.10%	6.80%	6.70%	3.10%	6.60%	5.30%
Total agreement 10	73.30%	87.50%	75.00%	76.60%	56.40%	78.70%	66.10%	68.90%	70.80%	49.20%	69.30%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mean	88.90%	90.60%	83.40%	91.50%	79.40%	85.10%	79.70%	86.70%	83.10%	62.40%	

7. It is important that there are affordable housing options in all parts of Austin.											
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	District 8	District 9	District 10	Total
Total disagreement 1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.10%	4.30%	11.10%	0.00%	6.90%	13.80%	6.10%
2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	3.40%	0.00%	0.90%
3	0.00%	16.70%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	13.80%	3.70%
4	0.00%	8.30%	10.00%	0.00%	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.30%	3.30%
5	20.00%	0.00%	5.00%	25.00%	11.10%	0.00%	3.70%	16.70%	6.90%	3.40%	5.60%
6	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%	4.30%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	10.30%	2.80%
7	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.10%	8.70%	0.00%	33.30%	13.80%	3.40%	5.60%
8	20.00%	0.00%	15.00%	25.00%	11.10%	4.30%	11.10%	50.00%	10.30%	10.30%	10.30%
9	0.00%	8.30%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%	4.30%	7.40%	0.00%	10.30%	0.00%	3.70%
Total agreement 10	60.00%	66.70%	70.00%	0.00%	33.30%	73.90%	55.60%	0.00%	48.30%	34.50%	57.90%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mean	80.00%	75.00%	85.00%	25.00%	50.00%	82.50%	74.10%	50.00%	68.90%	44.80%	

11. I am willing to pay higher taxes or higher fees if those funds were used to preserve or build affordable housing.											
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	District 8	District 9	District 10	Total
Not at all likely 1	46.70%	40.00%	23.50%	21.10%	44.40%	30.00%	23.10%	35.00%	19.20%	51.90%	32.80%
2	6.70%	10.00%	5.90%	0.00%	5.60%	0.00%	11.50%	20.00%	3.80%	0.00%	6.10%
3	0.00%	20.00%	11.80%	15.80%	0.00%	0.00%	7.70%	5.00%	3.80%	0.00%	5.60%
4	0.00%	0.00%	17.60%	10.50%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	5.00%	7.70%	0.00%	6.10%
5	6.70%	0.00%	5.90%	5.30%	5.60%	15.00%	15.40%	10.00%	11.50%	3.70%	8.60%
6	13.30%	10.00%	11.80%	5.30%	11.10%	0.00%	15.40%	10.00%	11.50%	11.10%	10.10%
7	6.70%	0.00%	0.00%	5.30%	16.70%	20.00%	7.70%	10.00%	19.20%	14.80%	11.10%
8	20.00%	0.00%	5.90%	15.80%	0.00%	10.00%	3.80%	0.00%	3.80%	11.10%	7.10%
9	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%	0.00%	7.70%	0.00%	3.80%	0.00%	2.50%
Very likely 10	0.00%	10.00%	17.60%	21.10%	11.10%	5.00%	7.70%	5.00%	15.40%	7.40%	10.10%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mean	20.00%	20.00%	23.50%	36.90%	16.70%	15.00%	19.20%	5.00%	23.00%	18.50%	

12. I support the City of Austin using additional tax revenue generated by new developments to preserve or build affordable housing.											
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	District 8	District 9	District 10	Total
Not at all likely 1	26.70%	10.00%	5.90%	10.50%	27.80%	20.00%	11.50%	15.00%	12.00%	34.60%	17.90%
2	13.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%	0.00%	3.80%	10.00%	4.00%	3.80%	4.10%
3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.30%	5.60%	0.00%	3.80%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.00%
4	0.00%	0.00%	23.50%	5.30%	0.00%	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00%	7.70%	5.60%
5	6.70%	10.00%	11.80%	5.30%	5.60%	5.00%	7.70%	5.00%	8.00%	7.70%	7.10%
6	6.70%	10.00%	11.80%	0.00%	5.60%	5.00%	15.40%	10.00%	4.00%	3.80%	7.10%
7	13.30%	10.00%	0.00%	21.10%	11.10%	10.00%	3.80%	15.00%	0.00%	15.40%	9.70%
8	13.30%	20.00%	5.90%	21.10%	5.60%	20.00%	15.40%	10.00%	8.00%	15.40%	13.30%
9	13.30%	20.00%	11.80%	0.00%	16.70%	5.00%	11.50%	5.00%	28.00%	0.00%	10.70%
Very likely 10	6.70%	20.00%	29.40%	31.60%	16.70%	20.00%	26.90%	25.00%	32.00%	11.50%	22.40%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mean	33.30%	60.00%	47.10%	52.70%	39.00%	45.00%	53.80%	40.00%	68.00%	26.90%	

13. The City of Austin should increase the amount of affordable housing along major roadway corridors and in major job centers.											
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	District 8	District 9	District 10	Total
Do not agree 1	7.10%	10.00%	6.30%	5.30%	17.60%	10.00%	8.00%	10.00%	8.00%	11.10%	9.30%
2	7.10%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	5.90%	0.00%	4.00%	5.00%	4.00%	3.70%	4.10%
3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00%	7.40%	2.10%
4	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
5	7.10%	10.00%	6.30%	0.00%	17.60%	5.00%	4.00%	5.00%	0.00%	7.40%	5.70%
6	7.10%	0.00%	6.30%	5.30%	17.60%	10.00%	16.00%	15.00%	16.00%	11.10%	11.40%
7	35.70%	20.00%	12.50%	10.50%	5.90%	15.00%	4.00%	25.00%	20.00%	14.80%	15.50%
8	7.10%	10.00%	6.30%	31.60%	5.90%	20.00%	20.00%	10.00%	16.00%	29.60%	17.10%
9	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.60%
Strongly agree 10	28.60%	50.00%	50.00%	42.10%	29.40%	40.00%	24.00%	30.00%	32.00%	14.80%	32.10%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mean	35.70%	60.00%	56.30%	73.70%	35.30%	60.00%	64.00%	40.00%	48.00%	44.40%	

14. The City of Austin should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed, in order to provide more affordable options.											
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	District 8	District 9	District 10	Total
Do not agree 1	7.10%	0.00%	6.30%	5.30%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	15.00%	0.00%	7.40%	5.20%
2	0.00%	0.00%	6.30%	0.00%	17.60%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	4.00%	7.40%	4.10%
3	7.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.90%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	8.00%	3.70%	3.60%
4	7.10%	0.00%	6.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	4.00%	0.00%	2.10%
5	28.60%	10.00%	12.50%	5.30%	5.90%	10.00%	12.00%	10.00%	8.00%	3.70%	9.80%
6	7.10%	20.00%	6.30%	5.30%	11.80%	15.00%	8.00%	10.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.30%
7	7.10%	10.00%	6.30%	15.80%	11.80%	20.00%	16.00%	10.00%	8.00%	22.20%	13.50%
8	14.30%	20.00%	12.50%	15.80%	0.00%	5.00%	24.00%	10.00%	16.00%	29.60%	15.50%
9	7.10%	0.00%	6.30%	10.50%	5.90%	0.00%	8.00%	5.00%	8.00%	7.40%	6.20%
Strongly agree 10	14.30%	40.00%	37.50%	42.10%	41.20%	40.00%	28.00%	25.00%	36.00%	18.50%	31.60%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mean	35.70%	60.00%	56.30%	68.40%	47.10%	45.00%	60.00%	40.00%	60.00%	55.50%	

21. Please rate on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning not at all likely and 10 meaning very likely, your likelihood to support legislation or ordinances promoting affordable housing.											
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6	District 7	District 8	District 9	District 10	Total
Not at all likely 1	7.10%	10.00%	13.30%	5.30%	17.60%	5.30%	8.30%	10.00%	12.00%	8.00%	9.60%
2	7.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.90%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	4.00%	20.00%	4.80%
3	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.60%
4	14.30%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.90%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%
5	7.10%	0.00%	0.00%	10.50%	11.80%	15.80%	12.50%	10.00%	8.00%	4.00%	8.50%
6	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	5.90%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	16.00%	4.80%
7	21.40%	0.00%	6.70%	10.50%	0.00%	0.00%	4.20%	10.00%	4.00%	12.00%	6.90%
8	14.30%	0.00%	20.00%	10.50%	29.40%	15.80%	33.30%	20.00%	36.00%	4.00%	19.70%
9	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.50%	5.90%	10.50%	25.00%	15.00%	4.00%	16.00%	10.60%
Very likely 10	28.60%	60.00%	40.00%	52.60%	17.60%	42.10%	16.70%	20.00%	32.00%	20.00%	30.90%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Mean	42.90%	70.00%	60.00%	73.60%	52.90%	68.40%	75.00%	55.00%	72.00%	40.00%	

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

Affordable Housing Survey Research


Email English Version

April 2016

CITY OF AUSTIN HOUSING SURVEY (English Version) – April 2016


EMAIL VERSION

1. Are you?




Value	Percent	Count
Female	48.7%	239
Male	48.7%	239
Other	0.4%	2
Prefer not to respond	2.2%	11
Total		491

2. What is your age?



Value	Percent	Count
Less than 18 years old	0.0%	0
18 to 24	8.9%	44
25 to 30	19.7%	97
31 to 35	19.7%	97
36 to 40	10.6%	52
41 to 45	8.9%	44
46 to 50	7.7%	38
51 to 55	6.1%	30
56 to 60	6.7%	33
61 to 65	5.9%	29
66 years of age or older	5.9%	29
Total		493

3. Which of the following categories best describes your race/ethnicity?




Value	Percent	Count
African American	5.5%	27
Aleutian, Eskimo, or American Indian	0.8%	4
Asian, Pacific Islander	6.7%	33
Mexican American, Hispanic, Latino	15.7%	77
White	67.7%	333
Other	3.7%	18
Total		492
Responses "Other"		Count
Left Blank		484
1		1
American		1
Anatolian		1
Does it matter		1
Indian		1
Italian		1
Mix		1
Mixed		1
NA		1
Prefer not to disclose		1
White with Hispanic origins		1
White/Black		1
mixed		1
prefer not to answer		1

4. What is your home zip code?


Count	Response
1	76092
1	78613
3	78617
5	78701
16	78702
11	78703
40	78704
15	78705
7	78717
12	78721
6	78722
25	78723
3	78724
3	78726
14	78727
1	78728
12	78729
6	78730
17	78731
5	78735
3	78736
22	78741
14	78744
24	78745
9	78746
7	78747
12	78748
27	78749
10	78750
28	78751
17	78752
23	78753
6	78754
8	78756
16	78757
18	78758
43	78759
1	79724

5. Do you rent or own your current place of residence?




Value	Percent	Count
Rent	57.1%	281
Own	42.9%	211
Do not know	0.0%	0
Total		492

6. People who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	3.9%	19
2	0.4%	2
3	2.1%	10
4	0.6%	3
5	4.3%	21
6	2.1%	10
7	4.5%	22
8	7.6%	37
9	5.3%	26
Total agreement 10	69.3%	338
Total		488

7. It is important that there are affordable housing options in all parts of Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	6.8%	33
2	1.2%	6
3	3.5%	17
4	2.9%	14
5	7.4%	36
6	3.1%	15
7	5.0%	24
8	8.7%	42
9	3.9%	19
Total agreement 10	57.5%	279
Total		485

8. The City of Austin should provide, as an incentive, faster permit review if the developments provide housing affordable for households making less than \$40,000/year.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	12.1%	55
2	2.6%	12
3	3.1%	14
4	1.5%	7
5	9.2%	42
6	4.6%	21
7	9.0%	41
8	14.3%	65
9	4.8%	22
Total agreement 10	38.8%	177
Total		456

9. The City of Austin should provide, as an incentive, the ability for developers to build taller buildings along major roadways if a percentage of the apartments/condos in the buildings are affordable for households making less than \$40,000/year.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	18.8%	85
2	4.0%	18
3	5.7%	26
4	2.7%	12
5	13.7%	62
6	9.1%	41
7	9.1%	41
8	11.7%	53
9	4.0%	18
Total agreement 10	21.4%	97
Total		453

10. The City of Austin should, as an incentive, require less parking for developments within $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile of a bus route or rail line if the developments provide housing affordable for households making less than \$40,000/year.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	20.9%	95
2	5.1%	23
3	6.8%	31
4	6.6%	30
5	12.8%	58
6	6.4%	29
7	10.1%	46
8	10.3%	47
9	3.7%	17
Total agreement 10	17.4%	79
Total		455

11. I am willing to pay higher taxes or higher fees if those funds were used to preserve or build affordable housing.




Value	Percent	Count
Not at all likely 1	32.0%	144
2	5.3%	24
3	6.4%	29
4	4.0%	18
5	10.4%	47
6	8.7%	39
7	10.0%	45
8	8.7%	39
9	3.3%	15
Very likely 10	11.1%	50
Total		450

12. I support the City of Austin using additional tax revenue generated by new developments to preserve or build affordable housing.




Value	Percent	Count
Not at all likely 1	17.9%	80
2	3.1%	14
3	4.3%	19
4	3.8%	17
5	8.5%	38
6	7.2%	32
7	8.5%	38
8	13.7%	61
9	9.6%	43
Very likely 10	23.5%	105
Total		447

13. The City of Austin should increase the amount of affordable housing along major roadway corridors and in major job centers.




Value	Percent	Count
Do not agree 1	10.2%	45
2	3.2%	14
3	3.2%	14
4	1.8%	8
5	7.1%	31
6	9.6%	42
7	13.6%	60
8	14.1%	62
9	4.8%	21
Strongly agree 10	32.5%	143
Total		440

14. The City of Austin should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed, in order to provide more affordable options.




Value	Percent	Count
Do not agree 1	7.6%	33
2	2.8%	12
3	2.8%	12
4	3.0%	13
5	9.2%	40
6	8.7%	38
7	11.4%	50
8	13.7%	60
9	7.3%	32
Strongly agree 10	33.6%	147
Total		437

15. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: Traffic congestion and commute time when choosing your home location.




Value	Percent	Count
No influence 1	3.7%	16
2	0.9%	4
3	1.1%	5
4	1.1%	5
5	2.7%	12
6	4.8%	21
7	7.1%	31
8	15.5%	68
9	12.1%	53
Very influential 10	50.9%	223
Total		438

16. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: The cost of a car and gas when choosing your home location.




Value	Percent	Count
No influence 1	17.4%	76
2	2.5%	11
3	5.3%	23
4	7.5%	33
5	12.1%	53
6	8.0%	35
7	7.5%	33
8	12.8%	56
9	5.5%	24
Very influential 10	21.5%	94
Total		438

17. Would you consider living in a townhouse, rowhouse, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it was affordable to you?



Value	Percent	Count
Very unlikely 1	9.9%	43
2	2.1%	9
3	3.5%	15
4	2.1%	9
5	7.9%	34
6	3.5%	15
7	8.6%	37
8	12.5%	54
9	7.6%	33
Very likely 10	42.5%	184
Total		433

18. Would you consider living in a townhouse, rowhouse, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it improved your commute?



Value	Percent	Count
Very unlikely 1	9.7%	42
2	2.1%	9
3	3.0%	13
4	3.9%	17
5	7.9%	34
6	4.9%	21
7	8.8%	38
8	15.0%	65
9	5.8%	25
Very likely 10	39.0%	169
Total		433

19. What is your greatest concern regarding affordable housing in your neighborhood?

Count	Response
1	Access to solid public transportation - so as to reduce congestion and make it livable
1	Additional traffic
1	Affordable housing being advertised well so people know it's available
1	Anything affordable in my neighborhood is being bought and flipped for a not so affordable price.
1	As long as the structure is compatible with the neighborhood
1	Associated Crime
1	Availability and effect on property values.
1	Bad people moving into the neighbourhood and not taking care of property
1	Being priced out and having to move further away and endure more traffic congestion.
1	Bring priced out by rising rent prices
1	Bunisses being in the neighborhood
1	Bus routes
1	CRIME rate
1	CRIME/CONGESTION
1	Can't afford the mortgage & property taxes
1	Changes the feel of the neighborhood
1	Condition of the housing
1	Cost and accomodation
1	Cost and availability
1	Cost and neighborhood
1	Cost of Rent and Utilities
1	Cost of living versus cost of rental
1	Cost to other neighbors
9	Crime
1	Crime & expensive housing 5yrs after development
1	Crime rate increases.
1	Crime rate not being controlled
1	Crime rate too close to schools and family neighborhood
1	Crime, Lowering of property values, Police patrolling is already quite low
1	Crime, education outlook
1	Crime, when people have nothing to lose they do dumb things.
1	Crime. Drugs. Prostitution.
1	Crowding and Crime
1	Decrease in property values of existing homes
1	Decrease in value of homes and crime rate.

1	Decreased property value; creation of govt funded ghetto will ruin Austin
1	Development of required transportation, roadways preferably public transportation.
1	Distance from places that make it truly livable (e.g., cafes, bakeries, restaurants, etc.)
1	Education and security
1	Even now low end housing is so hard to qualify for with the new rules acts have for qualifying
1	Everything is expensive
1	Excessive regulations
1	Existing home values
1	FUCKING PRICES.
1	Finding a location near UT that I can afford on my graduate stipend
1	Generating more people and more congestion
1	Gentrification
1	Gentrification/ forcing long time residents out of their homes due to rising taxes
1	Getting a loan.
1	Hidden costs, not just affordable housing but cost of safety
1	High Rents which are not affordable
1	Homes in my area are almost half a million dollars
1	Household size
1	Housing values will go down.
1	I do want affordable housing but I don't want my home to lose its value
1	I live in an area of apartment complexes.
1	I love TND concept but want to ensure that safety issues don't arise
1	I would like less government involvement in housing.
1	I'd like an efficient bus stop or train stop.
1	I'm a renter & the rent is similar to the rent back home in the
1	I'm not convinced there's very much of it.
1	If I qualify
1	If you can't afford it you shouldn't live there
1	Impact on transportation / commute. Property maintenance and impact on property values.
1	Income
1	Increase in rent/mortgage
1	Increase in traffic in my area
2	Increased crime rate
1	Increased traffic and congestion- on roads and in local establishments
1	Increasing rent costs year to year
1	Inflation
1	Inflated land value

1	It does not exist
1	It is not widely available, and many families are being forced to move outside of Austin.
1	It screws the households making just above the threshold, e.g. \$41,000 per year.
1	It won't happen in 78759, but I'd welcome it
1	It's only ever affordable for families, not for single, working individuals.
1	Its not affordable
1	Its not available.
1	Lac of it
1	Lack of ADUs
1	Lack of affordable housing. People can't afford to live in my neighborhood.
1	Lack of efficient public transportation to where jobs exist.
1	Lack of housing supply, missing middle
1	Lack of it
1	Lack of security and no curfew.
1	Lack of services
1	Loss of property value
1	Lower cost areas in Austin, unfortunately, are synonymous with higher crime rates.
1	Lower quality building and up keep of them
1	Maintenance and upkeep of affordable units
1	Maintenance of the property
1	My own property taxes
1	New development is not affordable.
1	No HUD
1	No caps on property tax hikes
1	No comment
1	No concerns. I want more affordable housing options all over austin
1	No parking and traffic
2	None
1	Not enough
1	Not enough -
1	Not enough of it
1	Not enough of it for families
1	Not sure
1	Older non-white families being priced out. I don't want to live in a white-bread community.
1	Older, smaller houses torn down to build big expensive ones.
1	Overpopulation, traffic congestion, crime
1	Overpopulation. However, I feel it is very necessary.

1	Price
1	Prior California influx making people believe higher housing prices are normal
1	Probably future lack of diversity due to skyrocketing housing costs.
1	Property Value
1	Property taxes going up because of inflated market
1	Property taxes, lack of public transportation and walkability
1	Property value impacts
1	Property values may suffer
1	Protecting value of my current investment and quality of neighborhood
1	Proximity to downtown and cost
1	Quality of life in my neighborhood
1	Quality of people
1	Re
1	Reducing property values and increasing crime
1	Relaxed regulations regarding multi use in my neighborhood
1	Rent
1	Rent cost
1	Rent could go up at any time and I will be forced to move because I cannot afford it
1	Rent price
1	Rising housing costs
1	Rising rents. Property values.
1	Safety
1	Safety and cleanliness
1	Safety issues
1	Safety, grocery stores and schools.
1	Safety, security, theft
1	Section 8 renters not maintaining property
1	Single Family Home Cost is high
1	Size of housing
1	Space to build & costs involved
1	Tasteful and well maintained, in keeping with neighborhood aesthetic
1	Tax increases
1	Taxes
1	That affordable housing within my budget will not exist in a year.
1	That costs will irreversibly increase and price full time working people out
1	That is built with quality and fits the design of the neighborhood.
1	That many believe that it requires more strip developments, which I strongly oppose.

1	That the property degrades
1	That we won't have any. We need to assure affordable housing in Central Austin.
1	The City of Austin over-regulating housing.
1	The amount of control the city had on affordable housing units
1	The area, the commute, the school district, the prices
1	The city getting involved and it is not their business
1	The city of Austin should keep out of this! Not their business
1	The ghetto people messing everything up
1	The housing supply is too limited
1	The rent will continue to rise and force me to move out of town.
1	The rising cost pushing low income residents away
1	The type of people it attracts.
1	The upkeep, increase in taxes, the amount of incentives given to developers (
1	There are very little if any affordable housing in the neighborhood.
1	There is none, and the waiting list for complexes that aren't even built are full for years
1	There is none.
1	There is too much regulation of housing. It drives up cost.
1	There is very little affordable housing and the current prices are rapidly increasing.
1	There isn't affordable housing to buy in my neighborhood
1	There isn't any and rents continues to go up
1	There isn't any right now.
1	There isn't any!
1	There isn't enough
1	There isn't going to be any left. And what is available is low-quality compared to the price.
1	There really isn't any and I struggle to get by working full time and living on my own.
1	Too high compared to other cities of similar or larger size
1	Too many houses, not enough high-density residences
1	Too many low income people ruining our neighborhoods.
1	Too many poor people drawn in by cheap housing, creating additional social problems.
1	Too pricey
2	Traffic
1	Traffic and foot congestion if you start building tall apts, stacked housing.
1	Traffic and upkeep
1	Traffic on neighborhood streets
1	Unfortunately the types of family living there (stereotypes of issues)
1	Unsavory tenants
1	Where is this affordable housing, because rent is super high.

1	With rent rising there needs to be more affordable housing.
1	availability
1	bad people, bad neighborhood
1	building expensive houses in my neighborhood
1	bus routes
1	character of the people
1	convenient bus routes
4	crime
1	crime and neighborhood pride
1	crime/dirty people
1	effect on property value
1	fostering entitlement and generations of people stuck in poverty cycle
1	getting priced out of my home
1	greater fear of irresponsibility
1	high taxes
1	homelessness
1	how it relates to utility increases
1	i dont have one
1	increased crime
1	increased density without corresponding transportation improvements
1	increasing my taxes so that someone else can pay less.
1	keeping it affordable even for those of us making more than \$40K annually!
1	lack of rent control
1	limited availability
1	loss of privacy
1	money
1	no additional space available and closeness to IH-35
1	no affordable in my area
1	no concerns!
1	no more room to build
1	none - affordable housing should be provided, as should capping rent increases
1	not concern
1	not enough
1	not enough and current affordable is not affordable
1	not enough of it
1	nothing-it's needed
1	out of state people

1	over crowding
1	parking
1	policing of neighborhood due to higher crime in affordable housing areas as in New Yorkcity...
1	preservation of existing communities and architecture
1	price and property taxes
1	property devaluation
1	property tax increases
1	property value
1	property value/perceptions regarding neighborhood
2	quality of housing
1	reduce the value of my home
1	reducing my property value
1	rent is outrageous anywhere but bad neighborhoods in Austin
1	rent keeps increasing wages stay the same
1	rent raising
1	safety and cleanliness based on demographics
1	safety within poorer neighborhoods
1	taxes are too high, teachers make too much to qualify for affordable housing
1	that it is safe
1	the lack of it
1	the value of my own home
1	there are not enough affordable housing options.
1	there is none
1	traffic
1	trafic safety
1	try west austin
1	unaffordable rent, and being priced out of the rental market
1	undesirable
1	value of living
1	variances
1	violence
1	I'd rather there not be any affordable housing in my neighborhood AT ALL. There is absolutely no reason why any affordable housing should be within 5 miles of downtown Austin. Living downtown is a privilege, and in NO WAY a right. If that means we have to improve public transportation to get people from their home that they can afford to their job, that they themselves have the ability to get a higher paying one if they worked hard enough, then so be it. I'm a 29 year old self-made white male who studied in high school, went to college and am still paying off student loans, and have worked hard through my 20's so I could purchase a condo downtown and start investing in the city of Austin. If we add more affordable housing for people who don't have the same drive, what exactly motivates people to work hard and live the downtown lifestyle if they can just work part-time jobs and live in affordable housing within 2 miles of downtown, while also bringing down the cost of the non-affordable housing, because my condo complex is 2 blocks awayfrom

	section 8 housing. It goes against what this country is founded on.
1	That uneducataed people use it as an excuse to live in a better area when they don't care about themselves enough to make the right decisions in the first place. Sorry their parents didn't instill good work ethics or morals but evolution happens
1	I'm concerned that low income housing will lower my property values due to lack of pride or no maintenance.
1	it's an excuse to remove existing affordable housing and replace it with 5 story unaffordable housing
1	Don't want my tax money spent that way and don't want poorer people living near my neighborhood.
1	I feel I may soon be priced out of my neighborhood and forced to move solely for that reason. Rents are rising faster than incomes and it angers me to see what I perceive as a lot of speculative buying of properties for investment purposes driving up market prices.
1	Depreciating property value or the likelihood resale value would not keep pace with other locations without affordable housing projects nearby. Upkeep of the affordable housing in the long term by the developer or by another entity that takes over the project operation such as an ode pendent investor or REIT.
1	Skyrocketing rents- mine is going up \$150 to 1000 per month I only make 23000 per year before taxes that pretty much eats up most of my income on housing
1	There is no affordable housing in our area! We keep renting an apartment in this area because we enjoy the neighborhood but can't afford to buy a home here. Our commute from work takes 45 minutes to 1 hour both ways. Affordable housing shouldn't be based on just a \$\$40,000 income. We struggle with a \$50,000 yearly salary. We live further southwest to be able to afford where we live, whic makes the commute to work difficult.
1	Big Government never makes good decisions. Austin has a history of solving one problem only to create others. The concept of master planning which was discarded by the 1970s era hippies running Austin continues to haunt us today. Yes I was here then. I lived thru the idiotic bus solution which had three siblings in my family going to three different parts of town to school.
1	Home ownership is a great source of wealth for those fortunate enough to afford it. This causes a widening disparity between those who can afford to save and those living paycheck to paycheck. I would like to see the city put more pressure on large employers to offer better benefits to working families such as sharing ownership, or matching savings.
1	There is very little affordable housing in my neighborhood. Fortunately, this is not an issue for my family.
1	Whether or not the housing would be adequately maintained and the residents are treated with fairness and respect.
1	Should not cost the tax payers anything. If you cannot afford where you live, sell it and move somewhere cheaper.
1	Mixed income housing. Low income families should live in the same complexes as high income families
1	Even "affordable" housing is not affordable to a regular working person. I work with several people who cannot afford an apartment now. One was homeless, one is in a residential hotel for now, one keeps moving to different situations in shared homes. One is renting a room in a house. These people work full time. The Affordable housing requirement in new apartments is only for a 4-5 year commitment for the property owners. It is no solution at all. Neither is building apartments alll along Burnet Rd which cannot handle the increased traffic. I am 62 and have lived in my house since 1979. I will not be able to live there if I retire. Austin property taxes are too high and I have no confidence in the mayor


	or city council to know what the hell they're doing.
1	Building affordable housing that isn't architecturally compatible to a neighborhood and not designed around the needs of people with low income. Affordable housing should be designed sustainably and planned accordingly to city amenities.
1	Multiple families dwelling in one unit, multiple cars parked along the road, and lowering the appraised value of my home due to lack of curb appeal that may be associated with affordable housing.
1	The rate at which rent is increasing will make it impossible for most people to live in Austin in the coming years.
1	There is nothing really affordable in Austin. The cost of living here is extremely high and some jobs pay rate don't make where a person can afford to live some place nice . So what's affordable about affordable living in Austin TX?
1	When moving to Austin it was very difficult to find an affordable single family home, and we are currently living in a house we can barely afford.
1	My family falls just above the \$40,000 mark, so we don't make enough to afford a home near work, but we don't qualify for many "affordable" housing options. What efforts will be made to provide affordable housing to families in the \$40K - \$70K income bracket?
1	"Affordable" in my neighborhood (Hyde Park) is quickly meaning houses/condos that cost \$350k+. Too much luxury housing is being built at the expense of actual affordability.
1	There aren't any. I'm a single professional and all of my friends have moved away because they can't afford living here anymore. It's a buncha bull!
1	I have lived in the same apartment for five years. Every time I renew the lease the price of rent goes up. The rent is now double what it was I moved in. There has been no improvement to the quality of life at that apartment complex, and no one can explain why the rent gets jacked up EVERY year. I'm furious about this, and am really started to dislike living in Austin because of it!
1	My greatest concern is having neighbors who would not maintain their residence at the same level of quality that a person who pays full market value for the same location or dwelling.
1	I can only live in my current neighborhood in a single family home because i have a good agreement with the landlord. If i have to move from my current residence i may have to leave Austin since, for various reasons i can only live in a single family home. I din't want to leave austin, bit rent hikes may make it a necessity. Another artist dkiping town for greener or more affordable pastures. Austin will not be wierd without itsartists.
1	Even I cannot afford rent, and I have 3 degrees, and have income higher than 40k. Housing costs are WAY too expensive.
1	There is no affordable houseing . Affordable to how ? There are more apartments then homes in Austin Texas. And the apartments are expensive.
1	Imposing too much taxes may defy the purpose of affordable housing, coz if the cost of housing is the same after increasing the taxes as that of now then it's of no use.
1	We need more housing of any kind. Supply and demand will make it affordable. Less government intervention, please. Faster permitting process. Taller buildings permitted. Smaller houses on smaller lots permitted.

1	there is not enough affordable housing and what is available is substandard living. It needs to be located throughout the city and more public transportation is needed to help offset high costs and congestion issues.
1	Lucky to own a home in Austin, but do worry as I watch the property taxes increase. Wish my neighborhood was attached to the train system being expanded here. Using the bus system is just not a practical and speedy way to commute in town for a work commute or household shopping.
1	I'm concerned that my neighborhood will lose it's character over time if none of the current residents can afford to stay.
1	I think housing in Austin is pretty affordable. My biggest concern is that places where housing is much more affordable (Del Valle, Manor, etc)- the only access is toll roads and there is a severe lack of public transport to get into the city
1	Not being able to make enough income to afford housing in Austin. The increase in rent/mortgage is steadily increasing, yet the wages for jobs is staying the same.
1	Nothing we should have affordable housing all over Austin. While your at it deny developers that don't keep trees!
1	current housing bubble needs to burst; Californians should have to live in Texas for several years before paying overinflated prices for all available properties
1	Often affordable houses are made with cheap materials and/or they are located in parts of the city that are not considered as "rich"
1	Rent and home cost too high. High taxation only drives up rent as landlords pass that expense on, making this a useless route to keeping things affordable for those already with apartments. Student accommodation is ridiculously overpriced. Rent controls would be a better option to keep people from having to move further and further out.
1	People who have lived in my neighborhood for many years can no longer afford to live there due to rising property taxes.
1	If we're talking about Section 8 housing, I don't want it in my neighborhood. But rental prices in general are out of control. My rent has increased about 35% in 6 years.
1	I'm most concerned about my ability to one day own a house, townhouse, or condo in my current neighborhood.
1	QUALITY affordable housing and affordable housing that does not rely on or cater to section 8 subsidies/residents.
1	That it take into consideration a families net income as opposed to their gross income. Many folks take home a lot less than they make.
1	Affordable housing exists in my area but access to public transit and proximity to amenities concerns me.
1	I don't want my home devalued and crime because of a city housing project. Build housing where economics work and mass transit where needed. Let people live how they like.
1	Tearing down places I love to go, like restaurants, bars, parks, etc. The influx of people congesting roads and public services.
1	Affordable housing has a stigma that it attracts people who could have a negative impact on the community -- this could be seen as driving an increase in crime and/or a lack of maintenance for the housing. Because of this stigma,

	surrounding property values can lower based on an assumed impact of the nearby affordable housing units and their residents.
1	"affordable" housing in my neighborhood is sub-par; the duplex i live in is affordable, but the building itself is not up to code, there are fleas, roaches, and mice, and my landlord won't address those things because the rent is lower than other rents in the area. I'm also very concerned about longtime Austinites being pushed out of the city because of property taxes and high rents; my neighborhood is rapidly gentrifying and its sad and gross. i wish the city of austin would do more to help longtime residents who are being forced to leave their homes because of gentrification. the city should be looking at sustainable growth, and making sure to maintain equity as the city grows. i fear Austin is becoming a city for upper class and rich people and that one day soon i won't be able to afford to live here, even though i have advanced degrees and make a living wage, that's how unaffordable Austin is right now.
1	Not affordable for current single-family home owners. We are paying more taxes for new residents to have affordable housing . That is a Robinhood affect just like the Texas school finance.
1	Everything is far too expensive. An apartment worth maybe 400 a month costs over 1000. It's insane.
1	Unregulated group homes where too many people live in the same place with no one checking in on their safety and health, crime, people not taking care of their properties
1	My neighborhood has already been sold to developers making way for McMansions and the removal of the indigenous residents. This effort has been made too late in regards to my neighborhood. Thanks for your effort.
1	High property taxes impact tenants negatively by causing higher rent, so those who can't afford to purchase their home are carrying the burden for those who can.
1	Preserving/restoring old low population density buildings for profit reasons. Building higher population density buildings allows for individual affordability.
1	Increasing property values are making it hard for me to stay in my home in Windsor Park. I love this neighborhood; my neighbors know each other. We watch out for each other and have helped each other during natural disasters as well as some personal challenges. I would hate to move. But right now I'm paying \$600 per month on top of my mortgage to pay for property taxes and insurance. I DO NOT MIND PAYING PROPERTY TAXES. I believe we should all pitch in. But the burden shouldn't be on lower middle income wage earners like myself. It should fall squarely in more affluent communities.
1	there is too much money flowing to a small number of incoming residents. the demand for luxury housing naturally keeps developers making more of it. incentivize rich, young transplants to live away from the city center and incentivize new companies to stay out of downtown.
1	I don't want any "affordable housing" anywhere. Let the market decide what is affordable and what is not. Forcing prices to be artificially lower than the market will only distort the price of rents everywhere in the city. Do not turn Austin into communist China.
1	that it might increase crime. Crime has already increased in my neighborhood in the one year I have been here.
1	doesn;t exist - just purchased condo. it is the smallest living space at the highest cost of any of the 4 homes I have purchased.
1	I pay a pretty penny in order to live amongst other individuals that choose to do the same. I do not want the city of Austin to subsidize people to live in an area where they cannot afford or do not deserve to live.


1	Hyde park is ridiculously expensive, especially considering the majority of people living there are probably students or recent graduates without high income who are renting
1	The prices are rising so quickly, and I have not yet bought a house. I am worried that I might never be able to.
1	Developers are buying up land and putting up poorly run and expensive apartment complexes in order to extract as much money from poor people as possible.
1	I don't want people younger than me to be shut out of opportunities I've had, and due to the increase in housing costs, they are.
1	SAFETY - A low income apartment building was built next to our neighborhood and all of a sudden we have a huge increase in crimes such as breaking & entering, theft and vandalism of vehicles
1	The loss of it! I've already been priced out of a former residential area, due in large part to higher property taxes on properties. Coa has caused a huge amount of the problems, time to fix it. Give residents a tax break based on the # of years lived here, the ones moving here should be paying the higher taxes. Where is all this money going? Tax revenue has skyrocketed for austin and i haven't seen anything done with that to benefit those it is displacing. In southeast austin especially the roads are terrible. Bus stops are not covered, bike lanes and crosswalks are barely visible, and yet our rent keeps on rising. This city is in a housing crisis!
1	What the city of Austin's definition of affordable housing is; I would not want a section 8 property near where I live, due to crime associated; section 8 often lends itself to unemployed people. The problem in Austin is that even a person or persons who WIRK FULL-TIME can't afford to live in central Austin.
1	there isnt any either you have to be very poor to get the affordable housing or make over \$100,000 a year to afford rent or buy a home in Austin. There is no inbetween in Austin!! if you cant get affordable housing because you make a few thousand more than the limit you are working just to pay HIGH rent and hoping to afford groceries!!!!
1	i work a good job and make decent money, rent is still too high for me, i should be able to find housing that i can afford WITHOUT having to be subsidized by anyone. Austin is increasingly unaffordable, and the city wants to make it less affordable for most to make it more affordable for some. Why doesn't the city try to make housing affordable for EVERYONE?
1	Concerned about prices rising such that I would have to move further away and incur a longer commute
1	Gentrification is raising the property values and taxes where I live. This pushes the minorities further from the

20. Who should be eligible to purchase or rent affordable housing that is subsidized or incentivized by the City of Austin? Please choose the household income that best answers the question.



Value	Percent	Count
Under \$10,000	3.9%	16
Under \$20,000	5.1%	21
Under \$30,000	17.3%	71
Under \$40,000	28.0%	115
Under \$50,000	30.7%	126
Greater than \$50,000 per year	15.1%	62
Total		411

21. Please rate on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning not at all likely and 10 meaning very likely, your likelihood to support legislation or ordinances promoting affordable housing.



Value	Percent	Count
Not at all likely 1	10.3%	43
2	3.4%	14
3	3.8%	16
4	2.4%	10
5	8.4%	35
6	6.0%	25
7	7.4%	31
8	16.3%	68
9	10.3%	43
Very likely 10	31.8%	133
Total		418

22. Do you have any ideas for creating affordable housing in Austin?

Count	Response
1	"infill" projects should be zoned for affordable housing
1	< 900sqft homes
1	After school programs should be offered to families.
1	Allow multiple Tiny houses on 1 lot or small lots for tiny houses-400sf or less
1	Allow strip malls to have 2 floors, and the upper floor is used for affordable housing
1	Allow tiny housing
1	Along public transportation lines
1	Austin is very overrated in the housing market. Bring this to a normal level.
1	Be it practical
1	Better public transport to Austin from the suburbs
1	Better public transportation system
1	Bring back IDA accounts
1	Build affordable housing in vacant parcels used by homeless campers.
1	Build more market-rate housing and then let economics take the helm.
1	Build tiny houses under overpasses, or other locations.
1	Building a wall around CA
1	Container houses. Modular, cheap to construct and move, with the bonus of being trendy.
1	Corporate taxes pay for affordable housing
1	Create in the burbs, not city
1	Creating homes using recyclable materials, creating micro homes,
1	Cut regulation. Regulation drives up cost in the form of fees and mandated expenditures.
1	Density, ADUs, Expanded Light Rail,
1	Do not create isolated communities in order to create affordable housing.
1	Don't
1	Don't do it
1	Don't do it. It only benefits developers.
1	Encourage landlords to decrease rent in exchange for tax breaks
1	Encourage people who can't afford to live in Austin to move to places that they can afford.
1	Expand public transportation to reach more neighborhoods.
1	Force apartment owners to lower rent to appropriate levels. Hundreds of dollars a month cheaper.
1	Get rid of all these pointless golf courses and build affordable housing on them.

1	Have rent controls
1	I wish that I did.
1	I'm moving out of Austin.
1	If you do not make enough money to live in Austin, MOVE elsewhere
1	Improve commuting options and time
1	Improved road network to make more areas within a reasonable commute distance
1	Increase housing supply, density. Reduce/remove minimum parking requirements and lot size.
1	Increase income wages.
1	Increase of (not free to use) public transportation system. See: Portland, Oregon
1	It should be for ppl who work not on governorship assistance completely
1	Just do it! :-)
1	Let people who cannot afford to buy a house rent one.
1	Lower property taxes
1	Lower property taxes.
1	Master plans should be required to include housing option for all income levels for that area.
1	Mini house/apartment trends 400 sqft or less
1	More dense housing, urban infill projects
1	More housing like that found on Webberville and Thompson St
1	More mixed use, mixed zoning, mixed income to encourage integration.
1	Move it further out with Cap Metro access
1	N/A
1	N/a
1	Need more info.
13	No
1	No it just seems like developers are selling houses to high
1	No regulations on number of unrelated occupants.
1	No, but me ex husband AJ Gonzalez in San Antonio is a recognized expert.
1	No.
1	None
1	Nope
1	Not at this time
1	Not at this time.
1	Not every place needs granite and high amenities

1	Not now
1	Portland-style no-growth policies
1	Pray
1	Private market is always best. I would support incentives, but not cash subsidies
1	Provide incentives for multi family homes.
1	Provide low interest rate loans and subsidized
1	Providing property tax breaks for middle class wage earners (\$50k-\$100k annually)
1	Raise the income limit to at least \$75,000
1	Raise the minimum wage so people can afford to rent in Austin.
1	Reduce regulation overall; allow larger, more compact developments to occur.
1	Reducing the amount of increasing rent costs year to year (adjusted to inflation)
1	Refurbishing, expanding, and renovating current affordable housing as well.
1	Remove red tape so private entities can solve the problem
1	Rent Control
1	Rent control
1	Rent control law would help current residents that live in Austin already.
1	Rent control. One-bedroom apartments should never cost more than \$1000 per month max.
1	Rent controlled areas.
1	Rent should be based on a person's annual income.
1	Sadly, no.
1	Start with the vast population of residentially challenged (homeless)
1	Support local charities
1	Talk to Alex Papavisiliou
1	Tax incentives to renters
1	Tax the developer \$50k for each home built with more than 3000 sq ft
1	The government should stay out of it
1	There should be more house built. More homes -> Lower Demand -> Lower Prices
1	Tiny House incentives and communities,
1	Tiny home for family closer to metro rail, bus stop, and other public transportation
1	Turn Tarrytown into apartments.
1	Unfortunately no
1	Work equity programs
2	Yes

1	Yes - DONT
1	Yes I want more affordable housing communities like community first village
1	Yes, give the rich humanity classes.
1	Yes, put it on the West side where the white people will start to have to care about the issue.
1	Yes.Tell the developers to consider communities with smaller homes and community gardens and
1	Zoning to encourage it
1	affordable housing/workspace for artists
1	avoid red tape
1	build "tiny" houses for all those who want them.
1	build further out
1	build them in areas with already low property value.
1	cluster near mass transit, build up
1	declare moratorium on major projects
1	do not do it
1	do not segregate it
1	higher buildings, better metrorail
1	higher density
1	incentives for college grads working full time/incentives for single college grads
1	incentives to landlords to stop jacking up rents
1	increase density, public transportation
1	leave it up to the market
1	less regulations
1	lots! But not in the position to be educated on an answer.
1	lower our taxes and reduce city and county staff.
1	make existing apartment/ condo buildings mixed income
1	make rent affotdable like in 2008
1	microhouses and large, tall buildings with many small apartments
1	n/a
7	no
1	none
1	pay people more..not my taxes!!!
1	quit increasing the property taxes, I am making less than I was making 10 years ago

1	re-develop slummy parts of austin
1	rent caps
1	rent control
1	require greater percentage of units to be affordable in mixed use or residential developments.
1	requirements for significant % placed at affordable level
1	row houses
1	small 2-story building retail & housing
1	stop over pricing taxes on homes to move people out
1	tax credits
1	the city should stop encouraging unbridled growth
1	use smaller houses, the tiny high quality houses are more appealing than a high rise
1	yes
1	Lean on private developers -- provide incentives but also minimum requirements for affordable housing.
1	Rely on private sector and charitable foundations to develop, manage and own, using financing vehicles supported by city / county / state / US government funding.
1	Better education for tradesman in early Highschool leading to the probability of earning a living wage
1	the developers need to get better financing for longer terms on their payments allowing them to lease the housing units for less at the beginning of their loans=less rent
1	On number 21, I'm only likely to support if it makes sense; so far no question on this survey has led me to believe that there are sensible options and controls available. Rent controls and a preference for Austin and Texas residents.
1	Yes stop developing more and more of the ugly straight up apartments and put some thought into different type architecture that would include plants and wildlife. No I'm not stupid. People are people no matter their income. If you enjoy your backyard so would they.
1	New developments have to put a percentage into affordable housing in that development. Mix people of both groups. Don't keep the people who are working towards getting out of affordable housing out side the area. Keeping all affordable housing together creates low income neighborhoods which end up going down hill. Kids living with kids from different areas will pick up habits to push for more goals. Then work on schools...>>>
1	Most multi-family affordable housing must be attached to the train system (preferably) but at the least, the bus system. Affordable and practical home needs and services should be within walking distance or included in the affordable housing area.
1	Capping rent increases. See Boston, MA city law for capping the percentage of rent increases allowed per year
1	Require large corporations to pay higher property taxes and city use funds to develop affordable housing. Decrease regulations on "mother-in-law" developments and "tiny home" to increase density in urban areas.

1	Put a cap on how much rent can be, make owners pay penalties if homes are on the market for long periods of time because rent is too high.
1	Set the amount of rent an owner can charge based on the population's average income; instead of allowing the "market," which is FALSELY inflated
1	Make stricter regulations on developers. In my neighborhood they buy older more affordable housing, tear them down, and build new more expensive properties that price out single home owners' families.
1	More housing of any kind automatically means more affordable housing will come into existence. The law of supply and demand ensures that. Less regulation. More freedom. Build whatever you want on whatever land you own. We need wider roads and more roads, as well as more public transit, as well as deregulated taxis and ubers and private buses and private trains. Let the market figure it out from the bottom up, rather than imposing top-down solutions.
1	i think there could be tiered availability. for example, guaranteed rental based on income of 30k or less. but there has to be active participation in programs either involved with the city or community to give a sense of pride with a goal toward ownership. for the 30k - 50k, opportunities to purchase with some criteria set forth that i would like to think about but have input, and maybe the same for 50k + with some different incentives and or requirements. Decent sized apartments, townhomes and homes tiered to different salaries and needs, but all with requirements that will ensure community involvement, self-respect, high standards of conduct and production and also transportation assistance (not free)
1	Build nice affordable housing in outlying areas and commute and bus services. Build high density low sqft in the city where economics work like north lamar area
1	i just feel like it's turning similar to chicago, they should've left austin how it was instead of trying to be a big city. it's losing its originality
1	Increase in Tax for new business and trade companies which are developing their business in Austin just for increasing their benefit.
1	developers should be required without incentive to build affordable housing. most austinites make an average of 10/hr. rent is too high as the property values rise
1	Raise the income limit so that hardworking married couples can have affordable housing be able to pay all their bills with money left over for GROCERIES and try and save for their future!!
1	Biggest cost to developers is timing. Austin has the most intensive planning process. Time is money
1	Create new affordable housing options in areas already heavily saturated with Section 8 housing. There are plenty of those areas within the city limits, and there seems to be an abundance of open, non-greenbelt space still undeveloped
1	I don't unfortunately. :(I find the topic somewhat depressing and have avoided thinking about it.
1	Yes. Put it where the cost of land is cheap and where we're not already trying to gentrify. Maybe further south toward Buda, or east of 130.
1	I love the idea for The Grove at Shoal Creek, giving discounts to teachers, and also for discounts being given to artists at certain complexes.

1	Concern yourselves more about the citizenry than tourists that don't have a vested interest in the beauty, livability, and vitality of our beautiful city.
1	Take blighted neighborhoods, with several small bungalow homes and renovate, add sidewalks and bus routes.
1	Spend some money on masterplanning and demographics. Learn from Boston and others vs using home grown solution.
1	Put affordable housing near the bus lines and rail lines that are less likely to move. As well as developing near city amenities that prevent people from commuting in vehicles to go purchase food.
1	No. There is very little space with all of the nonaffordable housing and hotels that have engulfed the area within a 5 mile radius of downtown.
1	I believe it's important to try to help poor and middle class people, however I don't think that mandating and regulating is an effective way to do that. Often you find that government programs are inefficient and I say this as a progressive, "liberal" person. I've lived in rent-controlled housing before, and my experience was that the people who live in those places are not the people who need it the most, but are people who were able to organize the necessary paperwork they needed to qualify for the housing. So it's a worst-of-both-worlds scenario where taxes are increased, but the people who should have benefited from the program don't. Once programs like these are on the 'books' they're hard to remove, so you get an accumulation of this kind of legislation over time. I do favor dropping the minimum yard-size per home-size stricture because that could provide more affordable housing for people without requiring new legislation. Also, it would give people more options when buying a place. Say I want a home with a smaller yard because I don't want to do landscaping. It's harder to do that because of a regulation that was probably passed with similar good intentions. A good use of tax dollars are infrastructure projects like a well-designed rail system. Infrastructure has been one of the better uses of tax dollars and it would allow the city to expand in a sustainable way, while reducing commute times etc. instead of placing a band-aid on the problem. I'm glad that people care about the needs of the poor and working class. I think these programs are well-intended, but I don't think they're effective. I've talked to people in the city about this and it clearly is an emotional issue. The student who registered me to vote "turned" on me slightly because of this issue. Not because I was being belligerent or hostile, but simply because I disagreed with him. I don't think that's healthy for democracy. We should be open to debate and more skeptical of the ideas of our own parties (if you have one). Good luck in your political activism and I hope you'll succeed in making real change in the world.
1	density bonuses, increased density, get rid of the building height limitations, less residential zoning restrictions (more granny flats), more diverse unit mix (more 3-4 bedroom units)
1	People tend to go all NIMBY about it. A public education campaign to convince classist/racist folks that affordable housing near them does not, in fact, mean that their property values will tank and they'll need bars on the windows might help. People who have always been comfortable tend to demonize the poor. Public education on this issue might dispel some of that ignorance and fear.
1	Allowing tiny homes to be added to lots currently zoned for one single family detached home as rental housing similar to the Loaves and Fishes Development in Manor.
1	Force the city to stop giving tax breaks to large businesses and be more responsible with the money they have.
1	The builders and banks will make the money / profit so if it has to be done let them pay. Do not tax or try to redistribute wealth from those that have worked and saved their entire lives.
1	Build tiny home neighborhoods. Not everyone in Austin wants to live in a 2000 sqft home. If you can build tiny homes to help the homeless why not build neighborhoods of them to help those not making enough to afford the


	high cost of housing in Austin. Right now the "affordable" housing program in Austin is a JOKE!
1	taller buildings, smaller homes more compact areas amenities for those families - day cares nearby.
1	Incentivise companies to allow working from home which would cut back on population density in the inner city.
1	Yes, it is not your concern, you are wasting tax payers money with this survey, the weird people and musicians that made this city great to live in will go else where and in 20 years you will have your own shitty Detroit full of rude Californians.
1	Making sure individuals who are in these housing is defiantly in the salary range and there is no crime or negelance within the area
1	Find land that does not make the community look like the community projects for the poor. Criminal background check a must offer same anenities as you do for other communities
1	I don't think it's a good idea. Whoever thought up this nonesense about a need for affordadable housing is nuts.
1	Matching seniors who want to stay in their homes with single-parent families who can't afford to live in a nice home. It's a win-win.
1	Screen the low end people with criminal records, trouble makers, immigrants that don't even speak English, no jobs. Allow good people access to affordable housing. I live in the ghetto now because there is no affordable housing near work. We have crack heads work the corner daily at corner of mystreet.
1	Communal living centers for similar demographics. High-rise apartments. Aim for higher density. Fuck million dollar homes for just a few... build a million dollar apartment that hundreds could live in.
1	No more housing projects - if you make someone feel like they live in a slum, they'll act like they live in a slum! Offer housing vouchers and integrate low income options into larger housing complexes
1	Reduce fees/permits to build...it would make housing more affordable for everyone...and all would be treated equal under the law.
1	(this is probably more on the state level) expand the qualified allocation plan to include sites that located throughout the city, not just in wealthy, less diverse neighborhoods. education and awareness are at the core of the issue, affordable housing does not equal unsafe areas. provide incentives for developers to create smaller, more dense housing and redevelop existing buildings. Infill is important as is allowing for accessory dwelling units.
1	Just put a cap on how much people can charge to rent property. Rent prices keep going up and up. The people who make Austin a great place to live can no longer afford to live here. Cap the amount renters can charge, but keep it affordable for everyone!
1	This should have been thought of a long time ago. I am of the belief that this is to little too late. Greed has already taken root. The gold rush vampires have already descended upon the city of Austin. Sorry for the gloom.
1	Stop allowing developers to buy downtown lots, drive out existing businesses and then build expensive condos.
1	How about offering a toll road rebate to low-income people? The I-45 toll road is usually deserted.

1	Improve commute infrastructure, but the more attractive properties should go to those who can afford it
1	Just support developers to build more, let the market set the price, but give tax breaks to developers to build more condos, townhouses, etc
1	Rent caps, rent subsidies, tax and other incentives for landlords to keep rents low. Artist subsidies.
1	Austin and their "feel good" laws like this Green Initiative are doing this - adding money to everything
1	Remove not taxed land from the city and place those builds where taxes are cheaper. Then build commercial buildings in there place and use that money for affordable housing.
1	Affordable housing trust fund, inclusionary zoning, using Medicaid funds for permanent supportive housing
1	I think it's too late. There's no real commitment. Austin has been sold to developers. I'm a legal assistant, single, 62 and it's very sad to see.
1	I haven't studied this issue, honestly. I do understand that growing income inequality results in poorer health outcomes for everyone in a community. I believe that affordable housing should be available in all quarters of this city to avoid disenfranchisement.
1	Raise property taxes in outlying areas and lower them in central/corridor areas. Incentives for residents who live and work within an x mile radius.
1	I think they should help middle class with affordable housing. There is already help for people that make under \$40000. It is still hard to get a home single with a \$50000 income.
1	Incentives for first time home-buyers; create different levels of affordable housing spread out in all the different neighbors, not just downtown high-risers etc.
1	Allow construction of smaller houses. Stop raising property taxes. Stop allowing developers to destroy currently affordable areas.
1	I think there should be sliding scales with subsidies for individuals and families of all income levels. I think that most condo/apartment complexes should provide a mix of housing for low, middle and high income families.
1	Allow home owners to build accessory dwelling units but regulate "sneaker dorms" and properly tax companies building large apartment complexes
1	http://uli.org/wp-content/uploads/ULI-Documents/Preserving-Multifamily-Workforce-and-Affordable-Housing.pdf
1	Stop outrageous property tax hikes that force local residents to relocate, forced into the outskirts of the city, far from where they lived and work- sometimes for decades.
1	Stop developers from high priced homes in well established older neighborhoods raising prices in the market
1	I am of the opinion that we need to accept the idea of density. It will relieve traffic and if we plan well can make travel safer for cyclists and pedestrians. People need to get over the absurd ideal of single family homes. I am not a fan of apartments but one of the best living situations I ever experienced was in Mexico where I had a tiny studio apartment, around 100 square feet with my own tiny kitchen and bathroom and I shared an outdoor courtyard with 5

	other units of different sizes. We need to adjust our expectations and get comfortable with the idea of more shared, communal spaces. This apartment even had a large kitchen off of the courtyard that was for anyone to use when the tiny efficiency kitchens wouldn't cut it. I would like to see builders propose creative ways to squeeze more people in smaller spaces while preserving some of the things we all like about living in a house like outdoor spaces and construction with character. A lot of the new buildings going up are either lavish luxury apartments or multi-family units with seemingly shoddy craftsmanship and little character. I think we can and should set higher standards for new developments. This is our landscape, our skyline and what we build now we'll be stuck with for a while so lets build spaces we'd want to live in.
1	Require it everywhere new developments are being created. Stop hiking up property values. We need another Mueller type development on the southside.
1	Make it almost impossible to get a permit to build new developments without affordable housing options. Lock in property tax rates for people who have lived in a specific home for greater than 10 years instead of increasing it past the point of affordability.
1	Tiny house projects, extension of the rail line to make other neighborhoods that are affordable more accessible, aggressively incentivizing affordable housing as percentages of residences in any new development.
1	Innovation in the use of materials, home layouts, size of lots, and renewable energy options. Lowering property tax!
1	Get rid of toll roads. Making housing futher out possible and less trafiic. Stop raising value on houses in town which are not that valuable. Check for sellers tricking outsiders on prices.
1	Do not give tax abatements or tax incentives to businesses & developers, because existing COA homeowners are paying excessive taxes that the City Government is giving away.
1	No. I do think we need to educate the public (including myself) on the importance of affordable housing and the benefits it brings. As someone who does not qualify for affordable housing, I still feel that I can barely afford to live here anymore -- the price to get in drives the make-up of the community, so adding in very low affordability options into neighborhoods with high home values (\$400k+) seems to ignore the needs of middle man.
1	the entire city should share in accommodating affordable housing, grouping or clustering of affordable housing seems like it creates more problems than it solves. sharing the affordable housing across the entire city would reduce the risk of negative impacts
1	Subsidize construction of affordable housing by private industry in communities where the neighborhoods have similar valued properties. Scattering affordable housing into higher market neighborhoods just creates more market momentum to up price upon resale. Understand interest in diversity of neighbors, but housing economics overcome good intentions.
1	diversify the options: duplex, triplex, garage apts everywhere, microhome options and land that fits a smaller, more affordable home in the city
1	IF you work in Austin and cant afford to live hear then you live outside Austin and drive to work. Just like everybody else. If you cant afford to live in Austin then move some where you can.
1	It's not just for those who earn less than \$40k. As a teacher who is married to a librarian, we are squeezed out of all neighborhoods in Austin that are even remotely close to the city.
1	Use existing properties owned by the city to create affordable pockets throughout Austin. Do not limit to one area of


	town. Get RFPs from affordable housing developers.
1	Downtown Austin is seeing a lot development but it is incredibly expensive. There should be some percentage of housing that is designated as "affordable".
1	If rents were regulated or capped for individuals that work close to their jobs not only would it be affordable for an employee to live close to where they work but also with traffic. The majority of the people that work there can't afford to live there dispersing them out of town and making it harder for them to find work but also employers trying to find people that will commute.
1	It is important to note that many people who may require affordable housing still need to have vehicles. I personally have a job that requires me to have a car, but I make under \$40k a year. Having a car is also beneficial to families. Also, access to public transportation shouldn't even be a consideration until public transit is improved in this city.
1	incentivize all businesses to hire austinians over relocating people from other cities. tax people who move here for jobs well beyond the local median/average salary. increase crime so that new people are fearful of living in certain areas. create high-density mass transport so that this isn't an issue. i have more ideas than you want to hear; contact me with my email address that you already know for more.
1	Work with local, reputable architects and builders to brainstorm ways to keep building costs lower. The building should be affordable as well as aesthetically pleasing for the whole community
1	Impossible to accomplish. Focus on providing a basic std of living so people can afford market values.
1	Thoughtful development in areas which can be developed further than their current capacity is paramount. That and improvement of existing means of travel, as well as investment in new means of travel will help as well. There are areas outside of central Austin which would offer more affordability, but may need creative solutions on how people who purchase or rent those properties could commute to their workplace or other places they need to go to.

23. What is the highest level of school you have completed?




Value	Percent	Count
Some high school	0.7%	3
Graduated high school	2.9%	12
Some college	17.7%	74
Graduated college	47.4%	198
Post-graduate work	30.1%	126
Do not know/unsure	0.0%	0
Refused	1.2%	5
Total		418

24. Which of the following best describes your residence?




Value	Percent	Count
Single-family home	44.4%	186
Duplex	5.0%	21
Townhouse	4.3%	18
Condo	6.2%	26
Apartment	38.9%	163
Other	1.2%	5
Total		419

25. What is your current employment situation?




Value	Percent	Count
Employed part-time	7.7%	32
Employed full-time	73.7%	308
Unemployed	3.4%	14
Student	3.8%	16
Retired	8.6%	36
Homemaker	2.2%	9
Do not know/unsure	0.7%	3
Total		418

26. Which of the following categories best describes your total family income for 2015, before taxes?




Value	Percent	Count
Under \$10,000	1.5%	6
\$10,000 to under \$25,000	9.4%	39
\$25,000 to under \$40,000	13.3%	55
\$40,000 to under \$50,000	12.8%	53
\$50,000 to under \$60,000	10.4%	43
\$60,000 to under \$75,000	7.7%	32
\$75,000 to under \$100,000	13.3%	55
\$100,000 or more	27.1%	112
Do not know/unsure	4.6%	19
Total		414

27. Which best describes how many people live with you, including yourself?



Value	Percent	Count
1 (just yourself)	33.6%	140
2	41.3%	172
3	15.4%	64
4	6.2%	26
5 or more	3.6%	15
Total		417

28. Do you or does someone in your home have a disability?



Value	Percent	Count
Yes	9.1%	38
No	85.9%	360
Prefer not to answer	5.0%	21
Total		419

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development


Affordable Housing Survey Research

Email Spanish Version

April 2016


EMAIL VERSION

1. ¿Es usted?




Value	Percent	Count
Hombre	38.5%	5
Mujer	61.5%	8
Otro	0.0%	0
Prefiero no contestar	0.0%	0
Total		13

2. ¿Cuántos años tiene?



Value	Percent	Count
Menos de 18 años	0.0%	0
De 18 a 24	0.0%	0
De 25 a 30	7.7%	1
De 31 a 35	46.2%	6
De 36 a 40	0.0%	0
De 41 a 45	7.7%	1
De 46 a 50	23.1%	3
De 51 a 55	0.0%	0
De 56 a 60	0.0%	0
De 61 a 65	7.7%	1
66 años o más	7.7%	1
Total		13

3. ¿Cuál de las siguientes categorías describe mejor su raza/etnicidad?




Value	Percent	Count
Afroamericano	0.0%	0
Aleutiano, esquimal o nativo americano	0.0%	0
Asiático, de las Islas del Pacífico	0.0%	0
Mexicoamericano, hispano, latino	69.2%	9
Blanco	30.8%	4
Total		13
Responses "Otro"		Count
Left Blank		14

4. ¿Cuál es el código postal de su casa?


Count	Response
1	78705
1	78723
2	78724
2	78727
1	78747
1	78748
3	78752
1	78753
1	78758

5. ¿Alquila o es dueño de su residencia actual?




Value	Percent	Count
Alquilo	61.5%	8
Soy dueño	38.5%	5
No sé	0.0%	0
Total		13

6. Las personas que trabajan en Austin deberían poder pagar una vivienda en Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	15.4%	2
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	0.0%	0
9	7.7%	1
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	76.9%	10
Total		13

7. Es importante que haya opciones de vivienda económica en todas partes de Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	0.0%	0
9	7.7%	1
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	92.3%	12
Total		13

8. La Ciudad de Austin debe proveer como incentivo la revisión más rápida de los permisos si los constructores proveen viviendas económicas para aquellos hogares con ingresos menores de \$40,000/año.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	9.1%	1
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	0.0%	0
7	9.1%	1
8	0.0%	0
9	0.0%	0
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	81.8%	9
Total		11

9. Como incentivo, la Ciudad de Austin debe permitirles a los constructores construir edificios más altos a lo largo de las calles principales si un porcentaje de los apartamentos/condominios en los edificios los podrán costear aquellos hogares con ingresos menores de \$40,000/año.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	10.0%	1
7	10.0%	1
8	10.0%	1
9	0.0%	0
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	70.0%	7
Total		10

10. Como incentivo, la Ciudad de Austin debe requerir menos espacio de estacionamiento para las construcciones a $\frac{1}{4}$ de milla de una ruta de autobús o riel si las construcciones proveen viviendas económicas para aquellos hogares con ingresos menores de \$40,000/año.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	20.0%	2
6	10.0%	1
7	10.0%	1
8	0.0%	0
9	10.0%	1
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	50.0%	5
Total		10

11. Considere pagar impuestos o cuotas más altas si los ingresos de esos mayores impuestos y cuotas se usaran para construir viviendas económicas en propiedades con otros usos públicos, como bibliotecas y otros edificios públicos.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	33.3%	3
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	11.1%	1
6	11.1%	1
7	11.1%	1
8	22.2%	2
9	0.0%	0
Muy probable 10	11.1%	1
Total		9

12. Apoye a la Ciudad de Austin para usar los ingresos de impuestos adicionales generados de la construcción de nuevos complejos para preservar o construir viviendas económicas.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	10.0%	1
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	10.0%	1
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	10.0%	1
9	20.0%	2
Muy probable 10	50.0%	5
Total		10

13. La Ciudad de Austin debería aumentar la cantidad de viviendas económicas en los corredores de carreteras principales y en los centros de mayor concentración de trabajo.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	10.0%	1
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	10.0%	1
6	10.0%	1
7	0.0%	0
8	10.0%	1
9	0.0%	0
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	60.0%	6
Total		10

14. La Ciudad de Austin debería permitir que se construyan casas pequeñas en terrenos más pequeños de lo que permite actualmente para que haya más opciones económicas.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	10.0%	1
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	10.0%	1
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	20.0%	2
9	10.0%	1
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	50.0%	5
Total		10

15. La congestión de tráfico y la distancia al trabajo a la hora de escoger la ubicación de su casa.




Value	Percent	Count
Ninguna influencia 1	12.5%	1
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	12.5%	1
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	0.0%	0
9	0.0%	0
Muy influyente 10	75.0%	6
Total		8

16. El costo de un automóvil y la gasolina a la hora de escoger la ubicación de su casa.




Value	Percent	Count
Ninguna influencia 1	25.0%	2
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	0.0%	0
9	0.0%	0
Muy influyente 10	75.0%	6
Total		8

17. Considere vivir en una casa adosada, casa de construcción en fila, triplex, apartamento u otra opción de vivienda que no sea una casa unifamiliar independiente de si la pudiera pagar.



Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	33.3%	3
2	0.0%	0
3	11.1%	1
4	0.0%	0
5	11.1%	1
6	11.1%	1
7	22.2%	2
8	0.0%	0
9	0.0%	0
Muy probable 10	11.1%	1
Total		9

18. Considere vivir en una casa adosada, casa de construcción en fila, triplex, apartamento u otra opción de vivienda que no sea una casa unifamiliar independiente si mejoraría su distancia al trabajo.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	33.3%	3
2	0.0%	0
3	11.1%	1
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	11.1%	1
7	0.0%	0
8	11.1%	1
9	0.0%	0
Muy probable 10	33.3%	3
Total		9

19. ¿Qué es lo que más le preocupa en cuanto a las viviendas económicas en su vecindario?


Count	Response
1	Cleaningness
1	Devaluo de la propiedad
1	El estado en que se encuentre la vivienda, reparaciones
1	La calidad de las personas que viven alrededor
1	Nada, porque es justo.
1	Pay more taxes to cover the costs
1	costos altos
1	lo pequena que puedan ser los cuartos

20. ¿Quién debería calificar para comprar o alquilar viviendas económicas subsidiadas o con incentivos de la Ciudad de Austin? Por favor seleccione una.



Value	Percent	Count
Menos de \$10,000	0.0%	0
Menos de \$20,000	11.1%	1
Menos de \$30,000	22.2%	2
Menos de \$40,000	33.3%	3
Menos de \$50,000	22.2%	2
Más de \$50,000 al año	11.1%	1
Total		9

21. Por favor clasifique en una escala del 1 al 10 las probabilidades de que usted apoye la legislación u ordenanzas que promuevan viviendas económicas. 1 significa que no es para nada probable y 10 significa que es muy probable.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	33.3%	3
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	11.1%	1
9	0.0%	0
Muy probable 10	55.6%	5
Total		9

22. ¿Tiene alguna idea sobre cómo crear viviendas económicas en Austin?


Count	Response
1	Casas tipo canadiense o complejo de apartamentos pequeños
2	No
1	Tiny Houses
2	si
1	Hacer que las carreteras de cuota sean locales, y usar las ganancias

23. ¿Cuál es el mayor grado de educación que ha completado?




Value	Percent	Count
Parte de escuela secundaria	0.0%	0
Graduado de escuela secundaria	0.0%	0
Algunos estudios universitarios	22.2%	2
Graduado de la universidad	55.6%	5
Postgrado	11.1%	1
No sé/no estoy seguro	0.0%	0
No deseo contestar	11.1%	1
Total		9

24. ¿Cuál de las siguientes describe mejor su residencia?




Value	Percent	Count
Casa unifamiliar	55.6%	5
Dúplex	0.0%	0
Casa adosada	0.0%	0
Condominio	0.0%	0
Apartamento	33.3%	3
Otro	11.1%	1
Total		9

25. ¿Cuál es su situación de empleo actualmente? Usted es:




Value	Percent	Count
Empleado a medio tiempo	0.0%	0
Empleado a tiempo completo	77.8%	7
Desempleado	0.0%	0
Estudiante	11.1%	1
Jubilado	0.0%	0
Ama de casa	0.0%	0
No sé/no estoy seguro	11.1%	1
Total		9

26. ¿Cuál de las siguientes categorías describe mejor su ingreso familiar total para el año 2015, antes de los impuestos? Sería:




Value	Percent	Count
Menos de \$10,000	0.0%	0
Entre \$10,000 y menos de \$25,000	11.1%	1
Entre \$25,000 y menos de \$40,000	33.3%	3
Entre \$40,000 y menos de \$50,000	11.1%	1
Entre \$50,000 y menos de \$60,000	22.2%	2
Entre \$60,000 y menos de \$75,000	0.0%	0
Entre \$75,000 y menos de \$100,000	11.1%	1
\$100,000 o más	0.0%	0
No sé/no estoy seguro	11.1%	1
Total		9

27. ¿Cuál describe mejor cuántas personas viven con usted, incluyéndose usted mismo? Viven:



Value	Percent	Count
1 (usted solo)	11.1%	1
2	33.3%	3
3	44.4%	4
4	0.0%	0
5 o más	11.1%	1
Total		9

28. ¿Está usted discapacitado o alguien en su hogar tiene una discapacidad?



Value	Percent	Count
Sí	0.0%	0
No	100.0%	9
Prefiero no contestar	0.0%	0
Total		9

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

Affordable Housing Survey Research


Online English Version

April 2016

CITY OF AUSTIN HOUSING SURVEY (English Version) – April 2016


ONLINE VERSION

1. Are you?




Value	Percent	Count
Female	64.7%	580
Male	32.9%	295
Other	0.5%	4
Prefer not to respond	1.9%	17
Total		896

2. What is your age?



Value	Percent	Count
Less than 18 years old	0.1%	1
18 to 24	6.6%	59
25 to 30	19.6%	176
31 to 35	20.1%	180
36 to 40	14.4%	129
41 to 45	10.9%	98
46 to 50	7.8%	70
51 to 55	7.4%	66
56 to 60	4.5%	40
61 to 65	3.9%	35
66 years of age or older	4.7%	42
Total		896

3. Which of the following categories best describes your race/ethnicity?



Value	Percent	Count
African American	4.4%	39
Aleutian, Eskimo, or American Indian	0.6%	5
Asian, Pacific Islander	2.7%	24
Mexican American, Hispanic, Latino	14.5%	129
White	72.8%	650
Other	5.2%	46
Total		893
Responses "Other"		Count
Left Blank		873
.		1
American		1
Arab		1
Australian - American		1
HUMAN RACE		1
Hispanic White		1
Human		2
Iranian-American		1
Middle Eastern		1
Mixed		1
Mixed		1


Mixed - Mexican American/White	1
Mixed race	4
Multi	1
Multi racial: white & latina	1
Native Austinite	1
Race should stop being a question - all these labels are divisive and should be discarded.	1
Romani	1
Slavic	1
United States of America	1
biracial	1
human	1
mixed	2
multiracial	1
mutt	1
none of your business	1
part Romany	1

4. What is your home zip code?

Count	Response
1	27705
1	49242
1	75051
1	78240
1	78610
7	78613
3	78617
2	78626
1	78628
1	78634
3	78640
2	78652
2	78653
1	78659
4	78660
1	78664
2	78665
2	78666
2	78681
14	78701
72	78702
30	78703
82	78704
21	78705
1	78712
7	78717
1	78719
34	78721
29	78722
50	78723
5	78724
7	78725
3	78726
11	78727
12	78728


7	78729
3	78730
35	78731
1	78734
14	78735
1	78736
1	78737
4	78739
62	78741
15	78744
51	78745
8	78746
5	78747
26	78748
22	78749
11	78750
53	78751
14	78752
18	78753
9	78754
25	78756
42	78757
15	78758
22	78759
1	787904
1	789741
1	79602
1	79751

5. Do you rent or own your current place of residence?




Value	Percent	Count
Rent	48.4%	433
Own	51.0%	456
Do not know	0.7%	6
Total		895

6. People who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	1.2%	11
2	0.8%	7
3	0.4%	4
4	0.8%	7
5	2.1%	19
6	1.1%	10
7	3.0%	27
8	6.8%	61
9	5.2%	47
Total agreement 10	78.5%	706
Total		899

7. It is important that there are affordable housing options in all parts of Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	2.1%	19
2	1.2%	11
3	1.2%	11
4	1.5%	13
5	3.1%	28
6	2.8%	25
7	5.2%	47
8	9.0%	81
9	5.7%	51
Total agreement 10	68.1%	611
Total		897

8. The City of Austin should provide, as an incentive, faster permit review if the developments provide housing affordable for households making less than \$40,000/year.




Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	5.6%	50
2	1.8%	16
3	1.7%	15
4	2.5%	22
5	7.8%	70
6	4.2%	38
7	8.9%	80
8	14.6%	131
9	8.6%	77
Total agreement 10	44.3%	397
Total		896

9. The City of Austin should provide, as an incentive, the ability for developers to build taller buildings along major roadways if a percentage of the apartments/condos in the buildings are affordable for households making less than \$40,000/year.



Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	10.3%	92
2	3.5%	31
3	4.7%	42
4	3.1%	28
5	12.1%	108
6	7.4%	66
7	11.5%	103
8	12.9%	115
9	6.4%	57
Total agreement 10	28.1%	251
Total		893


10. The City of Austin should, as an incentive, require less parking for developments within $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile of a bus route or rail line if the developments provide housing affordable for households making less than \$40



,000/year.


Value	Percent	Count
Total disagreement 1	11.7%	105
2	3.1%	28
3	5.3%	47
4	4.8%	43
5	13.8%	123
6	6.2%	55
7	10.0%	89
8	11.3%	101
9	5.4%	48
Total agreement 10	28.5%	255
Total		894

11. I am willing to pay higher taxes or higher fees if those funds were used to preserve or build affordable housing.




Value	Percent	Count
Not at all likely 1	17.0%	152
2	2.9%	26
3	4.1%	37
4	4.7%	42
5	8.5%	76
6	8.4%	75
7	11.9%	107
8	12.6%	113
9	5.7%	51
Very likely 10	24.3%	218
Total		897

12. I support the City of Austin using additional tax revenue generated by new developments to preserve or build affordable housing.




Value	Percent	Count
Not at all likely 1	6.8%	61
2	1.7%	15
3	2.0%	18
4	1.5%	13
5	5.4%	48
6	4.2%	38
7	9.0%	81
8	10.9%	98
9	11.8%	106
Very likely 10	46.8%	420
Total		898

13. The City of Austin should increase the amount of affordable housing along major roadway corridors and in major job centers.




Value	Percent	Count
Do not agree 1	3.9%	35
2	1.4%	12
3	1.6%	14
4	1.1%	10
5	6.0%	53
6	6.3%	56
7	9.8%	87
8	13.5%	120
9	8.1%	72
Strongly agree 10	48.4%	430
Total		889

14. The City of Austin should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed, in order to provide more affordable options.




Value	Percent	Count
Do not agree 1	6.0%	53
2	1.2%	11
3	2.6%	23
4	2.3%	20
5	5.5%	49
6	6.0%	53
7	8.6%	76
8	13.2%	117
9	6.8%	60
Strongly agree 10	48.0%	426
Total		888

15. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: Traffic congestion and commute time when choosing your home location.




Value	Percent	Count
No influence 1	3.7%	33
2	0.7%	6
3	1.3%	12
4	1.6%	14
5	3.7%	33
6	4.2%	38
7	8.4%	75
8	15.5%	139
9	9.7%	87
Very influential 10	51.3%	460
Total		897

16. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: The cost of a car and gas when choosing your home location.




Value	Percent	Count
No influence 1	14.1%	126
2	5.7%	51
3	6.5%	58
4	6.1%	55
5	8.7%	78
6	8.7%	78
7	11.2%	100
8	12.0%	108
9	6.9%	62
Very influential 10	20.2%	181
Total		897

17. Would you consider living in a townhouse, rowhouse, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it was affordable to you?



Value	Percent	Count
Very unlikely 1	9.8%	88
2	1.8%	16
3	3.0%	27
4	3.1%	28
5	5.0%	45
6	6.2%	56
7	7.0%	63
8	9.8%	88
9	9.0%	81
Very likely 10	45.2%	405
Total		897

18. Would you consider living in a townhouse, rowhouse, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it improved your commute?



Value	Percent	Count
Very unlikely 1	9.7%	87
2	2.0%	18
3	3.2%	29
4	2.5%	22
5	5.6%	50
6	5.7%	51
7	9.9%	89
8	10.7%	96
9	9.0%	81
Very likely 10	41.7%	374
Total		897

19. What is your greatest concern regarding affordable housing in your neighborhood?

Count	Response
1	# of residents per home
1	\$\$\$
1	'get in' price is only moving higher
1	A nice neighborhood.
1	Ability to afford ongoing maintenance and upkeep of the exterior
1	Accessibility by bicycle is a must
1	Added congestion
1	Adding to flooding
1	Adopt mandatory affordable housing requirements within all higher-density zoning categories
2	Affordability
1	Affordable housing in my neighborhood is dwindling.
1	Affordable housing is disgusting, virtually uninhabitable, bug problems
1	Affordable housing runs counter to capitalism . Duh.
1	Allowing animals and a small backyard.
1	As a full-time teacher, I am unable to afford a place in Austin without a roommate.
1	Austin need to increase density
1	Availability
1	Availability, cost
1	Awful NIMBY jerks blocking it
1	Being able to afford my housing
1	Being able to buy an affordable house
1	Being able to buy/own a home rather than rent
1	Being priced out of my existing neighborhood due to taxes.
1	Being priced out.
1	Building small houses on smaller lot size should be permitted.
1	Cheaper housing doesn't have to mean lower quality living (roaches, disrepair, etc)
1	Choices on density
1	City Regulation and Taxes driving up costs.
1	City's miss use of our tax dollars. City is a poor stewards of tax payers money.
1	Close to everything
1	Compatibility and transportation
1	Cost of rent is increasing
10	Crime
1	Crime rates/crime impact
1	Crime, decline in schools, trashy neighborhoods

1	Crime, pest control, bed bugs
1	Crime. Affordable housing can bring crime back into an area
1	Cultural values.
1	Decreasing green space, decreased parking
1	Democratic control and ownership, i.e. housing co-ops
1	Democratic ownership
1	Dense small housing destroying its SFH character.
1	Developers just bought all of St. Elmo and our prices in Battlebend are already driving up.
1	Developers trying to con the development rules
1	Development rules that prevent non-single-family housing options
1	Developments required to provide parking in West Campus. Parking spots are unnecessary.
1	Displacement of existing residents/gentrification
1	Distance from public transportation, and a unit at street level.
1	Diversity
1	Don't make enough to afford most places
1	Economic segregation in our city
1	Ensuring it is high quality and safe
1	Even though it's labeled as "affordable housing" it still isn't affordable.
1	Families that would not take care of their property!
1	Families with children finding affordable homes near good schools.
1	Forceing out long time single family residents
2	Gentrification
1	Gentrification and long lines at area restaurants
1	Gentrification displacing heritage home owners and renters.
1	Gentrification of the existing residence by the increase in property taxes due to economic growth
1	Getting priced out of my rent.
1	Good neighbors
1	Government should not manipulate the housing market.
1	Govt efficiency in planning and development
1	Hard to Pull off given the rising cost of property taxes
1	Hard to type all I'd like to say in this tiny box.
1	Having to move each year because of increased rent prices and/or landlords selling the house.
1	High property values and high property taxes
1	High rent costs
1	Higher Traffic
1	Higher property taxes for homeowners.
1	Higher property taxes, which already adversely affect housing affordability.

1	Housing Quality
1	Housing is still unaffordable if you make less than \$60K - \$80K a year with student loan debt
1	How little there is of it. And how much it's shrinking.
1	How long will it still be affordable?
1	Huge lots that require a lot of watering and that don't provide people with places to live.
1	I am concerned that if there is not affordable housing. There will be more homeless
1	I am going to be forced out of this city
1	I can't find a bus stop within walking or biking distance. At all.
1	I cannot afford to purchase a home in my neighborhood. I make more than 40K a year.
1	I cannot continue to live in hays county and work in Austin due to traffic
1	I have none
1	I have to work 2 jobs just to pay rent
1	I will never be able to buy a house where I live.
1	I wish more people owned and less people rented in my neighborhood.
1	I won't be able to find a home in the area I am accustomed to and like.
1	I'm concerned that there isn't any.
1	I'm fine, just concerned for others
1	I'm making \$60K/year and still cannot afford housing without dipping into my retirement savings.
1	I'm spending half my money on rent. I couldn't commute from South to North Austin any longer.
1	Impact on existing neighborhood character.
2	Increased crime
3	Increased traffic
1	Insufficient density in the core of Austin.
1	Isn't available to all that need it
1	It actually being affordable for someone making less than 40k a year
1	It brings in people who run their car stereos loud at all hours and takes parking spots
2	It doesn't exist
1	It doesn't exist.
1	It effects diversity in my kids' school. (There is less and less)
1	It is disappearing.
1	It is rapidly disappearing.
1	It will attract tenants with less regard for the housing
1	It would change the character of the neighborhood.
1	It's all dilapidated & public transit access is poor.
1	It's becoming very scarce.
1	It's changing and rent increase is unreasonable.
1	It's not cheap

1	Kid & Pet Friendly (Room to breathe)
1	Lack of Affordable Housing
1	Lack of affordable housing in Austin in general
1	Lack of affordable housing.
1	Lack of apartments in neighborhood as defined by school boundaries
1	Lack of diversity
1	Lack of housing diversity - in terms of size, scale, cost, etc.
1	Lack of housing types.
1	Lack of infill opportunities
1	Lack of jobs for those people who move into affordable housing. lack of support services
1	Lack of landlord attention to properties
1	Lack of preservation of neighborhood character, added noise, traffic
1	Location to amenities.
1	Location to stores/restaurants
1	Long term residents being displaced
1	Long term truly affordable (60% MFI) options and increasing density
1	Long time residents being displaced
1	Long-time residents being pushed out of their historical homes.
1	Longtime residents can't afford property taxes
1	Loss of diversity
1	Loss of quiet peacefulness. People being unfriendly
1	Loss of the unique character of the city if only wealthy can afford to live here.
1	Lot sizes force expensive housing
1	Low income housing may decrease the value of my home.
1	Low- & middle-income folks are being pushed out.
1	Lowers my property value
1	Maintaining open or multiple use space
1	Maintaining property values!
1	Mixed income is paramount; I do not want concentrations of poverty.
1	More congestion and noise
1	More generations cramming into homes, due to affordability and proximity to place of employment.
1	My greatest concern is that soon I will be priced out of Austin completely.
1	My greatest concern is with housing becoming more unaffordable.
1	My neighbor hood already has low income housing
1	My neighborhood association will fight anything that isn't SF-2 in Allandale.
1	My neighbors can't afford to stay in their houses.
1	My rent had gone up 60% in 10 years. My income hasn't.

1	My rent is going up and I can't afford to live in Austin.
1	My taxes..I can afford my house, but the taxes are starting to make me reconsider where I live.
1	NOT ENOUGH
1	Neighborhoods full of only rich people are boring as hell
1	Neighbors' obstructionism
1	New families can't afford to buy or stay in Austin
1	No LOCAL developers developing
1	No concern as it is extremely unlikely that Austin will come up with such a great plan.
1	No concerns - would welcome.
1	No specific concern
1	Noise
1	Noise...traffic congestion, undesirable neighbors
6	None
1	None, my neighborhood already has affordable housing.
2	None.
1	None... Live in an affordable community now.
1	None; I need affordable housing.
1	Not affordable to people below 30% AMI
1	Not being able to afford to own a home
1	Not enough
1	Not enough affordable housing, high market rates
1	Not enough affordable single-family starter homes (less than \$300,000).
1	Not enough and limited accessibility for the disabled
1	Not enough and low income students being displaced from elementary school.
1	Not enough housing or density
1	Not enough new ft2 allowed to be built due to parking mins, McMansion and SF-3 zoning
1	Not enough of it
1	Not enough of it.
1	Not enough of it. Especially for families
1	Not enough supply
2	Not having enough affordable housing.
1	Now it is affordable but it won't be anymore. More expensive houses are being built.
1	Overcrowding and destruction of trees/wildlife
1	PRICE!!!! i lived in austin my whole life now im being forced to move bc of PRICE
1	Parking, trash and roads
1	People can afford their homes, may even be paid off, but cannot afford the property taxes
1	Politics revolving around developers and changes to their required "affordable units".

1	Poor building quality
1	Poor quality
1	Potential for Poor Property Management
1	Prejudiced neighbors who oppose it
1	Preserving affordability for low-income people in my neighborhood
1	Price
1	Price.
1	Proper care and maintenance of facilities, drive out or keep out businesses
1	Property Tax
1	Property Taxes forcing my landlord to pay more rent.
1	Property tax increases.
1	Property tax!
1	Property taxes are very high, but schools are a mess. What gives?
1	Property taxes raising the rent.
1	Public transportation
1	Public transportation options
1	Qualifying and understanding what is affordable housing in Austin REALLY mean
1	Quality agency placement
1	Quality of life (safe neighborhood)
1	Quality of life-style
1	Quickly depleting
1	Rent
1	Rent increases
1	Rentals
1	Renters and owners not taking care of the property.
1	Rents and home prices sky rocketting due to out of town investors buying up properties.
1	Rising Property values & property taxes
1	Rising costs of housing stock and rents mean my kids cannot afford to move out in area
1	Rising property taxes and developers only building \$350k+ homes
1	Rising property taxes on limited space.
1	Rising property taxes paid by current property owners and rising rents
1	Rising property taxes.
1	Safe neighborhoods
4	Safety
1	Safety, commute
1	Safety/Crime
1	School crowding

1	Security for all residents and maintenance of properties.
1	Size supports family of 4 and is affordable for 80%-120% AMI
1	Skyrocketing Rent's it's getting to expensive to live in Austin, fix this now!
1	Structural integrity / quality of building materials
1	Surveys with slanted questions
1	TAXES TAXES TAXES TAXES
1	THAT IT ISDISAPPEARING!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
1	Taxe
3	Taxes
1	Taxes and affordability to stay in home
1	Taxes are too high
1	Taxes too high
1	Tenants not caring for their property
1	That Austin is losing diversity because people are not able to afford to live in the city.
1	That I still am unable to afford it.
1	That affordable housing isn't close enough to the workplaces for those living there.
1	That children of families will get a good education
1	That is doesn't exist. I am a native Austinite and had to move to MI for affordability.
1	That is doesn't seem to exist. Rent has increased dramatically over the last 10years.
1	That is will cease to exist in a couple years.
1	That is will not stay affordable.
1	That it cant come fast enough
1	That it devalues my property.
1	That it doesn't destroy existing historical houses and neighborhoods we need to preserve.
1	That it is non existent!
1	That it is not mixed rate. Affordable (income-based) and market rates.
1	That it will be reserved for MFI levels that are too high
1	That it won't stay that way, and the developers take the incentives and leave the building.
1	That more people should have access to own a home in Austin
1	That my neighbors would hate it.
1	That my property taxes are increasing faster than my income
1	That neighborhood associations will block new housing options
1	That people are not pushed out of their homes
1	That people in my neighborhood will get priced out and ruin the diversity of the neighborhood
1	That soon it won't be affordable....
1	That the builders don't swindle the community by offering insufficient options.
1	That the city will subsidize developers along Burnet Rd and other corridors to build tenements.

1	That the elderly and the original residents cannot afford to live here
1	That there are none..
1	That there is less and less
1	That there is none.
1	That there is not enough
1	That there isn't any "affordable" housing
1	That there isn't enough of it.
1	That they go to good schools
1	That when my lease is up they will raise my rent and I will no longer be able to afford it
1	That you are mainly providing affordable housing that doesn't work for families like mine.
1	The Lack of it
1	The ability for families with modest means to live in Austin
1	The amount of new construction and the increases to my property taxes.
1	The balance between a safe neighborhood & affordable housing
1	The classist backlash from neighborhood associations.
1	The cost.
1	The effects of generational poverty on individuals and standards of living differences
1	The fact that there isn't any.
1	The hostility of my neighbors to any new housing, including single-family housing
1	The lack of available housing
1	The lack of it.
1	The lack of missing middle housing options
1	The lack of supply
1	The limited choices; want choices all across the city
1	The only affordable housing is built ugly. And usually a duplex.
1	The property taxes are going up too fast. That can't be the only source of income.
1	The quality of the structure and the residents who qualify
1	The roads can't handle the current population of the neighborhood.
1	The things that come with poverty, namely crime.
1	The utter lack thereof
1	There are very few small (less expensive) houses
1	There is a complete lack of wheelchair accessible housing
1	There is little to no affordable housing in my neighborhood
1	There is never enough, and rent keeps going up
1	There is no affordable housing in my neighborhood.
1	There is no affordable housing in this area!
1	There is none

1	There is none and I would have to move my kids school to find affordable housing.
1	There is none as the rents keep going up faster than my income.
1	There is none in my neighborhood.
4	There is none.
1	There is not enough affordable housing in central austin
1	There is not enough of it
1	There is not enough!
1	There is so little available, and too great a competition to get when one pops up
1	There is very little affordable housing in 78731, what is there is run down.
1	There is very little of it.
1	There is very little of it. To afford housing here, you have to have a lot of roommates.
1	There isn't any in district 10.
1	There isn't any available.
1	There isn't any for 40 miles. New neighborhoods brag they start in the 300s and up.
1	There isn't any!
2	There isn't any.
1	There isn't enough
1	There isn't enough of affordable housing
1	There isn't enough. My taxes are skyrocketing because of my Travis county appraisal.
1	There isn't very much
1	There needs to be more
1	There needs to be much more of it, both rent-restricted and market rate.
1	There should be affordable housing options in all areas of the city. Including my neighborhood.
1	There's a lot of it near me. It should be expanded to other areas, because they need it too.
1	There's nonever unless you are disabled or on welfare.
1	There's not enough available in Austin
1	There's not enough of it
1	Timeline and sustainability -- we need to increase the housing stock downtown immediately
1	Too concentrated
1	Too expensive to build an ADU
1	Too many large lots; need to get more houses and ADUs built to increase supply
1	Too much detached single-family housing
1	Trading density for neighborhood character
1	Traffic
1	Transient population & crime
1	Transportation options for residents without access to a car
1	Upkeep

1	Using it to enrich developers
1	Very little access to public transit,m
1	Vocal minority of homeowners complaining about affordable housing types
1	Walkability
1	Walkable proximity to recreational activities
1	We don't have enough housing in general.
1	We don't have nearly enough of it!
1	We just need more of it! Let's increase the supply so more people can live near downtown!
1	We need more affordable housing throughout the city. Now.
1	We need more of it
1	We need more of it.
1	We'd like to keep the population that's here and now price out people as they age
1	What affordable housing?
1	Will it be for people who have full time jobs an education and not living off the government ?
1	Will there be enough?
1	Working families not being able to afford housing
1	Young families and single parents can't afford to buy homes in town
1	Young families can no longer afford to live on my street.
1	Zoning limits minimum lot sizes and density, driving prices up
1	access to public transportation and grocery stores
1	accessibility
1	accessibility to public transportation
1	additional congestion on main transporation artery.
1	affordability
1	affordable houses are being pushed out
1	affordable housing disables neighborhood development
1	affordable housing needs upkeep and maintenance--often these are not part of the program.
1	animal control
1	appearance & upkeep
1	attract low income families
1	availability / quantity
1	availability and access to affordable housing
1	care taking of property (upkeep)
1	city taxes and spending
1	cleanliness and safety
1	commute time
1	commute, safety and land

1	continued gentrification; ridiculous land valuation
1	cost of purchasing a house
1	cost of the homes
8	crime
1	crime history
1	crime rates
1	crowding
1	decline in property values for established residences
1	defining "affordable"
1	democrats run the city and will steal my income to pay for the low income
1	disregard and deterioration of established neighborhoods
1	do not know how to create it
1	economic an dracial diversity along with property tax increases
1	ensure the residents of the rental property take care of the product
1	ensuring upkeep of the property is maintained
3	gentrification
1	have to live farther and farther from City center in order to afford a home
1	having the culture and feeling of the neighborhood leave.
1	having to live far from my job in order to be able to live on my salary
1	high tax values
1	higher taxes
1	historical preservation of landmarks
1	home price and tax inflation
1	honesty of developers
1	how much is my rent going to go up each year?
1	i want the same level of services including sidewalks and parks near affordable housing
1	illegal behavior, unattractive and unclean community, uneducated and unprogressive residents
1	increase in crime
1	increased crime
1	increased density ruins character & renters are less likely to maintain properties
1	increased property values driving out long-time residents, often people of color
1	increased traffic
1	increased traffic from higher density housing
1	increasing crime and lowering my porperty values
1	increasing rent and increasing traffic
1	influx of people/increased population/safety
1	integration that also maintains and respects the culture of the neighborhood

1	it is disappearing, being torn down
1	its lack
1	its not around Austin. only found in a certain area.
1	lack of City model designs which could receive expedited approval for ADUs
1	lack of affordability, lack of diversity
1	lack of houses affordable for the average Austin family
1	lack of it
2	lack thereof
1	living in homeless shelter - need housing
1	location
1	long wait lists
1	lowering my property worth.
1	missing middle and lack of density all hurts affordability
1	mixed-use pedestrian neighborhoods
1	more properties need "granny flats" facing the alleys
1	my greatest concern is bus service is not available on Brodie Lane south of Slaughter Lane
1	neighborhood opposition to affordable housing and density
1	no access to healthy food/ groceries store
1	no bus stops
1	no concerns
1	noise
5	none
1	none- i want more of it
1	none. we have some.
1	not enough
1	not enough exists-inflated rents
1	not enough for those who have been here
2	not enough of it
1	not enough of it!
1	not enough?
1	over-development, increase in traffic
1	overdevelopment
1	oversized development (ie. tall tall buildings) and loss of open spaces - including airspace.
1	people having to relocate after years of living in their home because the cannot afford it
1	potential decrease in quality of life due to sub-standard land/house upkeep.
1	preserving the quality of life of our residents
1	privacy

1	property tax
2	property taxes
1	property values
1	public transportation access!!!!!!!!!!
1	push back of new development
1	quality & maintenance
1	raising housing taxes!!
1	rapid becoming unavailable
2	rent increases
1	rent inflation due to short term rentals
1	rent priced
1	rental rates are untenable for individuals living alone
1	rising rents with no justification
3	safety
1	safety and quality
1	safety, access to food
1	space
1	sustainability
2	taxes
1	that current owners not be driven out because of ever higher property taxes!
1	that housing is no longer affordable from what it used to be 3 - 4 yrs ago.
1	that in order to stay in our neighborhood we end sacrificing space, privacy, and quality.
1	that it is going away
1	that it wont exist soon
1	that our city is classist and racist
1	that people would not take care of their homes bringing all value down
1	that the city will destroy single family housing
1	that the complex and apartment are well kept, and safe
1	that there is not enough affordable housing
1	that there isn't enough of it.
1	the bullshit narrative we have about its causes and its solutions .
1	the lack of affordable housing
1	the lack of it
1	the lack of it.
1	the lack of transportation options to support additional population
1	the lack thereof
1	the lowering of propety taxes

1	the nccd prevents missing middle development
1	the only options are rental homes in very bad shape, or some apartment complexes
1	the options available are limited and therefore causing long wait list or no availability
1	theft, vandalism
1	there are no affordable housing options less than \$700
1	there is barely any
2	there is none
1	there is not enough of it
1	there is nothing affordable in my neighborhood
1	there isn't any
1	there isn't enough
1	there isn't enough of it.
1	there's not enough affordable housing in my neighborhood
1	time it will take to build it
1	too much development is driving the cost higher
1	traffic with no mass transit option
1	transience
1	true affordability
1	truly affordable
1	unattractive/overpowering architecture
1	upkeep
1	I am seeing my long-time neighbors displaced by affluent (anglo) yuppies. I want our neighborhood to retain the original ethnic diversity and a decent level of income diversity. Even working people are being pushed out of the neighborhood as property taxes rise and the affluent people now buying homes in the NH push up prices. Developers frequently tear down old, historic homes (that were more affordable) to build McMansions that they sell at a premium. We shouldn't be tearing down older, more affordable housing and subdividing lots in order to build new expensive housing, however small/on smaller parcels of land. This will not mitigate exorbitant houses costs in 78702 because the location is now so desirable, developers can build micro units and sell them at the same price as a regular SFR. I only support density bonus awards to developers in cases where they are not destroying/tearing down existing SFR neighborhoods. These massive new developments need to stay on major arterial roads- please don't force them on SFRs in the middle of our neighborhoods.
1	With the possible exception of co-ops, my neighborhood (West Campus) is too expensive for a large segment of the population, and we end up with a segregated city.
1	There is a bottleneck for those households that make just over the max for affordable house assistance and good houses on the market. Don't give permits to builders with poor reputations. They are bidding at that cost because the poor quality of the materials and labor. Buyers know what builders to avoid and there is no choice but to get into bidding wars and make housing even less affordable for those households that make \$100,000 a year.
1	That gentrification is spreading to South Austin from East Austin...that the city is allowing condos to pop up all along south congress, and that eventually the tax burden will become so heavy, I'll have to leave the home I grew up in. Basically, what's happened to so many on the east side. Forcing out old minority families to make way for higher income wielding caucasians.

1	People - predominantly families of color - are no longer able to afford Austin and are being pushed out.
1	Not enough multi-family housing. It is legal to tear down a house, build a 2300sf detached home, and list it for \$680k. Building three smaller units instead would not be legal.
1	gentrification; blatantly white racist homeowners like my landlord who talk about "improving" the neighborhood when she really means getting rid of all of the black families living in it.
1	Austin was affordable when I grew up here in the 1960's through the 1990's.. City workers and retired military were able to afford centrally located single family residences. The idea that density is going to solve this problem is false. If density were the answer, then Manhattan, San Francisco and Paris would be the most affordable places to live and they are not. My greatest concern is that the COA planning dept. is made up of people that are unaware that no matter what is built as long as we have well educated people moving to Austin, this new housing will be sold/rented at market rates. How much do all the planning efforts cost the taxpayer? What are the result metrics for the cost of doing the neighborhood plans, Imagine Austin, and now CodeNext? UT has a great transportation system that has worked well since I went there in the 1970's. Copy that and apply it to areas with bad traffic. Don't try to change an entire industry (housing) to fix a transportation problem. Downtown is now a playground for rich millennials and their parents, not families. COA promised downtown would have lots of affordable units if we just built high rises and that has not happened. Downtown now looks like giant dorms and it is very institutional--most people don't want to live in a dorm or assisted living or some other place that takes away one's autonomy and connection to the land. And trying to duplicate what is north of the river on the south shore is ignoring why folks moved south since the history of Austin.
1	There is so little left. Complexes are getting bought up and turned from 750/mo apartments to \$1500/mo apartments with little to no warning for tenants. I'm a 7th gen Austinite, and I'm about to get priced out. I'm opening a business (craft beer industry), and zoning codes are making it impossible to put my shop in a location where customers live. I want artists and working class people to be able to live in my city, the way we always have. You must try harder.
1	There is no affordable housing in my neighborhood and I am unable to buy a house Even though I made \$38,000 a year. I'm terrified that I will eventually have to be forced to start a life outside of the city I love because of investors buying and renting out affordable housing and people moving from out of state that don't earn a living here.
1	Not affordable any more. It's ludicrous that the closest housing in a 20 minute commute costs \$1600
1	Lack of diversity of housing options - all options are either single-family (expensive) or mega apartment complexes. Mega apartment complexes are not good for families, especially if they are on busy roads. We need more fourplexes and 8-plexes like they have in San Antonio's old neighborhoods.
1	Demolition of current housing, we're losing all of the character that makes Austin Austin and replacing it with cheap development. Change code to allow for sharing economies, tiny homes, multi use zoning. We must get creative, not just eat the cost and give everything away to profit driven developers.
1	We have to live far from the city center because of affordability and schools. Would rather live closer to downtown in an urban neighborhood.
1	Long term effects (becoming Houston, for example). Some of the ways the wording was crafted: Should people who work in Austin be able to live in Austin?" Well, of course. But what does that mean
1	I'm more worried about property taxes becoming too burdensome on families. You buy in one income bracket and two years later your house is worth more and you can't afford the new mortgage payment!
1	That market rate affordable housing is less and less an option because we haven't allowed enough supply to meet demand.

1	Our district has large population of aging Austinites. Many if us are very concerned we will not be able to stay in the city long term.
1	My neighborhood is a good mix of homes, apartments, and trailers. My concern is all parts of the city have these options. Also, rents need to be controlled. The apartment we lived in upon arrival has gone up 200%
1	Escalation of taxes drives residents out of their homes. People should be grandfathered and taxes are way too high. The city especially the schools need to spend less or we need other sources of funding even a state income tax.
1	I don't think we should build more density in my neighborhood. It would threaten the character of the area.
1	There is NO affordable housing in my neighborhood. I think that unfortunately, most people in my neighborhood would be opposed to affordable housing options due to fears/discomfot.
1	there is hardly any. only a few section 8 complexes. they are building giant single family homes that cost 500k + that do not open up realistic housing options for the working poor or those in poverty. i want to see ALL AFFORDABLE units or at LEAST 50-75% Affordable Units - that is the only way i am agreeable to my tax dollars going into new permits or rushed permits. No more 2-3 "semi affordable for middle/upper middle class renters" in a HUGE space. Unacceptable.
1	Many of the single-family homes for low-income and/or elderly minority folks are rapidly disappearing as new development and gentrification have an ever increasing stronghold
1	Maintaining property values for housing not considered affordable. People shouldn't take a hit on their investment because affordable housing makes an area less appealing to buyers.
1	Ensuring the affordable housing is compatible in scale with the current neighborhood and does not drastically increase congestion/noise
1	The idea that you have to give extra incentives before requiring an affordability set aside. And that you seem to want arterial blight (affordable units only on busy streets). We already have arterial blight in Dove Spring, Quail Creek, etc.
1	I live in a neighborhood where housing is somewhat more affordable than other areas. I am an Austin native and lived in Mueller prior to my current residence. I left Mueller due to the lack of diversity and waning Austin vibe. I fear that before long only the rich and elite will be able to afford to live anywhere in Austin. Often times, even "affordable" housing is not affordable.
1	teardowns thaare rebuilt with boxmansions and drive up real estate. mine is one of the last affordable to me single family homes.
1	Rapid flipping of old housing stock to new luxury homes, depleting affordable units while erasing the neighborhood's history.
1	HIGH COST OF MEETING SILLY CITY CODES - SILLY CITY REGULATIONS - LET THE MARKET DECIDE WHAT HOMES TO BUILD AND HOW MANY AND HOW BIG OR SMALL
1	Squeezing the poor out of Austin, increasing commute time for them, traffic for all of us, increasing commute time for the poor, and decreasing access to social services in city neighborhoods
1	Most affordable housing segregates the families in lower socioeconomic levels and are usually seen as a burden because of all the gentrification and urban development from those of higher socioeconomic levels. I wish there was no housing segregation.

1	Increase in crime. My neighborhood is between two public housing developments, and there are always police and crime because of them
1	Affordable housing is only considered for people making less than 40k a year. Leaves out affordable housing for two income middle class families
1	high and rising property taxes will drive long-term middle class residents out of the city of Austin
1	I am middle class yet still live paycheck to paycheck due to costs of rent, car, bills, daycare, gas, food, medical. I wish there was affordable housing available for those that are not below the poverty line.
1	That low income folks won't have access as well as people of color. That only white developers will benefit as well as white construction companies and so on. That these affordable communities will only hire white staff from out of
1	That the burden is not shared equitably amongst all citizens. Inclusionary zoning exclusively for additional density in MF is borne by the residents of those projects that pay market rents. They are in effect, subsidizing the affordable resident. The responsibility and cost of affordable housing should be spread across all commercial property types; since they are also the beneficiaries of affordable housing for their workforce, customers, etc.
1	Existing affordable houses and apartments are being destroyed by the hundreds in favor of bigger, more expensive homes and multifamily complexes!! The city's so called concern about affordability is a farce! Only if much smaller numbers of "affordable" homes can be replaced with higher taxable and developer friendly buildings is this city's real concern!
1	That the difficulty of creative development in the city will continue to negatively impact affordability and drive up rents and real estate values.
1	My neighborhood is mostly single family homes on large lots, which are very expensive to purchase and to maintain, and even when rented, translates to higher costs.
1	There is not enough of it, and minimal transport options to get into the city or out of the suburb.
1	Poor quality and crime if affordable housing complexes are not well supported or maintained. The housing projects concept should be replaced with mixed income housing.
1	That it's too late for me and other middle classers to afford Austin. And fear for the future of my single adult son's well-being. Additionally, the elderly.
1	It is nonexistent! My boyfriend and I are middle class professionals who cannot afford to purchase a home here and can barely afford to rent. Worst of all, the clients I serve as a Clinical Social Worker cannot afford to live independently in Austin. Even those awarded housing vouchers are finding few options and vouchers are expiring. People remain homeless.
1	Mothers staying in situations of domestic violence because they cannot afford to leave is a real and urgent concern.
1	Until water and electric rates are affordable, affordable housing is a joke and the cart before the horse
1	upkeep. richer neighborhoods get better city maintenance and poorer neighborhoods are neglected by the city.
1	get a house, then taxes rise. my taxes now are 75% of my educator net salary. I've been loyal, but can't stay much longer

1	It will not actually be affordable and that it will only be available to those making 25k or less. So I won't still won't get any assistance.
1	Middle class families like me and my husband (a teacher and a social worker) are being pushed out of the city's core. Gentrification and the pushing out of historical residents is a HUGE issue in our east Austin neighborhood, and development continues to be wildly unaffordable.
1	There is no longer affordable housing in my neighborhood and long-time residents are losing their homes because taxes are increasing with the new developments
1	We need affordable housing for the poor AND for the middle class. It seems that there aren't options for people who are making 60-80,000 per year. Housing needs to be affordable for ALL
1	It is being allowed to disappear. Zoning & Code are allowing demolitions and the destruction of existing affordable housing-- the incentives to build more supposed affordable housing are usually giveaways to developers friendly to the city government-- that never produce the level of homes for those who need it at a truly affordable price.
1	That bias, lack of knowledge, and misunderstandings will limit or prevent affordable housing in my neighborhood (and in other areas).
1	Forcing regulations on builders in an effort to improve social engineering is not a good idea. The free market usually works out all the kinks in the system.
1	being taxed out of our own home: monthly now we pay as much in tax now as we did when we had a mortgage payment
1	Affordable housing typical means unsafe housing in ATX. It is only worth it being affordable if we can be safe.
1	Lack of "starter homes," property investors buying the few remaining affordable homes and flipping them/developing large homes that most first time buyers can't afford
1	Our neighborhood is being bought up by developers and these houses sit empty for years at a time. It is ruining the sense of community; I understand that people want to maximize their return when they sell their home, but the density of development needs to come with amenities like restaurants, shops, etc.
1	We are gentrifying our central neighborhoods at a rapid pace and losing any semblance of diversity.
1	I'm concerned that I'll soon be unable to afford housing here and I'll be forced to move further out of town, where I don't necessarily want to be.
1	Housing options that don't create a large standard of living gap for Austin residents, where only the wealthy and the extremely low income can live here.
1	Not enough. I cannot afford to send my kids to college and afford to live in Austin where I am from originally. I did not commute from California or any other state. I live in Austin and I cannot afford to live or buy a home in the Austin area and still put money away for my kids to attend college. Thanks Austin city council
1	I have lived in Bouldin Creek area for 56 years and NOW, I will be forced to sell because of very high taxes. My home will be torn down and an attached condo/TH will be built and each unit sold for \$1.1m each or higher. The City does care about locals, they only accommodate new citizens. These folks are not Austinites!

1	Affordable housing should be available to those who qualify however, if taxes continue to go higher what tax income is going to be able to afford to live in Austin? Not I.
1	My greatest concern is that affordable housing designations are not in perpetuity, and that property taxes driven up by gentrification and soaring property values will render even designated affordable housing into the realm of unaffordable for low-income residents.
1	The feasibility of it without driving up property taxes for those of us who are first time homeowners scraping by.
1	The quality of the building, maintaining the buildings, pushing people into townhouses and apartments who used to be able to live in their homes but now can't afford the property taxes in the area. "Affordable" is not affordable enough
1	My greatest concern is that neighborhood groups have too much power and sway at city council to prevent land owners in the neighborhood from building additional housing. The zoning laws are too strict.
1	Traffic congestion. It's so packed and more apartments are going up. It's taking longer and longer just to get out of my neighborhood. I35 at William Cannon and I35 at Slaughter can't take any more traffic in the morning.
1	The City should preserve existing Single Family Neighborhoods and stop making them unaffordable by adding density to them which drives up cost. If the city wants to experiment with dense, highrise housing projects they should do it in the vicinity of F1 and stop destroying and driving up the cost of existing single family neighborhoods by speculative rezoning for greater density
1	Austinites have trouble affording to stay in the city and are being out-priced for housing by people relocating here.
1	The continuing rising cost of housing, the unlikeliness of living in austin once I buy a home due to unaffordability
1	Would like to see affordable housing encompass all income levels, including middle class. The reality is that all but the very affluent are priced out of central Austin. We would have preferred to live south of 183 but ended up further out due to high housing prices
1	Home prices in my neighborhood have doubled in the past five years. This has made a modest, diverse neighborhood a place where working class families can no longer afford to live.
1	Crime. No problem with less skilled workers. Big problem supporting drug users, etc. that often come as part of low rent developments. Receiving rent reductions supported by city should include random drug testing.
1	That people of color and middle income earners are being pushed out of our neighborhood making it increasingly less diverse.
1	homes aren't worth the sale price. Homes in established middle-class neighborhoods are being lost to new, bigger, more expensive development.
1	Central Austin is becoming so expensive that although we have lived on our street for 10 years, we cannot afford to buy a house in our neighborhood (and can barely afford to rent). I really love our neighborhood, so it's kind of sad.
1	Whether affordable housing will be accessible to those with disabilities. And whether neighbors with home will welcome me or judge me.
1	I would like to buy property and own a house, but cannot afford to do so in a safe area. Prices for houses are out of control.

1	There just aren't many options unless you go outside the Austin area which then over populated the rural towns and makes them more expensive to live in too
1	There is nothing under 200k really. House hold income is 78k and I can't afford a house and Barely my tiny apartment. I would love to own but it's just insane now. I feel like people who make just alittle more are over look like myself
1	That soon it will be nonexistent. I live in Judges Hill and have been walking to work for ten years at UT and for the state, making less than \$40k or right around that. "Affordable" should included household incomes up to more like &60k. State workers have received no significant raises in YEARS.
1	The loss of socioeconomic diversity as prices rise and the ability for my children to be able to afford to live here when they move out in 20 years.
1	We need real permanent affordable housing, not units that revert to market rate when original tenants move out. We need also just need more units to bring market rents down. And we need more dedicated mass transit lanes.
1	My neighborhood is affordable, for now. But that's only because I had to move east of 183 for my most recent move.
1	rentals are expensive in Brentwood, and without any substantive tenant's rights, this is unlikely to change
1	It's not affordable. I35 still acts as a de fact red line and as more white people get pushed east, the people of color east get pushed even further out.
1	There isn't enough, and the housing that exists isn't held to the same standards of safety and comfort that other housing is
1	My greatest concern is that I will never be able to afford a home. I do not qualify as low income household because I make above \$40,000. The middle income families are also being displaced or forced to move further away from the city. This causes more traffic and congestion on the roadways.
1	Inflated property values based on bullshit that are causing people to move because they can't afford the property taxes
1	Being able to be close to work and local stores while living in a house that is affordable to my income in the city of austin
1	Valuations sky rockets resulting in higher taxes. Investors buying up properties to use as rentals or Airbnb type rentals making the neighborhood less like a neighborhood. People that work here can no longer to live here. People building ridiculous McMansions.
1	Getting pushed to the further reaches of town increasing my commute and lowering my quality of life, *especially* when that directly impacts how and where I can see friends
1	Living in apartments SUCKS, renting rooms in houses is really the only option if you are low income. I hope the property taxes do not go up in areas with lots of small houses.
1	Gentrification-pushing people of color out of Austin. Access to public transportation. (I do not have a car).
1	That this survey, and the conversation about affordability, does not define what affordable means.
1	I am worried that my taxes will get too high and I won't be able to afford my home. I don't want to pay taxes to payfor affordable housing for others.

1	Quality Public School for my child in an area where I can afford to pay rent. As a single parent and POA for an elderly grantparent living in South Austin means living in a suburb of austin is too far. I live central IRS area, less than five blocks from work three miles from my grandparent and 15 minutes to my daughter school (in downtown Austin during traffic). However I pay for the conveniences in my rent \$1350 a month and I do not know how I will afford my rent next year without my daughters quality of life suffering.
1	Gentrification. People are being pushed out of their homes and very little has been done to address this. Even people with decent paying jobs are suffering. It seems like all the City cares about are the people with high paying tech jobs.
1	We have a relatively high proportion of subsidized rental housing. Our ability to have a mix of incomes is limited because for so many of our units, you have to be poor to live in them.
1	That there isn't enough. I appreciate income diversity within a neighborhood. Our communities and society is better off when we are not segregated by class/wealth.
1	Its integration is often very poor - affordability too often results in poor design and poor construction, naturally producing more NIMBYism. We need APPROPRIATE affordable housing, and services nearby to help those living there to do well.
1	Traditionally affordable units are being pped and rents overall are increasing at a much faster rate than incomes. Diversity of housing options is becoming more limited.
1	I think that apartment complexes often do minimal cosmetic upgrades as a way to increase the cost of rent and pass the upgrade expenses to tenants. I think that there should be a cap for rent increase percentages.
1	I'm offended by the City pushing a viewpoint on us with no peer studies to support their information. You cannot address the issues of affordability simply through land use. as for transit WHAT transit.
1	Even in my neighborhood association, Pecan Springs/Springdale Hills NA, was opposed to the Ryan Corps. affordble housing community currently being built at Rogge/Springdale. They wanted groundfloor retail in teh development, whereas the developers couldnt make the numbers work on their end to allow this to happen. I think the City needs to do a better job of educating NAs about affordable housing and how much they are needed, even if the developer is not able to provide all of the bells and whistles that the neighborhood assoc. demands. To me, affordable housing is more important for our neighborhood than having ground floor retail in that development (retail will follow when there are enough roofs to support the businesses, IMO).
1	Getting enough affordable housing with the limitations of an environmentally sensitive district AND getting transit service to the affordable housing we already have.... Southwest Trails and Homestead Oaks
1	I have a master's degree and I can't afford my own place in Austin. Rent is out of control even for young professionals
1	Austin must allow housing supply first in order to obtain affordable housing options. Don't limit the incentives to taller buildings and less parking for projects on corridors to just affordable housing. Needs to be for all housing.
1	restrictive zoning and land uses that limit both the size and number of homes that can be built on one lot. Lot size limits are also a problem.
1	Many houses are empty the majority of the year due to being short term rentals. These could be long term rentals and help Austin's housing problem.
1	there isn't any, persons are displaced from living in the woods as these affordable new high rises bring in less diversity and

	move everyone out to the country or just in the streets as is happening. Without sect 8, I would be one of them.
1	Only high dollar multifamily facilities are being built nowadays in 78701-78704. More affordable housing MUST be incentivised or MORE transportation alternatives should be funded to get downtown from the outskirts.
1	My concern is the definition of "affordable." I am positive that people in my neighborhood make less than \$40,000/year - it is more likely about \$25-30,000/year. My concern is that they will be pushed out of the neighborhood in an effort to make more "affordable" housing for other populations.
1	The City needs to offer tax vouchers for municipal and local school employees. I own a house in central a East Austin which I bought for \$130k, and which I could barely afford to stay in because property taxes were so high. And I know they pay my salary. But I tutored kids in my neighborhood, knew my neighbors, and was involved in my community. That neighborhood is now home to several high-frequency Airbnb listings and few local, infrastructural people. I miss living there. Fortunately for my cost of living, I married an aging yuppie who bought a house in Allandale in the '90s. But I could never afford to live here otherwise. If I was renting, still, I'd be fucked.
1	Neighbors who oppose any new housing developments because they don't want Austin to change from how it was when they bought their homes.
1	Long time Austinites having to leave Austin because they can't afford it. People from other states moving into their places just because they have money. Austin's long time history and culture being lost.
1	Just make affordable housing already. Not everyone who moves here comes from a big city or city that is increasing in size by the day. Not everyone is used to this and not everyone wants to have roommates. Why have my kids in another city while I'm in the city so that I can make it in this city before their arrival? Why am I able to afford a 2 bedroom nice apartment on the nice side of town in another city for \$700-\$800 for my kids and I but in Austin I have a studio close to 1k? I am looking for a second job so that I can afford to have my kids here, too. How the hell is that fair? And I have an Associates degree right now. That is not fair. I lived in California before, and I never had issues like this!
1	I don't have a concern about increased affordable housing. It will make for a safer more inclusive neighborhood for all when people without homes have access to a roof over their heads (access to affordable housing should be a human right, not something for the privileged).
1	That increasing property taxes are determining who can stay in their homes, even among middle income residents and especially among long-term residents. This breaks up communities, displaces people, and can have so many other undesirable ramifications, including stress.
1	the influence of the mueller development causing a general cost of living increase in windsor park
1	Developers raising prices and driving up property taxes, also resulting in existing apartments and unit housing being expensive
1	Low-cost apartments nearby leave a lot of litter in the street and on the sidewalk. We also have crime problems that seem to come in part from residents of those apartments.
1	Landlords in my neighborhood seem to take advantage of the rapid changes and declining affordability by taking advantage of tenants in affordable housing and providing them with substandard living conditions.
1	My greatest concern regarding affordable housing in my neighborhood is that affordable is not affordable enough.
1	That I will not be able to afford rent when it is time to renew my lease and will have to move again.

1	I currently live in one of the more "affordable" apartments in Austin and I am usually very concerned with the upkeep and maintenance of my dwelling. I've been days without water and weeks without hot water this year alone. If that is acceptable, then it sets a precedent for what I can expect from similar locations and that makes me very worried. So, my greatest concern is that the owners of these affordable properties are held accountable for making sure their residents have the basic necessities that other members of the city receive without a second thought.
1	We are tearing it down to build luxury housing. Awesome developments nearby are raising property taxes.
1	Austin has a major housing problem if a working family cannot afford a reasonable home in a good school district.
1	It's getting bought out by higher income individuals causing rent to go up significantly in an area that is rapidly becoming gentrified. This is causing lower income individuals and families to be pushed out farther from work and the city where public transportation isn't adequate.
1	There are not enough affordable rental options near bus routes and transit. There seems to be plenty of space relegated to parking that I just wish would go to housing for those of us without cars. Can I live in your extra parking space please?
1	I am concerned the property value will rise at such a sharp rate that many people won't be able to afford living in the area. Low and mid-income residents will steadily be pushed further and further from the entertainment/businesses downtown.
1	Need more of it, esp. smaller options, without adding a lot of parking. The city should not require any parking, esp. for projects in the central city.
1	That people who have long lived in the neighborhood will not be able to afford property taxes. That property tax will be a financial strain for us.
1	Affordable housing lacks a good definition. Affordable for the single early earner, elderly, married couple, new family, etc.. We need to decide what we are trying to solve versus just an income level.
1	My concern isn't specifically my neighborhood. Friends and Long time Austin residents are getting taxed out of their homes throughout the city. property taxes should have a capped % increase per year.
1	That my neighbors won't be able to afford the homes they've lived in for decades. I am young and can sacrifice, but the people who are elderly and have no one are being forced to leave their homes.. Austin needs to value the people who built Austin.
1	There is not enough of it and we are losing the affordable rental options we have had historically.
1	that the neighborhood will not embrace it because it is "not in character" with existing development
1	That families who have created communities in these neighborhoods are being forced out by high property taxes; that this burden to move to Buda, Pflugerville, etc., and commute into the city is falling on people who have been residents for longer and the benefit of living in this awesome city built by those folks is being enjoyed only by newer residents who can afford to pay for homes and even 1 or 2 years' rent upfront in cash. I'm seeing families move out of my neighborhood all the time to move to a "suburb" where they can afford to own and we are losing a whole community and work force.
1	The lack of affordability in Austin is very troubling. Housing costs have more than tripled. WORKING POOR individuals, such as myself, struggle to find a decent place to live.
1	Rents keep going up every year & options are limited. I would love to buy a house but was priced out of the market. If this problem is not addressed, Austin will become a city only for the elite.


1	Neighborhood Associations campaigning against density along the South Shore of Town Lake. 78701 and surrounding postcodes need denser housing close to the core
1	Nothing, There has always been neighborhoods that are not affordable for all, and that is fine with me.
1	It doesn't exist, closest bus stop is 2 miles away; Austin is now only for WASPs, the city council doesn't care about the indigent
1	I'm afraid that preserving single family zoning in my neighborhood will ensure that low income families will never be able to move back in.
1	I would like to live somewhere affordable and have a sense of stability. As a renter I strongly dislike having to move every year or so and having to put up with constant invasions of privacy from my property management, who are doing renovations on my house without my approval (and which will no doubt lead to a considerable increase in the cost of rent next year.)
1	Changing landscape of neighborhood by people who have no interest or concern for the community living here. Investors are buying homes who haven't even visited here and evicting tenants for higher rents
1	Balance of quality housing options. Bringing poor quality affordable housing with no integration of multi-level incomes will result in unkept communities.
1	The homes in my neighborhood of 78702 are nowhere near affordable and property taxes have sky rocketed making it hard for long-time residents to stay in their homes.
1	Those of us that make over 40k and under 75k are left out of the "affordable" bracket and can't qualify for affordable housing, but can't afford to pay for a down payment or qualify for traditional options...there's a huge gap in neighborhoods for middle class workers
1	Don't allow it to support shoddy construction firms to make money on high rises that are poorly built and barn-raised
1	High taxes pushing me out of affordability after i buy a "affordable" condo/house, safety and quality of neighborhood
1	I live at Mueller in an affordable condo. I think the new multifamily properties should be required to provide MORE affordable units as well as HOUSING FIRST and PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING units.
1	I will no longer be able to afford a 1 bedroom apartment on my retirement income in a city that has been my home for 50 years.
1	It's completely unaffordable and almost impossible for a family making a middle class salary to buy a home in my neighborhood.
1	My neighborhood is rapidly gentrifying and it doesn't seem like a lot is being done to preserve affordability or culture on the East Side.
1	developers tearing down to build massive, expensive homes. Lack of easy and affordable options for building ADUs due to cost and permits
1	Although I make a decent salary it is becoming more and more difficult to afford housing in my children's school districts.
1	The TOTAL MYTH that density increases affordability. Anyone at COA heard of Manhattan? Wake up! Serve your taxpayers!

1	that's there's not enough in older richer neighborhoods because they have the political clout to force it in poorer areas where there already is plenty
1	The lack of "starter homes" available for purchase. We would like to own a home, but with the cost of living already so high, and house prices increasing dramatically, I'm not sure we'll ever be able to afford to buy a house in Austin.
1	That neighborhood politics gets in the way of the greater good for Austin. I feel like a lot of older Hyde Park homeowners would fight tooth and nail to prevent more affordable options to come into the neighborhood. The city as a whole needs to make a decision on what's important, and radical neighborhood activists should not have the power to override the decisions of the city as a whole.
1	If I sold now I would have to move to Pflugerville to find something affordable, which I don't want to do.
1	There is no affordable housing in my neighborhood. Austin over-incentivised, over-promoted, and oversold...now longtime residents are paying the price.
1	Not dispersed. Big complexes don't work. It needs to be integrated throughout single family neighborhoods, in every neighborhood. Small complexes are important
1	I don't like what I've been seeing in regards to lower-income families being pushed out of neighborhoods they've lived in. They've established a community and it's not fair that (due to circumstances outside of their control) they are being pushed out.
1	That there isn't enough of it. Also, much of what claims to be "affordable" housing is actually not very "affordable".
1	That there are no regulations on rent increases and people are getting pushed out to the suburbs. If you already struggling to pay rent and can't afford reliable personal transportation - how are you supposed to get to work on time to make the money to pay your rent? I am also concerned that if affordable housing is not required to be well-built and done in a manner that complements the architecture style and design of the surrounding neighborhood, that it could become stigmatized. Denver, CO has beautifully integrated affordable housing that people don't even realize has income restrictions until they look up those properties online and learn they do not qualify to live there.
1	That developers will use "affordable housing" to destroy our neighborhood character and "quality of life" amenities as laid out in our neighborhood plan.
1	That I will be pushed out of my neighborhood year after year until my commute is 45 minutes to an hour because I have to live so far away.
1	Brand new houses being built that are unaffordable for those already living in the community and a lack of safe & stable affordable housing
1	The rate of change. New unaffordable development is coming in faster than city code is being implemented.
1	rent going up unchecked to point I would have to move because I can no longer afford the rent at my current place
1	Developers are building for their own profit: tearing down good houses and building bigger single family homes they can sell for \$1M. I'd love to see "small homes on small lots", and "a percentage" of tall condos be affordable, but define small, and what percentage? I don't trust the developers care what's good for the city in view of their own profits.
1	COA agenda will crowd out and destroy single family homes with yards and trees and air that is so important to quality of life for families with children. One of the many reasons high rise "affordable" housing projects often become slums filled with

	conflict and crime is the stacking of persons in little boxes on top of each other with little or no safe open space to run, play stretch and breathe. Imagine you and your whole extended family confined to your house for a week, much less years!! And if it isn't totally desirable with your own family, how desirable with total strangers?
1	no preservation of older structures which is generally more affordable housing. also, we're missing middle housing stock around here. single family housing reigns supreme.
1	My neighborhood is rapidly gentrifying, home prices and rent prices are skyrocketing, and the people who have lived there for decades can no longer afford their houses. I am part of this problem!
1	That all of it is forced to go on major roadways instead of back on the quieter streets. Low income people should not all be forced to live on major arteries to serve as human shields against noise and pollution for the wealthy owners of single family homes behind them. They deserve places to live throughout every neighborhood even (especially?) if that mean building small apartment buildings nestled among single family houses.
1	not where i live now (san marcos) but when i was looking for a home to buy in austin, there was NOTHING available to me. NOTHING. NOTHING. NOTHING AT ALL. i had very low expectations and very few needs. my budget was around the 130K mark. as a single mother with two children, what am i supposed to do? i'll tell you what i'm supposed to to...live in san marcos. SURPRISE!!!! THAT'S NOT AUSTIN, FOLKS.
1	That NHCD manages it so poorly that \$ is wasted and there isn't a prioritization for those in greatest need.
1	The increases in property tax each year due to quickly increasing home values. I may be priced out of my own home soon.
1	We need to ensure that affordable housing can also serve Austin residents who have extremely low incomes, criminal backgrounds and previous rental debts. Affordable housing should include "deeply affordable" housing for very low to no income residents with housing vouchers and/or alternative means for payment
1	It will push me out of the only neighborhood I can afford/afford to commute to work from as I make only slightly more than the \$40k cutoff but not enough to live anywhere else within Austin.
1	Families being priced out - landlords raising rents too high too quickly and sharp increases in property taxes
1	People who serve their communities, especially when they serve in the public sector, should be able to afford to live in those communities.
1	biggest concern is whom ever is renting/selling will not understand the buyers problems and could not help them. also old houses is not being built up for the better
1	Not enough affordable options for low-income individuals, especially those with barriers, such as criminal backgrounds, poor credit scores, eviction history, etc.
1	It doesn't exist. Houses start at \$400k. My boyfriend and I both work as engineers and we can't afford to buy a house, let alone someone who didn't have the advantages we had in getting an education/jobs.
1	Administrative barriers and neighborhood activists saying NO to new types of housing in "their" neighborhood. No one should have to jump through months or years of hoops to build a home in Austin.
1	Dont put the tax burden on the tax payer, makes austin less affordable. Make the development process easier, and faster so that we can build to the demand. Our biggest problem is there is no housing stock and that inflates prices.


1	In my neighborhood, the smaller, more affordable housing units are being used for STRs or they are being torn down and replaced with overlarge single-family houses for high-income people. I live where I live because of the good public schools, access to bus routes, and proximity to jobs in central Austin. However, the people moving in are not using public transportation and not using the public school system--which means a prime site for lower and middle income families is being taken away and given to wealthier people, and people who need these services are being pushed out where the services are not as good.
1	maintaining reasonable rent rates. I have been in the same complex for five years & rent goes up \$50-\$100 each year. Likely the last year I can afford to live there. Being close to public transportation is also important, but transportation from east to west & vice versa in the city is not great- takes me an hour plus two transfers to get to work, when the drive is only 10 min. This is likely the last year I can afford to live there. Being close to public transportation is important too, but there needs to be reform on transportation going east to west & vice versa. Takes an hour and 2 transfers to get to work, when the drive is only 10 min.
1	None really, austin needs more. But better it's dispersed with other income levels. Lots of cheap rent in one area can lead to safety concerns
1	Affordable housing for the working class and service industry is necessary for cultural vitality of a city.
1	so much concerns me.Keeping the artists and musicians here, we pour the rich people's coffee.Even if there is affordable housing the resale value later on down the line is cut so I've heard.Plus too many i know got affordable places but tgen the next year the taxes rose do high its unrealistic. Plus even if you can afford an expensive condo those people ARE NOT GONNA USE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

20. Who should be eligible to purchase or rent affordable housing that is subsidized or incentivized by the City of Austin? Please choose the household income that best answers the question.



Value	Percent	Count
Under \$10,000	3.1%	27
Under \$20,000	5.8%	51
Under \$30,000	14.5%	128
Under \$40,000	30.5%	269
Under \$50,000	35.6%	314
Greater than \$50,000 per year	10.5%	93
Total		882

21. Please rate on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning not at all likely and 10 meaning very likely, your likelihood to support legislation or ordinances promoting affordable housing.



Value	Percent	Count
Not at all likely 1	4.6%	41
2	0.9%	8
3	1.8%	16
4	1.6%	14
5	4.6%	41
6	3.4%	30
7	6.6%	59
8	10.7%	95
9	10.3%	92
Very likely 10	55.6%	495
Total		891

22. Do you have any ideas for creating affordable housing in Austin?

Count	Response
1	A few were already mentioned. Add rent controlled units.
1	ADU s, requirements for developers that they can't just pay their way out of
1	Affordable housing must be developed IN CONJUNCTION WITH transit planning.
1	Affordable housing should be across the city and easy to find.
1	Affordable must be defined as including ELI households - targets or set-asides
1	Allow Group Residential or cooperative housing in more zoning categories
1	Allow a lot more housing to be built all over the city by changing zoning to support it.
1	Allow higher building, reduce parking requirements, allow higher density, eliminate setbacks
1	Allow house structures to be built on smaller size lots with houses already on them.
1	Allow more ADUs
1	Allow multi-development (tiny houses) on properties sloted for single housing development.
1	Allow multiple tiny houses per city lot.
1	Allow relaxation of rules and restrictions regarding tiny homes (especially ones on wheels)
1	Allow smaller lots for developers pricing homes in the central city at or below \$300000.
1	Allow smaller plot sizes.
1	Better public transportation
1	Bonds to pay for what the market won't.
1	Build more Cooperative Housing
1	Build more, more densely.
1	Builders should purchase land and build good quality homes & price them at a affordable price.
1	Building a diverse housing types.
1	Cap rental rates. Capitalism needs some checks and balances.
1	Capping the amount of rent increases each year
1	Change current codes to allow tiny homes to be built in residents backyards if they so desire.
1	Charge for use of Zilker Park...like a day pass per
1	Charge property tax for businesses and churches.
1	City must stop passing laws which raise the cost of living in Austin.
1	City needs to focus on solution stop passing the problem to the group who occupies City Hall.
1	CoA should buy the land
1	Communities made up of smaller homes for small households.
1	Consider conversions of vacant commercial buildings, creating rent controlsio
1	Continue to allow for efficient permitting for new developments
1	Convert 70s style apartment buildings into condos
1	Cooperative communities
1	Cooperatization of private property(-ies)

1	Cost of land drives the price up more than the structure...could buyers just buy the structure?
1	Create a housing glut.
1	Create apartments for musicians with practice space and music venue attached
1	Create apartments with rates that can be frozen for several years.
1	Create incentives for new residential buildings to have affordable units.
1	Create tax incentives for developers.
1	Decrease minimum lot size; see Missing Middle lectures done recently by Imagine Austin
1	Density and mixed income. Art space for artists.
1	Diminish the greedy development which is displacing East Austin communities
1	Dissolve the ANC
1	Don't destroy the quality of long established Austin neighborhoods. Please.
1	Don't only build along major highways
1	Ease building codes to allow for more ADU's, garage apts, and tiny homes.
1	Eliminate all the red tape with the city.
1	Eliminate: SF zoning, min parking, compatibility requirements
1	Eminent domain.
1	Enact stricter slumlord ordinances
1	Encourage both cooperative housing and the construction and renting of tiny homes!
1	Enforce rent control
1	Ensure access to healthy groceries, improve public transit options
1	Every single housing development must include affordable housing.
1	Expanding on the mobile loaves and fishes idea for Community First
1	Find some land, build affordable housing on it.
1	Fix the roads. Then we could have more living options.
1	Focusing more on creating affordable housing than creating luxury skyscrapers.
1	Follow the model of the amazing nonprofit, Foundation Communities!
1	GET GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE WAY - LET THE FREE MARKET MEET THE HOUSING DEMAND
1	GIVE LANDLORDS INCENTIVES, DROP THE BOX ON RENTAL APPS, RENT FREEZES
1	Get Christian organizations involved.
1	Granny flats, additional dwellings
1	Higher taxes for landlords who refuse to offer affordable housing.
1	I have no suggestions at this time.
1	I wish I did
1	I wish I did.
1	I wish I did...
1	I would recommend connecting with organizations like BCL of Texas
1	I'd like to see affordable housing expanded and targeted at education employees.

1	I'm sorry, but no, I don't.
1	Improve permitting and laws to allow more granny flats
1	Improve transportation, offer incentives for school employees, city, etc
1	Improve vacant properties
1	Improved roads and built on the outskirts.
1	In All Neighborhoods
1	Incentives for Developers
1	Incentives for affordable housing developers, educating landlords
1	Incentives for builders
1	Incentives for locall-owned development companies/builders - more invested in city as a whole
1	Incentives to developers who render conditional ratio proportional units
1	Incentivize developers that are successful; sub size people to stay in their homes
1	Incentivizing cooperative housing
1	Include musicians specifically as well as teachers in these ordinances
1	Inclusionary zoning, incentives and bonuses, missing middle options
1	Increase density and allow for smaller dwelling sizes
1	Increase supply of all housing.
1	Increase supply or lower demand.
1	Increased awareness that ordinary citizens have an impact. (Better PR)
1	Increased density and access to public transit would together make it a more viable option
1	Jobs that pay a living wage
1	Landlords stop being so greedy
1	Legislate rent increases for current residents at apartments
1	Less expensive high rise condos and better public transportation
1	Less kitschy yuppie-targeted developments
1	Lessen exclusionary zoning of Manufactured Housing and allow taller Multi-Family construction
1	Let the people who've been living here, live here like the people that are moving here.
1	Light rail
1	Little detached houses
1	Low interest loans; assistance with down payments;
1	Lower property taxes & tax income instead!
1	Lower property taxes. people are getting priced out of their homes based on property taxes alone.
1	Lower the cost of building housing in the central city where people want to live.
1	Luxury Taxes
1	Maintain what we already have. Rio lado has been waiting
1	Make it for people who make 90k or less in household
1	Make it mandatory in apartment buildings and other developments.

1	Make it part of all new development.
1	Mandatory inclusive zoning. Decent public transportation. Equitable quality in schools.
1	Micro Apartments
1	Missing Middle Density Bonus Systemmm on all single family lots
1	Mixed Use High Rise Building Dense
1	Mixed income.housing developments. Many major cities do this.
1	Modify choose enforcement which penalizes people who but older homes and DIY homeowners.
1	Moratorium on East Austin condos and use underenrolled campuses for teacher housing.
1	Moratorium on luxury condos. Reduction of permits available for reconstruction to new tenants in
1	More Tiny homes
1	More co-ops. Better mass transit and biking options.
1	More density options/improvements for detached homes - the recent ADU changes are a great start.
1	More downtown density, taller buildings
1	More housing co-ops, cohousing communities, etc.
1	More housing cooperatives
1	More housing supply in the core of Austin.
1	More multi-family developments with easy access to public transportation
1	More multi-unit or apartment buidings
1	More multiple family units
1	More row houses, turn the old Brackenridge Hospital into affordable housing for single adults.
1	More small loans for businesses/homeowners
1	More tiny home communities
1	More townhouse/rowhouse architecture
1	Mueller model...did it work?
1	Multi-unit buildings that are NOT luxury condos.
1	N/A
1	Need some kind of rent control. Places charge whatever they want and it is absolutely ridiculous
1	Need to do it through increased entitlements not taxes or "incentives"
1	Negatively advertise life in Austin.
6	No
1	No socialism.
1	No, I'll leave that to the experts
1	No, but there's a huge need for wheelchair accessible housing
1	No. But I wish I did. I trust you all to do the right thing.
1	No. Much respect to the brains and creativity that goes into planning.
1	Nope
2	Not at the moment

1	Not letting apartments charge as much as they please for less than adequate apartments
1	Pass legislation to make flipping homes harder.
1	Passing laws that prohibit landlords from discriminate against tenants.
1	Pay people better
1	Permits, and requiring builders to have certain number of affordable units
1	Prevent artificial price inflation.
1	Promote homeowner involvement in creating infill affordable housing options through ADUs
1	Proport tax exemptions for landlords owning less than 3 rental properties
1	Quit raising property taxes
1	Quit tearing down affordable housing to build McMansions
1	REDUCE TIME AND RED TAPE FOR BUILDING PERMITS
1	Reduce Costs associated with city regulation and taxes.
1	Reduce parking requirements, allow more infill development. please please please
1	Reduce rental criteria / income guidelines
1	Reform property tax system
1	Remove barriers to density and allow more construction
1	Rent on a sliding scale.
1	Rent caps & limiting of rent increases for long term renters
3	Rent control
1	Rent control in certain areas of the city.
1	Rent control, incentives for artists to help maintain the culture that is here
1	Rent control, please.
1	Rent controls and small houses on private property
1	Rent controls, no tax breaks for corporations
1	Rent to own, assistance with down payments and closing costs.
1	Replace property tax with Land Value Tax
1	Require ALL new developments to include a percentage of affordable units
1	Require a greater percentage of affordable units per development if they receive tax subsidies
1	Require higher wages from employers;
1	Require more 2BR and 3BR apartments, change incentive rules from unit-based to sq ft-based.
1	Sadly no
1	Senior citizen, disabilities, low income families
1	Set up a REIT and get the City in the real estate investment business
1	Should be available in areas around schools
1	Slow the rate of change where it is still affordable until we figure it out.
1	Smaller houses on smaller lots
1	Smaller houses on smaller lots; rail for affordable/alternative transportation & access

1	Smaller self contained self sufficient homes spread throughout ALL parts of the city
1	Solve transporatation, less car dependent, equals density and affordability.
1	Stop advertising Austin and Texas in California!
1	Stop allowing the 3000 sf monster condos.
1	Stop allowing/promoting the gentrification of East and South Austin.
1	Stop income discrimination.
1	Stop pandering to short term renters due to tech boom
1	Stop requiring parking. Allow more options on smaller lots.
1	Stop subsidizing. Allow more density.
1	Stop turning areas zoned for housing into business sectors. Put a cap on propertytax.
1	Subterranium building
1	Supply. Let more housing types be built in more zoning districts
1	Sure
1	Tax churches
1	Tax credits for lower income households
1	Tax incentives for contractors that are building affordable housing
1	Tax income instead of property.
1	Tax the 1%!!!
1	The city itself should build and manage affordable housing. It could turn a profit.
1	The city should allow for smaller homes to be built, like a tiny home.
1	There needs to be mandated affordable housing in all high rise dwellings.
1	Throw out the tax credit model and have city owned and run properties
1	Tiny homes, incentives for landlords and big developer
1	Tiny homes, tax breaks per percentage of "rent-controlled" apartments
1	Tiny house communties
1	Unfortunately, no.
1	Upzone central Austin
1	We need many more "missing middle" housing options—rowhouses, etc.
1	We've had incentives before, not sure they will be enforced
1	What do larger cities do?
1	Wish that I did!
1	Work on housing and transportation at the same time.
1	Yes
1	Yes but cannot put it into this little window. 512-431-9665 for more
1	Yes, slow down growth Quit promoting the City
1	Yes. \$700 per month in taxes on top of a mortgage is not affordable.
1	Yes. Fix the traffic problem first.

1	Yes. In high rise buildings, have some affordable apartments, too--not just/only luxury condos.
1	Yes. Just make it affordable.
1	all of the above - there is no one size fits all solution
1	allow denser development!
1	allow micro homes to use housing vouchers
1	build more city centers instead of messing with my neighborhood. look toward IH 130 or hutto
1	build more public housing
1	build more units and work with the development community to lower household housing costs
1	built more missing middle housing. lessen parking requirements and other silly things.
1	charge more for new water meters
1	city city regulation!!!!!!!!
1	co-ops, group homes
1	community land trusts
1	constitutional amendmen to allow different valuation for affordable housing.
1	continue to encourage mixed income developments, throughout all parts of austin
1	create housing for fist timers more better
1	density and proximity matter
1	density instead of sprawl
1	do not provide tax incentives to corporate developers
1	don't be greedy
1	don't let Austin become Dallas
1	engage more single family property owners in providing affordable ADUs on their properties
1	establish a new tax on homes that are not occupied for longer than 3 months/yr.
1	forbid parking lots w no building on top
1	granny flats as an option
1	have more affordable housing downtown
1	i feel the city should set the rates as per the income of the individual
1	improve permitting process, allow more infill
1	improve transportation to remote areas
1	improved timing of LOCAL ROUTES on CapMetro!
1	income tax
1	just do it. people need to get over the fear of multifamily housing and renters.
1	land trusts, housing projects
1	limit population growth
1	limits on property taxes and other factors that contribute to rental rates sky rocketing.
1	living wage
1	lot splitting

1	lower property taxes
1	make it harder for out of state investors to flip houses for profit
1	making development costs lower and faster
1	mixed housing downtown
1	mixed use neighborhoods, walkable communities, proximity to stores/bus lines for everyone
1	moratorium on increase in property taxes
1	more ADUs (and less restrictions on them), lower taxes, more incentives for builders
1	more CLT homes
1	more accessory dwelling units in neighborhoods
1	more affordable housing in high demand areas (less expensive condos)
1	more tax incentives for developers, builders, funding for nonprofits
1	more tiny homes on big lots - mobile home style, but with shared living spaces
1	n/a
1	need more affordable, accessible and integrated housing for people with disabilities.
1	need more housing that helps old people and disabled afford it
1	need to be integrated into current neighborhoods not just added on as appendages
10	no
1	none
1	nope
1	not foundation community... they won't rent to criminal history
1	offset all money to this effort by decreasing other city budget items.
1	planned developments like the new Mobile Loaves and Fishes village, tiny homes
1	preservation- rent control
1	properties that offer a lot of affordable efficiency apartments
1	provide housing stipends to City of Austin employees
1	public private partnerships
1	quit gentrifying!!!!
1	removal of building code barriers such as minimum lot or building size and parking requirements
1	rent control
1	rent control ordinance, mixed type of living spaces
1	require a % in any new development or re-development
1	require from developers
1	roll back appraisals and tax rates so the houses we already have are affordable
1	school tax credits for teachers
1	seek to hire a more diverse work force and improve wages
1	senior-specific properties, incentives for existing apartments to offer affordable rates
1	small built housing, less condos

1	small houses
1	smaller lots
1	stop approving permits for luxury housing projects
1	stop tearing down old homes and building more expensive ones.
1	target bringing down construction costs
1	tax incentives in exchange for capped rent increases
1	the city has had ample opportunity to make developers participate. Why didn't you?
1	tiny houses
1	upzoning
1	utilize vacant public land
2	yes
1	yes quite building condons downtown that no one can afford.
1	yes stop the development and influx of folks from other states
1	zone and permit for efficiency apartments scattered throughout town
1	Require new developments of a certain size to include a fixed percentage of affordable units either for rent or purchase
1	improve the roads so that lower income people can access jobs in the city but live outside the city where housing is more affordable
1	Lower rent options for those of us who don't require a parking space and housing that doesn't require each unit to have a space.
1	My analysis shows that you can reach affordability through increased density. This survey only talks about incentives and increased taxes to subsidize affordable housing. there are other more attractive ways to achieve affordability.
1	80/20 program like in nyc. You must have proof of full time employment no criminal record and rent is based on your income so price is within the means of whoever is eligible
1	Stop allowing developers to put in very expensive condos in formerly affordable neighborhoods there
1	Allow more tiny homes and lower the restrictions on setting up RVs/mobile homes/trailers on private property.
1	Allow for construction of ADUs, more rigorous standards for developer incentives (80% MFI ain't affordable!), demolition moratoriums on flips of habitable old stock, ordinances and funding in support of community land trusts/co-ops/non-profit development and housing management, a time machine.
1	We need more permanent supportive housing, multi-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, and in general a better social safety net for people living in Austin.
1	1. Remove parking requirements 2. Make UT provide housing for students 3. The City should build more housing projects like Rosewood Courts or Santa Rita Courts 4. Allow small apt complexes in single family zoned areas (within reason)
1	increasing supply, programs that support buyers who intend to live in the home, incentivizing developers to build more affordable single family homes (not more luxury homes)

1	City encouragement of variety of housing options: garage apartments, micro homes, duplex, triplex, repurposing of existing buildings to residential close to transit routes. Higher density of units towards urban core.
1	Allow for greater density without parking requirements and allow tiny units (450 sq ft or less) to be built in neighborhoods and along transit corridors. Community land trusts to preserve existing housing.
1	Don't allow investment properties. The latest rules should help with the number of people buying up real estate to rent on sites like airbnb
1	Something similar to Mueller development, which includes energy efficiency; maybe lower property taxes for neighborhoods that keep their own crime rate low; incentives for our police officers to live in Austin may be beneficial.
1	DEFINE Affordable, please. Always subsidized? It just affordable to the average working Joe? Affordable to me mess prices are not skyrocketing bc of new development driving up prices and running out people.
1	A lot of the problems are out of the city's powers to control. Too many people have a vested interest in the market being too skewed toward sellers.
1	Allow for more missing middle infill, remove minimum parking requirements, and delete FAR from the vocabulary. Allow developers to build taller structures, particularly on core corridors.
1	Yes, we need transitional units where people can live while they get their feet under them, these transitional units may be temporary but should allow for families to save and work toward something better. Things like water and electricity should be free in these units and families need case management.
1	Make zoning to allow multiple small house on a lot, for example the senior housing at 21st and salina, shotgun row at 12th and airport, community first village, etc. Disincentivize and enforce rules to prevent developers from tearing down historic houses; incentivize them to build small houses.
1	Better mass transportation so people can live outside of the major city but still use mass transit to get to work ontime.
1	Note: homeownership is overrated. Allow smaller lot sizes, less or no off-street parking, taller heights, and greater density all through Austin neighborhoods.
1	Strong rent control laws can turn regular housing into affordable housing without having to go through the building process; and there can never be too much affordable housing.
1	Please challenge/prove the assumption that entitlement increases will automatically result in more affordable housing. Yes, supply is a factor, but entitlements alone don't automatically increase supply. Shortage in labor and financing has also influenced slower construction. I was also hesitant to show my full support for all the "incentives" bc Austin continually sets the baseline for density bonuses too high. They need to start low so that the added benefits of entitlements are split between the developer and community. We are just making land owners rich by setting the baseline too high.
1	make it mandatory that new developments that receive any assistance from the city contain a percentage of affordable units
1	Allow for micro apartment high rises, increase the # of adorable units required for new developments, understand that even people making more that \$50K may not be able to afford housing due to student loans, child care, transportation costs, etc. There need to be affordable units at every price range, not just the poorest and the richest aistinites. Also, home ownership incentives or support for musicians, artists, service industry workers. These people are what make this city wonderful, yet they can't afford to live in Austin.

1	Slow the pace of out-of-state developers coming in and building properties only the affluent can afford.
1	Make affordable housing comparable to more expensive housing. If it looks like a project people will treat it as such.
1	Encouraging "tiny homes"; allowing garage apartments in more neighborhoods; disincentivizing McMansions
1	Expand community land trust programs, density bonuses, improve transit options to create better access to affordable housing further from downtown
1	Cap property taxes for long-time residents, help artists live here (they contribute to the economy, but are rarely compensated for that contribution).
1	COA staff seems to have way too much concern for the ability of Developers to make maximum profits while having too little concern for protecting the quality of life and safety of the citizens. Perhaps COA could begin to require developers to come to table with projects which are affordable rather than the continual march of "high end" and "luxury" developments. That would be a good start to having "skin in the game". The best affordable housing is created by less greed. I think I loved this city more when we were less popular and more neighborly.
1	YES! Require that all sales data on properties be available for homebuyers. Requiring sales data even on properties will bring real information about sales (including deed transfers among family members) into the open and give a factual basis for these discussions.
1	moratorium on luxury condo construction until we have more affordable housing for the people who actually work and live in Austin
1	All new housing development should contain some affordable options. If affordable housing is available throughout the city it gives people more options and lessens possibility of certain areas being thought of as less desirable because housing is less desirable. Make sure property taxes stay at affordable levels too.
1	Allow garage apartments, granny flats, and similar housing to be built. Allow for smaller lot sizes and smaller houses. Encourage dense development in ALL areas of the city and don't kowtow to the vocal minority that says "no" to everything (including some on the city council that represent center city neighborhoods where density should be encouraged, not stamped out.
1	Stop letting apartment complexes arbitrarily raise rents without actually changing or improving anything
1	Take a harder look at where contractors are trying to build! The Grove on Pleasant Valley is disgusting/makes no sense.
1	Affordable housing should be made available to middle income families as well. Housing incentives should be given to people who serve in the public service sector (teachers, firefighters, police officers).
1	flippers need to stop creating mcmansions. millennials dont need the space, and cant afford million dollar homes
1	Like was suggested earlier, missing middle housing, townhouses, row homes, etc. This will greatly help bring back the huge diversity gap that is already here.
1	Create more programs like the SMART housing and group by income ranges. Also, create affordable housing that is separate from college students.

1	Stabilize and reduce property taxes. Rent control. Stricter regulations on new developments not providing affordable housing options
1	changing zoning to allow for multi-unit housing and smaller housing units, especially near transit hubs and public schools, and especially in central city. I don't favor building many condos on busy streets, like South Lamar, but I do favor making more duplexes, tri-plexes, etc within current residential areas.
1	Get rid of restrictive regulations, allowing anyone to build whatever they want on their property without the city government getting in the way.
1	Affordable housing should be placed throughout the city with no real distinction between affordable and market rate units.
1	Change state law and implement inclusionary zoning for the entire city; implement it in the Homestead Preservation Districts now.
1	Ask the employers who are raising wages here to be part of funding a solution. And allow housing to be built on top of store fronts. Affordable housing in outlying areas would be more desirable if there were many public transportation options into and within the city.
1	Higher density, lower on-site parking requirements, and improved public transit options to underserved places such as the east side
1	Require that developers building in gentrifying or underprivileged neighborhoods reserve part of their development for low-income, and ensure that the low-income units have the same amenities, access, and materials as the market-rate units.
1	Allow tri plexes, stop allowing luxury apartment complexes to replace affordable housing. Do not allow massive increases in property value year after year, forcing out longtime residents and leaving developers salivating.
1	1) Better public transportation so all 2 million residents don't feel they have to live downtown & so that when the City does institute minimum parking requirements, there is a realistic alternative (right now, minimum parking requirements only encourage drivers to park at the closest nearby locale, polluting neighborhoods with traffic & trash 2) multiple density areas (more than just one "downtown" hub- several scattered throughout the larger metro area to take the pressure off of downtown 3. Run the Austin Housing Authority more efficiently- right now, the Austin housing bureaucracy does a terrible job of tracking density bonus and fee in lieu incentives they recoup- they haven't quantified the impacts, if any, on the creation of affordable housing in ATX, in fact they are known for mismanaging resources. 4) Require more from developers as does Seattle (all new developments privileged to build in the City core must include affordable housing- here in ATX, developers seem to be building nothing but high end units and condos. The city is not properly incentivizing in the permitting process, not demanding enough from developers.
1	Open utility/electric competition, provide down payment assistance for home buyers, give grocery stores tax breaks instead of builders so people can afford to stay in town
1	No incentives or bond money for any developer who does not incorporate at least 25% affordable units and 5% PSH/Housing First units into their project.
1	Achieve workforce development and jobs training by involving American YouthWorks building energy efficient homes, for low income families.
1	Revisit tax maps. Also, 12th St corridor and the Grove. Re the Grove, the city needs to push the developers to make stronger investments in infrastructure. As it is, local residents will shoulder the burden of the developers choices.

1	Would love to see Affordable Housing (ie Foundation Community) move into the realm of missing middle like small apartment buildings that can be done with less zoning fights
1	The housing and transportation issues are inexplicably intertwined and must be addressed as a single, albeit complicated issue. If you look at areas with 'successful' mass transportation modes (SF, NY, CHI, etc.) it is because they have concentrated areas of high density population. The urban sprawl of Portland, LA, Dallas, Miami, Austin, don't or can't encourage
1	REDUCE TAXES, they just get passed on to renters and home owners. And for all the massive increases in Taxes I see ZERO added services. In fact less services rendered. You have RUINED Austin with these policies. Thanks.
1	City should purchase land (Land banking) designate it for affordable housing, and allow developers to build income restricted housing (low income) with the city permanently remaining as the owner of the land.
1	Living wages for all, assistance for domestic violence sexual assault families, mental health and poverty related homelessness, more trauma services for prevention of homelessness and lack of education opportunities, less criminal charges for nonviolent offenses, less credit checks for housing !
1	I support affordable housing but am horrified at how poorly the city manages its money with no accountability. Clean house at NHCD. The new City Council doesn't know what they're doing either. Blind leading blind.
1	Up zone everything to allow more housing supply, especially missing middle housing. Decrease minimum lot size. Abolish parking minimums or greatly decrease them.
1	Land trusts and guaranteed percentage of affordable homes in new housing projects, not just 10 percent, but 50 percent an
1	High density - really that's the only way - we have to build up if we want people to be able to live closer to the city.
1	Work with Foundation Communities, they have it figured out. Buy land from AISD, build permanent council flats to replace under-enrolled schools.
1	Preserve the older less expensive housing that we already have. Do not create incentives that would encourage developers to tear down existing housing.
1	Lower rent in area near a lot of work places. There are so many new buildings being built everyday, they can't all be for rich people.
1	denser housing (backyard tiny houses, garage apartments), stricter enforcement of laws that effectively limit property values and gentrification like noise, business parking minimums, and public intoxication
1	give additional tax incentives to developers to build affordable housing, make it worth their time financially
1	Transportation and housing are linked. I can't use public transportation to get back up north at night which
1	Penalized new developments that do not provide affordable units. Stop allowing small homes in older neighborhoods be destroyed to make room for McMansions. Allow for construction of more small backyard homes.
1	Simpler billing structures and controlled rent prices would do much to keep people out of the debt house. Most importantly, if property owners are getting "incentives" for building affordable housing, they should be held accountable for the upkeep and general safety of their properties. I like the idea of friendly surveyors from the city coming over to my apartment to make sure

	that I have running water.
1	Neighborhoods would be more receptive to changes and growth if transportation, school and park amenities are addresses at the start of the planning.
1	Instead of building more luxury highrise condos and apartments, make properties available for families
1	I do think the city's employees are coming up with good ideas. With neighborhoods having their own adopted codes, I only suggest the city ensure neighborhood organizations are not able to write exclusionary rules.
1	Provide incentives for developers and planners to work with the myriad social agencies that are supporting those who need affordable housing.
1	extend tax credits to landlords who provide affordable single family homes as rentals - right now, individual investors with a single family home for rent are penalized by state & federal taxes if the rent is "below market" rate; but I want to rent to a single dad who makes under \$30k per year, that means I eat it on taxes.
1	Limit the amount of rapid development that is taking place that is making key people a lot of money and not actually creating affordable housing.
1	1. Prohibit "luxury style apartments". That style of living increases gentrification. 2. Require affordable housing for developments with a certain number of units. 3. Increase density around transit stops for multi-modal transit. 4. Have residential areas near (within a certain distance) of uses that provide basic necessities-mainly grocery stores/corner stores. This will help reduce daily trips and also help those who cannot afford a vehicle. 5. Require or incentivize developers to provide bus/train passes for the tenants. 6. Have higher density with connected amenities/open space/trails to allow developments to easily reach their destination (I.e. Require developments to look and feel more like a neighborhood rather than a private development). 7. Require walkable developments and have mixed use developments that are in close proximity to job centers.
1	Build more apts, allow higher occupancy, allow smaller living spaces, cap increases in rent as a percent
1	Allow more density in neighborhoods, make the developent process easier, support building to the demand of Austin.
1	require all new multi-family dwellings to include a % of units for affordable housing. Perhaps retroactively require current multi-family dwellings to convert units to affordable housing
1	Stop allowing developers from buying lots downtown and on the east side. You, the city of Austin should be in control. Not people who have no love or care for this city. We can get creative. Southwestern University, just up the road, has many students who have won awards on their forward thinking ideas for future living. We can't only think about affordable housing, we have to think sustainable.
1	Create more single family housing, and stop destroying and densifying existing single-family neighborhoods. Density increases the cost per square foot of all types of housing and is more appropriately called "warehousing" because no housing is created, just increasingly smaller apartments which are not suitable for families. The collateral damage besides making all housing less affordable is that it decreases enrollment in Austin ISD, because families with kids want a house with a yard, not a tiny micro-unit or apartment. Increasing the percentage of rental apartments drastically changes the character of the City by replacing stable neighborhoods in all price ranges with a transient population of apartment dwellers. That is neither affordable, responsible or liveable.
1	Redevelop old housing projects into higher density affordable housing on land the City owns already!

1	implement the missing middle in terms of types of housing and increase supply overall in the core/not in a sprawl way, also increase density on areas that are transit hubs (see get rid of the car dealerships on burnet for example and replace with mixed use development)
1	Put a cap on the number of houses that are allowed to be used solely as short term rental properties. Make sure that in each neighborhood there is a certain number of affordable housing preserved. Put a cap on the amount that landlords are able to increase rents within a 5 year period.
1	Foundation Communities does an amazing job of construction and maintenance of affordable housing which includes needed services to help residents improve their lives. Organizations like this do a much better job than giving the incentive money to big "for profit" developers.
1	I am looking forward to the kasita project. I hope to live in one of the kasita units. I am in favor of smaller living quarters and I hate seeing all these giant 3-story single-family homes taking over areas that used to be affordable.
1	Stop developers from plowing down existing homes to put in a McMansion in communities that were once affordable. Allow unrelated adults to live in the same home with no restriction on the number of individuals per home
1	have a tiered system and percentages for affordability so you are inclusive of all income levels. Offer incentives to developers for using this tiered system such as expedited permitting and inspections. Rent control would be amazing to prevent what has happened in cities such as San Fran. Also allow tiny house neighborhoods and other alternative housing options.
1	Less regulations on types and sizes of houses. Lower taxation. Taxes can be higher than the mortgage. The rate of allowable increase is way too high. People that live in neighborhoods are being forced to leave. Let's worry about them as much as new options.
1	Smaller energy efficient homes on smaller lots with builder incentives of reduced time for permits. Property taxes breaks for homeowners with income under \$30,000. Larger homestead exemptions from all taxing entities.
1	many people who bought houses pre 2000 rent to so many, especially students and artists like myself. Maybe they could get a break on taxes if they kept the rents down
1	Land Shares, second liens provided by persons other than homeowners, reduction in property taxes for those with lower incomes, providing incentives to all apartment owners to rent to low income, and creating more SROs for single households.
1	Stop pondering to developers!! Let people continue living in their existing affordable homes and quit taxing residents out of their homes!!
1	creating affordable housing for public employees (state, county, city, school district, etc). Make sure to have multiple levels of affordability (i.e. less than 50k, 40k, 30k, 20k, etc).
1	There's a myth online (reddit for one) that the city needs to be high density downtown. This myth is false. Doing so creates more traffic swells downtown more frequently, as we can see happening now. Continue to expand in undeveloped areas (such as the McKinney Falls area) and create affordable housing there with park and ride services from Cap Metro nearby, so that individuals can use those services to bus to work.
1	Reduce restrictive zoning, especially near the city center; allow and incentivize missing-middle housing options, eliminate parking minimums
1	Ensure communities with a mix of income levels. Allow zoning that enables infill development of triplexes/duplexes, etc.

1	Smaller studio apartments that musicians, service people can rent that are close to venues and bars
1	Create simple buildings. Loft style apartments with communal kitchens and bathrooms or small houses with communal kitchens and bathrooms that young single people can afford. Finding affordable housing is increasingly difficult for those just out of college
1	Ensure affordable housing developments include housing opportunities that are "deeply affordable" for those residents with a fixed low income and/or coming out of homelessness. We need to ensure that these properties do not screen out residents for criminal histories or past rental debts. We need to ensure this housing is accessible to our most vulnerable citizens.
1	Research affordable housing in Wisconsin. Renovating existing buildings to create mixed rate units. Affordable and market rate developments.
1	Yes, don't tear down old houses. Have an incentive for people to fix the house so they can live there cheaper.
1	Reserve a proportion of MFI restricted units, achieved through density bonuses, specifically for HACA
1	Allow people to live in Tiny Homes, create a Tiny Home village with community garden for the young and old
1	Densification in our urban core, as well as potential urban cores like The Domain/North Burnet. Large buildings or mid rise, less Texas Donut style complexes
1	DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT DISPLACEMENT. there are books on this. Talk to Brian Kelsey at Civic Analytics. Hire city planners with degrees in city planning. Use the Texas A&M study on traffic rather than paying for a new one by UT. Smart people have already answered most of the questions you are asking.
1	Long term Austin residents should receive priority on housing. Less short term rental permits should be approved. Food deserts and transportation issues need to be reviewed in poorer parts of the city.
1	Take ownership of abandoned homes for HACA; encourage companies to build housing near their offices or at their offices for employees; incentivize alternative living like coops, create a program where families can pool their credit to build multi-family housing,
1	Pre-approved City ADU housing designs to help curb costs for homeowners willing to add secondary housing to their property.
1	not sure - property tax breaks under certain income? incorporate employment opportunities into space - like housing over a grocery store or upkeep of the property or large common areas (rooftops?) for flea market/art sales/live music on weekends? resident performers/artists get rent credit? make affordable housing beautiful/well designed so it adds value to area and neighbors support it
1	Allow ADUs everywhere. Up zone the entire city to allow multi-family housing. Encourage the transition away from exclusively single family housing zoning. Encourage a wide range of land uses near each other, retail, office, housing, to enable people to be less reliant on automobile transportation. Above all, allow the supply of housing of all types of housing, not just affordable, to be increased. That is the best way to bring about affordable housing. Allow the supply to meet the demand.
1	more housing options than just apartments and single family. like 3 deckers in new england or family friendly cooperatives
1	Yes, allow people to build low-cost housing. Let multiple people live together. Some people never cook at home—let there be some places with just a dorm fridge, sink, and microwave for a kitchen. Let there be small places. Let there be places with more common areas so people don't need their own living rooms. And then let anyone live there. Middle class people should be able to live in low-cost housing, too. When Mueller started selling "affordable" housing, it cost more than my house, and

	<p>your income had to be lower than mine to be allowed to get it—that did not sound affordable to me. We need ideas that let the market system work. Maybe some safety nets for landlords, like help with problem tenants to make it less risky to take on risky-seeming tenants. I think the city should provide fast (but thorough) permit review for everyone. This should be basic service and not an incentive. I don't know what I think about taller buildings along major roadways. I think the city should check out parking lots to study whether less parking is actually being used for affordable (or any) developments near bus lines. If so, then yes, require less. Otherwise, no. I don't think the city should be in the business of building affordable housing. I'm not sure what they would do to preserve affordable housing. I am strongly opposed to subsidized housing. I am for programs to help poor people live indoors, but that should be a payment to them, like food stamps. Housing stamps. Not something you bribe builders or landlords to do.</p>
1	<p>Stop letting the rich come in and drive prices up. Just because people are moving to Austin daily doesn't mean the city needs to be greedy and raise everything. You can still make money by having living affordable. They are driving people out of Austin by being greedy.</p>
1	<p>Charge a \$2/sf affordable housing fee on all new developments, including all property types. Uses the funds to subsidize affordable housing. Require the city to require compliance with the programs in the projects that already include affordable programs.</p>
1	<p>New residents should pay much higher taxes than people who have been here before Austin was ruined.</p>
1	<p>Stop annexing suburbs and trying to increase affordable options outside the central city. Focus on building it where transit operates now.</p>
1	<p>Create incentives for developers....we don't need anymore high rise hotels. The demographics in Austin are changing but that doesn't mean the City can ignore the needs of its existing residents who are suffering the consequences of gentrification and rent increases.</p>
1	<p>Allow small lot homes, make it easier to get MF-6 zoning, reduce parking minimums across the city, provide incentives to developers who build multifamily properties for home ownership instead of rental apartments</p>
1	<p>Property tax freezes for long term, low income residents to prevent unsustainable spikes in their housing costs</p>
1	<p>Expand out. Start developing on the outskirts to make more affordable housing. I don't know why you guys haven't thought about this yet. You guys are focusing so much on downtown area of Austin that you aren't creating anything for anyone that cannot afford what you are currently creating. This is a college town. How did I come here being able to afford a 2 bedroom and then having to move down to a studio at the prices that I am used to paying for a 2 bedroom nice apartment? This is a college town. Cater to the college kids that are STAYING like me. Do you know how many people my age are depressed right now? My friend has his Masters Degree, living in a shitty apartment on Oltorf, hates his job and is unhappy. My other friend has his Bachelors degree, living in STUDENT apartments in that area and is very depressed-like suicidal depressed because he is working at Dominos pizza, my other friend is a Real Estate Agent by Day and working Uber by night and my other friend is an Architect by Day and a Favor Driver by night just to keep up with the lifestyle in Austin Texas. Back when my little sister was here...in 2007, this was considered one of the happiest cities in America...and now it's not.</p>
1	<p>new tiered water rates and upcoming electric rate increases make Austin unaffordable, regardless of what is done for housing, making me less likely to support it. First things first!</p>
1	<p>Fix the code to allow for organic densification in all Austin neighborhoods - especially those with amenities like good schools, parks, job access, transit access, grocery access, etc.</p>
1	<p>Allow zero lot lines in transition zone between commercial and residential corridors, build on surplus public properties throughout city,</p>

1	all your suggestions rock! also, get rid of that stupid no more than 4 unrelated tenants per property ordinance. Outlaw trashiness and loudness, not efficient and lawful multihabitations.
1	stop regentrification. incentivize comprehensive transportation options that service underserved areas. set fixed property tax rates for historical and culturally significant land areas. create programs that encourage homes to be kept and maintained by current home owners. Encourage development on underutilized land tracts
1	Get a lot tougher on drug use and drop-outs. Living in a nice city is expensive. It is not a given. Education, hard work, doing what it takes. First step in solving this problem for 20 years from now is drug dogs inside schools daily. 3rd drug offense would end students right to any public education.
1	is it possible? refurbish walk ups. no more tear downs of old buildings and strip malls for high price condos.
1	stop developing ridiculously expensive condos/houses on the east side and pushing the poor locals out.
1	There are ways to build affordable housing that do not make rents begin at \$1000 a month. (Or purchases out of reach.) There are ways to build densely without making things like ant hills. Prefabricated buildings can be lovely if they are well thought out. Homes that go up and not out can be possible solutions. The city is not taking advantage of the opportunity for land trusts. These options should be exploited.
1	http://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/implement/physical-social-environment/affordable-housing/main
1	Fix the broken appraisal & property tax situation. keep city government focused on safety and infrastructure
1	I think it would be great if the City of Austin could look at incomes of working artists and if at least 50% of their income is generated with art the artists should receive some sort of validation certificate that they can present upon choosing housing that would give them 10% off each month's rent or something similar. Each rental would have to be in compliance with this in order to strengthen the quality of life and work for artists in ATX.
1	Creating shared living where the kitchen is shared for multi generational households or multiple family households
1	As unrealistic as it may be, I believe we need legislation to establish rent control. In addition, I read a citizen's proposal to cap property taxes at the rate in place when a home is purchased. As property taxes increase over time, the additional tax payments would be deferred until the eventual sale of the property, when the deferred taxes can be deducted from the proceeds of the sale.
1	Remove all developer incentives across the board, and only return the incentives if affordable housing exceeds a certain % (10% minimum)
1	It's an issue of demand. High demand, high prices. Maybe if property values and resulting taxes weren't pricing folks out of their homes, it would be better. But running them off just to tear down their small home and build dozens/hundreds of high-end condos and apartments DOES NOT result in affordability. Quit lining developers pockets at residents' expense
1	Land trust where people can buy affordable home to live in. Not turn around an flip as the current status quo.
1	More Co-ops for recent college grads, more granny flats, more units that have larger bedrooms for roommates and multi-family to share on rent
1	Create positive housing communities for vulnerable communities that have social service programs built in - such as childcare, safety watch, and carpooling

1	All of the abovev change land use codes, reduce barriers to being ADUS, allow multiple homes on large lots, etc
1	More density. Reduce influence of Nimby organizations/Neighborhood "Ass"-ociations. Deprioritize cars altogether. Lighten up on Uber and Lyft. Build high. Build dense. Build walkable. Ban Jeff Jacks and Lorraine Atherton from Travis county. Maybe banish them to Somalia. That'll shut them up.
1	Regulate rent increases more strictly so rents aren't going up at insane rates. Stop focusing on building fancy condos for the rich people moving into Austin and focus on the people getting pushed out by those people.
1	Give homeowners fewer seats at negotiating table and get rid of ordinances that don't allow densification. Also, pass rent control!
1	Listen to the developers and builders whom are actively building affordable house. Reorganize the current Housing Department, the current department leaders and staff are part of the problem.
1	Smaller houses on smaller plots of land, more row houses, greater incentives for non-corporatelandlords
1	Including business space within the construction and requiring 50% of the workforce to be employed by those who are eligible for the affordable housing. Creating a sense of community within the new construction AND with the existing surrounding neighborhoods. I believe building a sense of community among neighbors reduces fears about one another including the "unknown" about folks who live in low-income housing.
1	The city should guarantee down payments for buyers of modest purpose-built condos who can qualify for a commercial loan and meet certain criteria.
1	better transit system to ensure people can live anywhere in the city/county and work any where as well but be able to get to work in a timely manner
1	Yes! You have to fix regulatory scheme first. There will never be enough dollars for subsidized affordable housing if the broad middle class can't buy or rent affordably at market rates. And that supply must be allowed in the areas of Austin in close proximity to jobs, amenities, transit and services.
1	keeping it honest--single mom, \$30,000/yr; livein roommate \$30,000/yr--still eligible for under \$50,000housing?
1	I think creating property tax incentives for folks who have owned home for over x-years and made x-improvementswould benefit long-time homeowners in Austin. Also, some kind of disincentive for properties used primarily for short-term rental (AirBnB).
1	Collaborating with more nonprofit agencies who work with low-income individuals or families to provide ongoing support through counseling and case management
1	Even families making \$100k are struggling to find housing. Allowing more housing supply and housing types is really the only way to help middle-class families. Subsidized/below market housing is great, but it will only help the poor. Keep in mind that professors, mailmen, teachers, gov't workers are all struggling to find housing, but aren't poor enough to qualify for programs. It all boils down to supply and demand and housing stock diversity, really.
1	Not sure- housing was affordable at one point. The homes haven't changed that are now "unaffordable".
1	I live in an apartment. How about the apartments you live in "adopt" or "gift" a % of people in need instead of adopting families or family at Christmas. CWS Apartment Corporation will not work with me on rent. Gone from 1,280.00 to 1,480.00 in 3 yrs. Plus electric average 180.00, plus gas, 30.00 avg., plus water, 80.00 avg. The family they adopted 2 yrs. ago was in North Texas!

	Money from Lottery- going to education? Add % rentals to the middle class. The lost group. Don't help us we will become the next homeless etc. LEG UP, PLEASE!!!!!! NOW!!!!!!!!!!!!
1	Why must you pit the newcomers making \$350K against long time residents living on fixed income? Force the Googles of this world to open offices in outlying areas rather than downtown and central Austin. We are turning growth opportunities into unmanageable problems best addressed in virgin development that city leadership continues to insist on addressing through redevelopment. Seems entirely inefficient, regardless of how one characterizes motive.
1	All builders of huge, overpriced, neighborhood killing high rise condos should be required to subsidize affordable housing for every structure they build.
1	make Housing Affordable to people that have lived here for more than 10yrs because we are the people that made this city GREAT
1	make it easier for home owners to build structures on existing properties. Reduce parking requirements in urban settings
1	Not pushing out the current low-income home dwellers! Not entering their long-established neighborhoods.
1	I would be willing to live further away from central Austin if those areas were walking distance to necessities like grocery stores, I'm thinking the way Portland is set up where you can get whatever you need by walking. I like access to healthy food and it's hard to get that if I live far away. Also improving transportation for those who live far south or east would make it easier to live in those cheaper neighborhoods.
1	Stop building condos, apartments, etc. geared toward the incomes of folks from other states used to paying high rent/mortgages. Build for Austinites....state employees, students, and those don't have 6 six figure salaries.
1	There is a big difference between capital A "Affordable Housing" and general affordability. I think this survey undermines that difference and fails to define it substantively, which makes this full of leading questions, and skewed results. I don't want the tools that would contribute to Austin's general affordability such as increased height, reduced parking minimums, zoning changes, etc. tied strictly to "Affordable Housing." It undermines their importance in providing more housing at every price point. While I think "Affordable Housing" is an important ballot issue. I vehemently oppose tying it to building codes.
1	incentivize small. even "tiny houses" in neighborhoods with developable land, such as Mueller and the old state school property along Bull Creek.
1	Condo developers should be required to provide rent-controlled spaces in new developments equal and equivalent to the renters they displace.
1	Missing middle, smaller lots, inclusionary zoning, density bonuses, etc. End opt-out neighborhood planning options.
1	Apportionment ordinances. People shouldn't be allowed to build new condos like the ones downtown without a sizable portion being allocated for affordable housing. Developers in east Austin should be held to even higher standards if they want to build. It shouldn't be gentrifying, it should be integrated.
1	increase density standards and reduce minimum lot size for development. Allow greater height restrictions and compatibility standards. Quit encouraging sprawl
1	Allow ADUs on all type of lot sizes; encourage more duplexes and small apartment/condo developments on areas zoned single family

1	The city/state could offer incentives which could be put in place so that existing apt complexes/condos/townhouses are able to offer more affordable rates for those of lower SES. Also, more city/state money should be allocated to make whole complexes for those who are in need.
1	(1) Increase the percentage of affordable units that developers should include in developments before they can get incentives. (2) Distribute affordable housing throughout the city, rather than concentrating it in certain neighborhoods, areas, or along major roads, etc. (3) Alleviate the property tax burden that is currently weighing down residents to the point of displacing residents, which in turn is only magnifying the problem by increasing the demand for affordable housing. (4) Work in conjunction with the public and other agencies to address the other issues that are contributing to the situation. This is not an isolated situation that is only about creating affordable housing, and so the issue can't be addressed in isolation. (5) Extend incentives to homeowners, not just developers, to build (or not), in a manner that promotes affordability. Simplify and shorten the permit process, subsidize or offer construction loans, waive fees, etc., and/or incentivize so that landlords can keep rents affordable. (6) Make it easier for homeowners (not developers) to build ADUs on the property on which they live. The recent changes to ADU regulations are insufficient for this purpose. (7) Place a greater part of the responsibility on developers since they often benefit at the expense of existing residents who are affected by being displaced; by the increase in traffic, commute time, noise, and crime; or by increasing property taxes when their interest is in remaining in their homes, not turning a profit.
1	Tall apartment style buildings, 3 bedrooms in any of the new housing. Most of the housing I find is 2 bedroom or less.
1	More historic preservation, more code flexibility for building ADU's, better connected transit (makes existing housing more affordable b/c of lifestyle adjustment)
1	Integrate affordable units in with market-rate units so that affordable properties do not become stigmatized.
1	More housing along the metro rail line that improves those who work central. Have it be a commodity to all rather than a luxury to some.
1	tiny house options within condos and smaller lots. Single Family Homes are priced by the sq ft and 400-600 sq ft are great options for milenials
1	I'm not that knowledgable to have ideas that would be significant or beneficial. I suggest that y'all continue working with the Ending Community Homelessness Coalition, low-icome families, and other key stakeholders to generate and act upon effective ideas.
1	Making sure that the income and affordable housing rents are realistic. I went to an apartment community in Mueller and was told that I needed to make less than \$35000 a year to qualify (which is \$2916/month) but to afford a 2 bedroom apartment which is \$980 per month, I would need to make 3.5 times the rent or \$3430 per month. Those numbers do not work if, as a single mom, I ever want my child to have his own room (we currently have a 1-bedroom that when the rents go up we will not be able to afford anymore). Someone from the City should follow up on that as it seems like a way for these complexes to get away with City incentives, but never actually act on it. Maybe the lady had her numbers wrong, but also almost \$1000 for a 2-bedroom apartment is not affordable for a single mom working full time with a kid.
1	Give preference to local people who have lived in Austin for more than "--" amount of time over people who are moving here from states where cost of living is higher and have never lived here before.
1	Recognize that not everyone commutes, and it could be less through telecommuting with gigabit internet access.
1	Use measures to try to slow the growth. Balance economic interests and attraction of new business with the the equally important concern for quality of life for those of us who already live here. There are many incentive strategies for attracting businesses but far fewer for encouraging affordable housing...

1	Allow ADUs in all SF zoning, allow smaller lots, allow microunit apts, reduce parking requirements, allow missing middle housing sans site plans, allow coops, do a market study to fine tune density bonus rules
1	build, build, build. Don't make it so hard for developers. Allow small lots, small homes, more apartment/condo buildings of all sizes. Eliminate parking requirements.
1	making sure that code next is not watered down. Adding density not just on corridors, but within 3 miles of downtown. Working with State Legislature to remove capitol view corridors. tell the nimbys to "shut up".
1	Caps on yearly taxes/appraisals, require certain percentage of new developments be tagged for middle income. Affordable is not just for poverty level, but the often missed middle class, who make too much for assistance but cant afford rent or buy
1	There should definitely be benefits for people who have served the public, i.e. Teachers, police officers, firefighters, etc. also, people who have consistently held certain low paying jobs (custodians, etc.) but continue to help their community. There are large tracts of land all over Austin that could use some condos.
1	There should be affordable housing in every zip code to allow workers to be close to their work (and parks) not relying on one bus or one train
1	change the city council - get some people with brains instead of steal from the working class mentality
1	Figure out a better way to pitch making the existing housing affordable to landlords. Yes, we are growing and when that happens, property values increase substantially. Landlords would be missing an opportunity to not take advantage of that. But desire for increased wealth is greed, maybe tap into that greed motivation and supply something else other than money that fulfills it.
1	increase the diversity of housing types and promoting town/row houses, duplexes, triplexes, quads, etc. rather than just Single-family and apartments/condos.
1	Tighten demo rules, lower taxes in the city center for longtime homeowners and landlords, offer tax abatements to culturally significant areas such as East Austin enclaves (Holly, ECC), maintain old housing projects. Do not rely on new developer driven apartment type living spaces as affordable housing. Allow more housing vouchers for the needy so they can afford to live centrally near their jobs.
1	Work through Code Next to increase housing choices and to make it easier and cheaper to build all types of housing.
1	Don't let developers do in lieu of and put all affordable housing in the boondocks. Neighborhoods should be a mix of socioeconomic and income levels
1	Create a better property tax system. Those who flip houses should pay way more in taxes. I bought a house at a level I could afford, but income doesn't rise as fast as the taxes do. If people buy at a tax rate that rate should be locked or slowed for anyone owning their house long term. If you buy a house and flip it without providing low income options there should be a high tax penalty. Long term owners (people who buy and pay off their house) should have a slower and fairer tax rate increase.
1	Affordable housing needs to be downtown so that the hotel workers, restaurant and bar staff can be close to their jobs.
1	Increase density and ease the process for new construction. Also eliminate burdensome parking requirements in transit accessible locations.
1	stop apartment complexes from raising the rent as much as they want each year. There is no cap, my rent increased almost

	20% at renewal. :(
1	Allow affordable housing to be built in all areas of the city and surrounding areas, not just focused in one location or residential area
1	smaller multi-bedroom homes on small lots; people don't need tray ceilings and huge yards, they need places to sleep. more condos, just make insulate between common walls and floors/ceilings so people who buy have more privacy and feel a better sense of ownership. affordable housing doesn't mean 'projects'. allow tiny homes in austin; build tiny home communities; this town would EMBRACE that and LOVE it and really get behind it.
1	Encourage businesses to move from downtown to the outskirts, encourage cheaper housing near the major highways
1	Build more affordable housing within the center/main of Austin (NOT on outskirts or surrounding towns). Make that housing more energy efficient/lasting/quality, so as to not require constant repair or maintenance.
1	public transportation will help avoid housing segregation. If there were more public transportation options, the lower and middle class households would not have to worry about living far from their place of employment or school in order to have affordable housing.
1	even with bus routes, everyone has a car so need to include parking for residents, including ones in multi-family, apt, condo, etc housing
1	Let's create affordable housing based on a set of "personas." Artist, you married couple, new family, elderly, etc. and create programs targeted for each. The income question is a false flag without understanding the personas and their unique requirements.
1	Should be built on mass transit lines, allowing transport but not necessarily proximity to jobs downtown
1	Stop promoting the idea that Austin is the greatest place on Earth to live...not EVERYBODY has to live here!
1	Stop giving incentives to developers who think affordable housing means a 250k house. Getting incentives should mean at least 25-30% of the housing is affordable to people making less than the median income.
1	Require all new residential and mixed-use developments to reserve at least 20% of their units for lower-income residents.
1	Create an affordable housing trust fund. Development incentives for private developers to build more affordable housing units. Increase funding for rental assistance programs. Increase funding for downpayment and closing cost assistance for income-qualified homebuyers.
1	lower property taxes, make it harder for developers to tear down cheaper housing and turn it into luxury housing.
1	I grew up in a low income home near San Antonio. My parents moved us to a rural area to afford better housing. The commute was long, but the quality of life was great. San Antonio's affordable housing is in the suburbs. Austin has already, or almost already, outgrown its capacity for more burbs. I'm not convinced Austin is affordable any more. I moved here in 1984 after college.
1	Diversify the pool of developers building affordable housing by moving toward a more competitive, request for proposals model.

1	YES! Require some of those condos downtown to have so many units available for affordable housing (perhaps 1st through 5th floors, with no "view") so the many low income workers in many of the office buildings (janitorial staff, parking attendants, bar tenders, or support staff in those office buildings) can have more options. Why should only the wealthy coming in from other states benefit from all that Austin has to offer. Also, many of the older homes being bought up and renovated in the central Austin neighborhoods should require one affordable housing unit for those being turned in duplexes and fourplexes. For a young adult such as myself with a B.S. working at a non profit organization COA does not give me much option on good central affordable housing close enough to a good school for my daughter.
1	Stop electing real estate developers to City Council, stop building so many damn hotels, stop building so many expensive high rises and high-end condos, stop gentrifying neighborhoods
1	How about a contest for UT Architecture and Design students to design a tiny housing community, both rental and purchase property and the City goes with the chosen design as the prize?
1	Get rid of neighborhood planning contact teams. Remove SF housing from central city. Better public transit
1	Quit letting Californians in. No more tax breaks to large corporations and for crying out loud toll roads help no one but Rick Perry and his band of fat cats
1	Continue toward flexibility on infill and ADUs. Relaxing parking requirements. Get developers to build it in their developments instead of paying fee in lieu.
1	Expand and find Alley Flat Initiative; relax zoning for close-in neighborhoods especially; improve permitting process for missing middle housing types
1	Tax luxury developments to pay for affordable housing and improved transportation. Build the damn light rail.
1	I think it is a good idea to have more small houses on small pieces of land. Austin, with its rudimentary public transportation system is not well suited to high density housing
1	Tax non-local investors contributing to the gentrification of our city. I do like the idea of either requiring or incentivizing such housing company's to include more affordable options within their buildings.
1	Affordable housing in the city center specifically for State and City employees who work in the downtown area which would help eliminate traffic congestion going into the city and also help recruit employees for city/state jobs.
1	We should keep in mind that meeting demand is a huge challenge. There will be many people who cannot get subsidized housing because demand exceeds supply and/or they don't qualify. Increasing the supply of housing in areas of high demand will directly or indirectly help Austinites of all income levels. Also, minimum parking requirements should be reduced unconditionally; they make development more expensive, incentivize car ownership, and are generally bad policy, and I don't think that an income-based set-aside makes sense for a project with, say, only three or four units.
1	Stop building luxury condos & apartments & focus on housing that is well-made and affordable. Stop tearing down small homes and building monstrous, unaffordable mini mansions in neighborhoods that have traditionally housed people of color. Provide incentives for builders to stop flipping these properties out of the community's price range.
1	More efficient uses of space, including rethinking zoning law so we can have more dense housing like rowhouses or bungalow courts on lots zoned for single family housing.
1	Commercial property tax. Businesses want workers but don't want to pay them much? They should be responsible for


	assisting in finding them affordable housing nearby at the very least.
1	Foster neighborhood specific think tanks that pronotes the creation of affordable housing options, including but not limited to tiny home density on large lots, duplex or four plex multi-family units with options to rent or buy. Also consider areas that are near bus lines, libraries, parks & social services.
1	Fix the tax code so that commercial property taxes are assessed the same way residential property taxes are assessed and you have plenty of money to incentivize developers willing to provide affordable housing.
1	I would rather see people that have generations that have lived here not be moved out of their homes. I would rather the community find better ways to communicate the growth and find answers instead of kicking people out of their homes.
1	Incentives to build more moderately priced housing, especially multi-family and missing middle. Lower parking requirements. Speed up application process. Improve transit so people need fewer cars. Provide transit passes instead of parking. Greater equity in property taxes, so commercial pays it's share. Improve programs that help people to stay in their homes, both renters and owners. Rehab existing structures to save costs. Include energy efficiency to lower utility bills. Change the code to allow more missing middle housing.
1	I think that the City of Austin really needs to evaluate who is served by affordable housing. My concern is that the cutoff for qualification is \$40K; however, I think that the threshold should be higher, taking into account the 20%+ over-inflation in the housing market. Middle income families are not being addressed.
1	Institute rent control so some existing housing can be affordable, instead of letting developers get the incentives to overbuild.
1	love the mobile loaf and fishes communties. these would be great for single parents. Row homes with central park areas. Less land and more community focus.
1	Options for ownership of land as opposed to long-term rental. Require developers to include affordable units at all developments
1	allow mobile home parks owned by co-ops whose members are the residents, raise money by charging commuters daily transportation tolls for private vehicles, eliminate property taxes for housing co-ops,
1	Remove restrictions that prevent developers from building dense housing, and create regulations that prevent them from reserving what dense housing they build for people too rich to buy single-family houses.
1	The only way to provide affordable housing in Central, Southwest and Northwest Austin is through the utilization of a Community Land Trust. Land prices are to high
1	Get realistic about who should qualify. The criteria should allow for people with good credit but high debt (e.g. student loans) to qualify even if their income is slightly higher than the cut-off.
1	Support building smaller homes on smaller lots. Allow for subdivision of larger lots to accomodate more density. Incentivize development of affordable housing. Reduce parking regulations that make development more expensive and incentivizes car use. Support missing middle development, especially in transit corridors. Make building duplexes, triplexes, and multi-unit developments easier to build as long as they fit the neighborhood character. Incentivize living smaller!!!
1	Tall complexes have not worked in major population centers. They have become crime centers and are eventually abandoned. Please do not go in that direction. Duplex or four plex buildings would be more in keeping with Austin's spirit.

1	Build more housing period! I support parking waivers and upzoning on major corridors even if the developer does NOT provide affordable housing. I do support the city of austin providing affordable housing, but that should be to people at the very bottom of the income scale, the disabled, elderly, homeless.
1	Mixed-income communities are generally the most successful. I'd like to see more dense buildings with a mix of market-rate and affordable housing.
1	remove parking minimums, allow construction of higher FAR units/buildings, smaller buildings on smaller lots, more UNO-esque upzoning
1	Certain percentages of homes be tagged as affordable per district with the understanding that homeowners cannot sale the home at a higher price. Home to stay at same level at time of purchase. All new homeowners have to meet financial eligibility criteria. Cannot allow multifamilies in the same residence.
1	Incentives for taking Section 8 vouchers. Subsidized and supportive housing options for people with mental illnesses and other disabilities. Tiny houses near bus routes.
1	We've got a supply problem, clean up the code, and don't let neighborhood associations or contact teams have a say. This should be administrative. Of course no one wants something new in their backyard, but then the city as a whole suffers
1	Take power away from curmudgeons in the neighborhoods to stop or delay (add costs) to new housing.
1	More market rate supply PLUS subsidized affordable housing for those on the lowest rungs of the economic ladder
1	Increased city fees, long permitting times and onerous entitlement processes are all significant factors that are directly related to reduced affordability. If the City wants more affordability, fix these problems for all projects in desired development zones. Don't focus solely on an arbitrary household income. Fix it across all projects so there isn't such a huge gap. Smaller lot sizes help. Eliminate site area limitations and allow greater density in desired development zones.
1	Allow small homes on existing lots to increase density (but also restrict STR density for this property type).
1	relocate all the houses slated for demolition permits to "city" owned land- rehab them with a work force providing jobs for those who might be able to benefit from living in these homes. It is disgraceful and wasteful that we demolish perfectly good homes rather than trying to relocate these structures that could provide housing for people who need it.
1	I lived in an Artspace building in Mount Rainier, MD before returning to my home state of Texas. The tax subsidy helped me establish myself as an artist and save enough money to have greater stability and mobility. I don't have many ideas other than this example, but I believe affordability in housing and equity is one of the most important
1	I really don't have a clue how to do all of this, but city leaders should have seen this coming decades ago and made plans for combating this very serious problem. Gentrifying neighborhoods and kicking the poor people out of town isn't the solution. I don't think this was intentional, but could have been avoided a long time ago.
1	I feel Community First is doing a good job incorporating affordable housing for people of multiple economic levels together. I don't think it is healthy to systematically segregate people by housing costs. I think people on different earning levels have things to offer each other. I feel the city's definition of affordable is not truly affordable particularly for a single person. I also do not think it is fair to push people out of their homes into either affordable non-houses (apartments, condos ect), or ask them to move out of town or leave the city because they can no longer afford property taxes. I understand this is a universal problem in growing cities but I think Austin should be more creative about smaller house and accessory dwelling units. I would like Austin to stop offering tax breaks to companies to move to the city. Let them pay full taxes to come here. I also do not feel it is right to give breaks to developers near transit lines when the lines are not viable for commuting. Their tax money should instead go into building the commuting infrastructure. I don't want the city to be overly involved in providing affordable housing, just in

	ceasing to allow for unchecked growth.
1	Allow small multi-family buildings (12 units or less and 3 stories or less) by right everywhere in the city and eliminate compatibility requirements for those buildings. Eliminate parking requirements especially in around the University and the Plaza Saltillo area.
1	Renovated existing structures that are damaged or abandoned, rent caps, clean up neighborhoods that have affordable housing (Sweeney Circle) so they are safer, make Foundation Communities reinstate their appeals process for denied applicants, remove discriminatory policies that are practiced by housing market (financial background checks, income requirements, criminal background checks) so current housing will be more accessible.
1	Adjust zoning/building regulations so that 'tiny houses', 'mother-in-law units' and small houses can be built.
1	Give incentives to individuals and non profit organizations, not corporations. Stop flattening and pouring concrete. No one is even gonna want to live here when we're through. Tiny homes, community living!!
1	Make it mandatory for anyone developing 10 or more units or anything to be sold at higher than 700000 to either make ten percent of the units below market, or a percentage of the total sale go towards a fund to subsidize affordable housing
1	Remove the bottle neck created by the planning, development review, and permit departments. Stop funding 'pretty things' with tax dollars.
1	Work to increase the number of housing choice vouchers and apartment complexes that will accept them. Work to overturn the state law overturning the city ordinance that made it illegal to discriminate against source of income.
1	Stop allowing these developers to coming into East Austin and other places building these high rise \$400,000 homes next to this \$20,000 home that's been there for a while and then charged that \$20,000 home a boatload of Texas to make them get out of the neighborhood so you can build a \$400,000 home again
1	Provide vouchers and mandate all rental communities to allocate a portion of their rentals to meet affordable housing needs. Remember member of the baby boomers and senior citizens fall in this category.
1	Connect with public transit, levy more taxes on large condo developers to cover externalities e.g. increased congestion, to cover improved infrastructure
1	Make money available for low income and low middle income, take money from bloated police budget and tax incentives you give to the rich for being in your racist city
1	A state income tax would ease local property tax. This is a major contributor to housing affordability.
1	I have designed an affordable neighborhood based on the cohousing model. These are small houses. My phone is 512-422-4867. TXbicyclecamping@yahoo.com Lee Stork
1	Preservation of existing rental housing near transit, support creation of cooperatively managed rental housing, require acceptance of vouchers in all projects receiving density bonuses, require that affordable units created through density bonuses give the housing authority the opportunity to purchase these units. Creation of land trust units in all new subdivisions.
1	Provide incentive for cooperative housing development, removing regulations preventing coop housing, and removing legislation that limits the amount of unrelated/unmarried tenants sharing a single home.


1	Find the organizations that do it well already. Don't need to reinvent the wheel. Community land trusts. Inclusive zoning. Tax breaks for low income homeowners
1	Do not allow any more high rise condos or big developments to go up without offering at least 50% affordable housing that is AFFORDABLE - and not just a few bucks off a 1,000 1/br or 800 studio - that is absurd. Noone with a regular job can afford to live here.
1	Offer various kinds of programs. Subsidized housing, home buying incentives, education for credit repair/building and financial literacy, job creation/advancement opportunities, the use of tax credits, federal programs, and improve public transit
1	Expedited permitting for higher density/mixed use developments. Allowing tiny houses/multiple tiny houses on one large lot. Requiring new houses in Hyde Park, etc, to build a carriage house in the back (or something like it)
1	Stop using tax payre money to promote growth of Austin for the benefit of the wealthy at the expense of the moderate and lower income folks
1	a con: in my opinion, allowing builders/contractors to increase the size of buildings (either footprint, getting away from the impervious cover limits, or by increasing height) for adding a couple affordable housing is a bit of a farce - helping the builders but in the end doing very little for those who need help with affordable housing. integrate austin more and develop buildings with heathy landscapes - not simply buildings slammed up right against roads. in my mind two things will help austin continue to be a viable and beautiful place to live - open spaces and a solid mass transit system - the latter will help all in this town stay happy and the first one, open spaces will help folks of all income levels live better.

23. What is the highest level of school you have completed?




Value	Percent	Count
Some high school	0.2%	2
Graduated high school	0.9%	8
Some college	11.6%	104
Graduated college	47.7%	428
Post-graduate work	39.3%	353
Do not know/unsure	0.0%	0
Refused	0.3%	3
Total		898

24. Which of the following best describes your residence?




Value	Percent	Count
Single-family home	58.1%	521
Duplex	6.2%	56
Townhouse	2.0%	18
Condo	5.8%	52
Apartment	24.6%	221
Other	3.2%	29
Total		897

25. What is your current employment situation?




Value	Percent	Count
Employed part-time	9.0%	81
Employed full-time	77.8%	698
Unemployed	2.2%	20
Student	3.7%	33
Retired	5.7%	51
Homemaker	1.2%	11
Do not know/unsure	0.3%	3
Total		897

26. Which of the following categories best describes your total family income for 2015, before taxes?




Value	Percent	Count
Under \$10,000	3.0%	27
\$10,000 to under \$25,000	7.7%	69
\$25,000 to under \$40,000	16.7%	149
\$40,000 to under \$50,000	11.9%	106
\$50,000 to under \$60,000	9.2%	82
\$60,000 to under \$75,000	9.7%	86
\$75,000 to under \$100,000	14.8%	132
\$100,000 or more	24.5%	218
Do not know/unsure	2.5%	22
Total		891

27. Which best describes how many people live with you, including yourself?



Value	Percent	Count
1 (just yourself)	21.7%	195
2	44.1%	396
3	18.9%	170
4	9.9%	89
5 or more	5.5%	49
Total		899

28. Do you or does someone in your home have a disability?



Value	Percent	Count
Yes	10.6%	95
No	86.2%	774
Prefer not to answer	3.2%	29
Total		898

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

Affordable Housing Survey Research


Online Spanish Version

April 2016

CITY OF AUSTIN HOUSING SURVEY (Spanish Version) – April 2016


ONLINE VERSION

1. ¿Es usted?




Value	Percent	Count
Hombre	7.7%	1
Mujer	92.3%	12
Otro	0.0%	0
Prefiero no contestar	0.0%	0
Total		13

2. ¿Cuántos años tiene?



Value	Percent	Count
Menos de 18 años	0.0%	0
De 18 a 24	0.0%	0
De 25 a 30	0.0%	0
De 31 a 35	38.5%	5
De 36 a 40	30.8%	4
De 41 a 45	0.0%	0
De 46 a 50	15.4%	2
De 51 a 55	0.0%	0
De 56 a 60	7.7%	1
De 61 a 65	0.0%	0
66 años o más	7.7%	1
Total		13

3. ¿Cuál de las siguientes categorías describe mejor su raza/etnicidad?




Value	Percent	Count
Afroamericano	0.0%	0
Aleutiano, esquimal o nativo americano	0.0%	0
Asiático, de las Islas del Pacífico	0.0%	0
Mexicoamericano, hispano, latino	100.0%	13
Blanco	0.0%	0
Total		13
Responses "Otro"		Count
Left Blank		13

4. ¿Cuál es el código postal de su casa?


Count	Response
1	78640
1	78653
1	78702
1	78721
1	78725
1	78727
1	78730
1	78741
2	78745
1	78748
1	78753
1	78759

5. ¿Alquila o es dueño de su residencia actual?




Value	Percent	Count
Alquilo	46.2%	6
Soy dueño	53.9%	7
No sé	0.0%	0
Total		13

6. Las personas que trabajan en Austin deberían poder pagar una vivienda en Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	7.7%	1
6	7.7%	1
7	0.0%	0
8	0.0%	0
9	0.0%	0
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	84.6%	11
Total		13

7. Es importante que haya opciones de vivienda económica en todas partes de Austin.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	7.7%	1
6	0.0%	0
7	7.7%	1
8	0.0%	0
9	7.7%	1
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	76.9%	10
Total		13

8. La Ciudad de Austin debe proveer como incentivo la revisión más rápida de los permisos si los constructores proveen viviendas económicas para aquellos hogares con ingresos menores de \$40,000/año.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	15.4%	2
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	7.7%	1
9	7.7%	1
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	69.2%	9
Total		13

9. Como incentivo, la Ciudad de Austin debe permitirles a los constructores construir edificios más altos a lo largo de las calles principales si un porcentaje de los apartamentos/condominios en los edificios los podrán costear aquellos hogares con ingresos menores de \$40,000/año.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	7.7%	1
4	15.4%	2
5	23.1%	3
6	0.0%	0
7	7.7%	1
8	7.7%	1
9	0.0%	0
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	38.5%	5
Total		13

10. Como incentivo, la Ciudad de Austin debe requerir menos espacio de estacionamiento para las construcciones a ¼ de milla de una ruta de autobús o riel si las construcciones proveen viviendas económicas para aquellos hogares con ingresos menores de \$40,000/año.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	7.7%	1
2	7.7%	1
3	0.0%	0
4	7.7%	1
5	7.7%	1
6	15.4%	2
7	7.7%	1
8	15.4%	2
9	7.7%	1
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	23.1%	3
Total		13

11. Considere pagar impuestos o cuotas más altas si los ingresos de esos mayores impuestos y cuotas se usaran para construir viviendas económicas en propiedades con otros usos públicos, como bibliotecas y otros edificios públicos.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	46.2%	6
2	0.0%	0
3	7.7%	1
4	0.0%	0
5	15.4%	2
6	7.7%	1
7	7.7%	1
8	0.0%	0
9	0.0%	0
Muy probable 10	15.4%	2
Total		13

12. Apoye a la Ciudad de Austin para usar los ingresos de impuestos adicionales generados de la construcción de nuevos complejos para preservar o construir viviendas económicas.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	15.4%	2
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	7.7%	1
6	0.0%	0
7	15.4%	2
8	7.7%	1
9	7.7%	1
Muy probable 10	46.2%	6
Total		13

13. La Ciudad de Austin debería aumentar la cantidad de viviendas económicas en los corredores de carreteras principales y en los centros de mayor concentración de trabajo.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	7.7%	1
2	15.4%	2
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	7.7%	1
7	7.7%	1
8	23.1%	3
9	15.4%	2
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	23.1%	3
Total		13

14. La Ciudad de Austin debería permitir que se construyan casas pequeñas en terrenos más pequeños de lo que permite actualmente para que haya más opciones económicas.




Value	Percent	Count
Total desacuerdo 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	8.3%	1
4	8.3%	1
5	8.3%	1
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	16.7%	2
9	0.0%	0
Totalmente de acuerdo 10	58.3%	7
Total		12

15. La congestión de tráfico y la distancia al trabajo a la hora de escoger la ubicación de su casa.




Value	Percent	Count
Ninguna influencia 1	7.7%	1
2	0.0%	0
3	7.7%	1
4	7.7%	1
5	0.0%	0
6	0.0%	0
7	0.0%	0
8	7.7%	1
9	0.0%	0
Muy influyente 10	69.2%	9
Total		13

16. El costo de un automóvil y la gasolina a la hora de escoger la ubicación de su casa.




Value	Percent	Count
Ninguna influencia 1	46.2%	6
2	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	0.0%	0
7	7.7%	1
8	7.7%	1
9	0.0%	0
Muy influyente 10	38.5%	5
Total		13

17. Considere vivir en una casa adosada, casa de construcción en fila, tríplex, apartamento u otra opción de vivienda que no sea una casa unifamiliar independiente de si la pudiera pagar.



Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	7.7%	1
2	0.0%	0
3	15.4%	2
4	0.0%	0
5	15.4%	2
6	0.0%	0
7	15.4%	2
8	7.7%	1
9	0.0%	0
Muy probable 10	38.5%	5
Total		13

18. Considere vivir en una casa adosada, casa de construcción en fila, tríplex, apartamento u otra opción de vivienda que no sea una casa unifamiliar independiente si mejoraría su distancia al trabajo.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	7.7%	1
2	7.7%	1
3	7.7%	1
4	0.0%	0
5	30.8%	4
6	0.0%	0
7	7.7%	1
8	0.0%	0
9	7.7%	1
Muy probable 10	30.8%	4
Total		13

19. ¿Qué es lo que más le preocupa en cuanto a las viviendas económicas en su vecindario?


Count	Response
1	El barrio donde vivo que aumente el candalismo
2	El costo y la seguridad
1	El precio
1	Inseguridad, intranquilidad y escándalo
1	No existen en mi vecindario grandes opciones
1	No hay muchas opciones para rentar vivienda economica
1	Que las todos tengamos que hacer lo que mi familia, salir de Austin para poder tener un hogar.
1	Que suba el crimen en las calles
2	Seguridad
1	calidad, durabilidad, impuestos altos
1	el tipo de poblacion que termina viviendo en ellas no debe vivir del wealfare sino mas bien deben ingresar a programas de entrenamiento de empleo para poder mejorar su situacion economica. De nada sirve proveer vivienda economica si los residentes no mejoran sus habilidades para conseguir mejores empleos.

20. ¿Quién debería calificar para comprar o alquilar viviendas económicas subsidiadas o con incentivos de la Ciudad de Austin? Por favor seleccione una.



Value	Percent	Count
Menos de \$10,000	0.0%	0
Menos de \$20,000	23.1%	3
Menos de \$30,000	38.5%	5
Menos de \$40,000	7.7%	1
Menos de \$50,000	23.1%	3
Más de \$50,000 al año	7.7%	1
Total		13

21. Por favor clasifique en una escala del 1 al 10 las probabilidades de que usted apoye la legislación u ordenanzas que promuevan viviendas económicas. 1 significa que no es para nada probable y 10 significa que es muy probable.




Value	Percent	Count
No es probable 1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0
3	8.3%	1
4	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0
6	8.3%	1
7	8.3%	1
8	8.3%	1
9	8.3%	1
Muy probable 10	58.3%	7
Total		12

22. ¿Tiene alguna idea sobre cómo crear viviendas económicas en Austin?


Count	Response
1	Crear viviendas económicas aorillas de la ciudad
1	Get a land to build affordable house.
6	No
1	No es mi ramo
1	Si.que las renta de base a Lo que gana la persona
1	material prefabrica, contenedores, materiales reciclados,
1	Dejen de incrementar los impuestos y creen zonas de departamentos con retail para sostener el costo de los apartamentos

23. ¿Cuál es el mayor grado de educación que ha completado?




Value	Percent	Count
Parte de escuela secundaria	7.7%	1
Graduado de escuela secundaria	23.1%	3
Algunos estudios universitarios	23.1%	3
Graduado de la universidad	30.8%	4
Postgrado	15.4%	2
No sé/no estoy seguro	0.0%	0
No deseo contestar	0.0%	0
Total		13

24. ¿Cuál de las siguientes describe mejor su residencia?




Value	Percent	Count
Casa unifamiliar	69.2%	9
Dúplex	7.7%	1
Casa adosada	7.7%	1
Condominio	0.0%	0
Apartamento	15.4%	2
Otro	0.0%	0
Total		13

25. ¿Cuál es su situación de empleo actualmente? Usted es:




Value	Percent	Count
Empleado a medio tiempo	23.1%	3
Empleado a tiempo completo	53.9%	7
Desempleado	0.0%	0
Estudiante	0.0%	0
Jubilado	0.0%	0
Ama de casa	15.4%	2
No sé/no estoy seguro	7.7%	1
Total		13

26. ¿Cuál de las siguientes categorías describe mejor su ingreso familiar total para el año 2015, antes de los impuestos? Sería:




Value	Percent	Count
Menos de \$10,000	15.4%	2
Entre \$10,000 y menos de \$25,000	15.4%	2
Entre \$25,000 y menos de \$40,000	38.5%	5
Entre \$40,000 y menos de \$50,000	7.7%	1
Entre \$50,000 y menos de \$60,000	0.0%	0
Entre \$60,000 y menos de \$75,000	15.4%	2
Entre \$75,000 y menos de \$100,000	7.7%	1
\$100,000 o más	0.0%	0
No sé/no estoy seguro	0.0%	0
Total		13

27. ¿Cuál describe mejor cuántas personas viven con usted, incluyéndose usted mismo? Viven:



Value	Percent	Count
1 (usted solo)	7.7%	1
2	15.4%	2
3	38.5%	5
4	23.1%	3
5 o más	15.4%	2
Total		13


28. ¿Está usted discapacitado o alguien en su hogar tiene una discapacidad?




Value	Percent	Count
Sí	15.4%	2
No	84.6%	11
Prefiero no contestar	0.0%	0
Total		13

Transportation-Related Questions from
Austin Energy Statistically Valid Emailed Survey


15. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: Traffic congestion and commute time when choosing your home location.




16. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: The cost of a car and gas when choosing your home location.





17. Would you consider living in a townhouse, row house, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it was affordable to you?




18. Would you consider living in a townhouse, row house, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it improved your commute?



II. Paper Survey Responses

1. Are you?**2. What is your age?****3. Which of the following categories best describes your race/ethnicity?**




4. What is your home zip code?

78736
78749
78748
78749
78704
78745
78722
78748
78745
78758
78617
78723
78745
78705
78722
78705
78702
78702
78723
78723
78703
78752


78703
78702
78731
78727
78723
78705
78757
78735
78741

5. Do you rent or own your current place of residence?




Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 represents total disagreement and 10 represents total agreement. Please choose one answer.

6. People who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin.




7. It is important that there are affordable housing options in all parts of Austin.




The City of Austin can create regulations requiring developers to provide affordable housing if they are granted incentives. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements, where 1 indicates you do not agree and a 10 means you strongly agree? Please choose one answer.


8. Developments provide housing affordable for households making less than \$40,000/year.



9. The City of Austin should provide, as an incentive, the ability for developers to build taller buildings along major roadways if a percentage of the apartments/condos in the buildings are affordable for households making less than \$40,000/year.




10. The City of Austin should, as an incentive, require less parking for developments within $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile of a bus route or rail line if the developments provide housing affordable for households making less than \$40




Additional affordable housing in the city of Austin could be funded through property taxes, fees, state, and federal grants and partnerships. Please indicate on the scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means not at all likely and 10 means very likely. Please choose one answer.

11. I am willing to pay higher taxes or higher fees if those funds were used to preserve or build affordable housing.




12. I support the City of Austin using additional tax revenue generated by new developments to preserve or build affordable housing.




How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements, where 1 indicates you do not agree and 10 means you strongly agree? Please choose on answer.

13. The City of Austin should increase the amount of affordable housing along major roadway corridors and in major job centers.



14. The City of Austin should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed, in order to provide more affordable options.




Please rate on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means no influence and 10 means very influential, the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live. Please choose one answer.

15. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: Traffic congestion and commute time when choosing your home location.

1=Not Influence


10=Very Influential



16. Please indicate the level of influence the following statements had on your decision to live where you currently live: The cost of a car and gas when choosing your home location.

1=Not Influence

10=Very Influential




Please rate on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is very unlikely and 10 is very likely, the likelihood of considering these housing options. Please choose one answer.

17. Would you consider living in a townhouse, rowhouse, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it was affordable to you?

1=Very Unlikely


10=Very Likely



18. Would you consider living in a townhouse, rowhouse, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached, single-family home, if it improved your commute?

1=Very Unlikely

10=Very Likely



19. What is your greatest concern regarding affordable housing in your neighborhood?

Responses
Public infrastructure - especially transportation.
There is very little.
Property maintenance affecting property values negatively.
That it's going away very soon because I'm less than 2 miles from downtown.
Bad people who cheat the system bringing crime.
Traffic
Location
Affordable housing should be integrated into the entire community rather than in segregated areas.
Lack of density, especially with for-sale housing.
Housing is not dense enough. Height restrictions should be removed and tall multifamily housing units should be built.
Gaps in affordability and/or whether the types offered actually are desired.
Lack of non-car transportation for affordable housing residents.
That people will be forced into situations they did not plan for/not communicated them.
Our zoning system is archaic + prevents sufficient supply from being built.
Minimum income requirements + lack of affordable options.
Stigma


None!

Getting it.


Privatize transit?

undesirable element of depressing property values. Those people who live in "affordable" housing run it into the ground, make it look unsightly and make it a blight on the neighborhood

20. Who should be eligible to purchase or rent affordable housing that is subsidized or incentivized by the City? Which Income Category?




21. Please rate on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning not at all likely and 10 meaning very likely your likelihood to support legislation or ordinances promoting affordable housing.





22. Do you have any ideas for creating affordable housing in Austin?


Responses
Partner with ____? Like Foundation Communities.
I like the idea of smaller housing units but prefer that they are developed as a condo lot or a
Scattered in all parts not ty to seclude the people.
More funding for Section 8 and 1st time homebuyers.
Fees for development. Any property on co e transit corridor sold rezoned to include affordable
Taxing developers who do not choose to provide affordable housing. Strike fund.
City-led development that are bid out for construction and management.
Remove height restrictions on buildings. Build tall multifamily units east of I-35. I live a 11th & I-
35 and would love to see taller buildings with more affordable options presented.
Coordinated transportation options to go along with housing.
Look at what Seattle is doing. Zone for townhouse and increase height of buildings on major
Tax rich people. Just do it.
Require developers to make a percentage of property's available for affordable housing.
Please find me one!
More density.
I like the idea of affordable housing along with every housing project. I like the idea of flexible
institute linkage fee

23. What is the highest level of school you have completed?




24. What is the highest level of school you have completed?**25. What is your current employment situation?**


26. Which of the following categories best describes your total family income for 2015, before taxes?



27. Which best describes how many people live with you, including yourself?



28. Do you or does someone in your home have a disability?



III. Community and Stakeholder Meeting Comments

Community and Stakeholder Meetings Comments
Add more extreme, controversial ideas, like houses over 300k must have a second unit.
Already knew of the information, and group did not meet.
Better, more incentivized, city overseen developments and permitting.
Discuss affordable housing for people with barriers such as disabilities and mental health.
Discuss Co-op housing.
Discuss student housing and parking.
Discuss Tiny House's as an option.
Eliminate barriers to rent.
Expedite permits, waive development fees, and give higher entitlements for affordable housing.
Fees contractors goes?
Focus on intercity.
Get larger groups together, mine only had 4.
Hard to convey the conversation to paper.
Highlight importance of Senior Citizen's needs.
Housing affordability needs to go beyond the scope of just income limits; Expensive multi-family housing should be limited to prevent property values from rising all over; More moderate income housing; Better, less car reliant transportation; Lower utility rates for lower income people; Make property rates more fair so that commercial properties pay their fair share and residents pay less; Allow more Accessory Dwelling Units.
Include in discussion housing barriers faced by people with criminal histories.
Provide more details about Tax Increment Financing, such as downsides.
Provide place for own ideas to be submitted.
Reform property appraisal evaluation.
Smaller lots are trendy, but what about the long term?
Someone from the City of Austin should have been part of the discussion, to better explain and facilitate.
Would like the city to help fund, or partner with someone to help fund or create a Musician's community/Co-op.
Would like Underground Parking structures automated.
I would like to see development plans for my community area or district.
Provide Spanish language handouts/posters.
Put more images on the Topics Poster.
2 Agrees - would be strongly agree but skepticism of whether actual units produced will come to fruition.
Allow homeowners to (waivers on land) valuation regardless of growth cost or valuation, if not, affordability will not be!
Austin needs 20% exemption for property tax.
Closely review the appraisal formula to avoid displacement by allowing waivers to non comparable since neighborhood is changing.
Community input should drive this.
Cover topics to make affordability by asking (Employers w/ incentives) to do the following: Donate fund to affordability, Hire and train workforce in Austin, Allow them to pay for transportation cost once they are adding sheet activity thru (greet?)
Define "Affordable" in Austin
Developers are the problem not the solutions.
Discuss Grandfather Clause in TX Property Code for homeowners (not) to get displaced.
Discuss public safety.
Discuss specifics relating to Property Code and Local Government Code
Discuss the need for much improved public transportation.

How can current retirement age homeowners afford to stay in Austin with direction developers are create expenses/taxes imposed?
Make it more clear that his is less about affordable housing and more about how to designate affordable housing within developments
MFI needs to be lower.
More input from the public should clarify city goals.
More tools should be discussed; Rent Control (subsidized), More Public Housing
Need to get more and longer lasting affordable housing in agreements with developers.
No assurance that smaller units will be affordable, or create more affordable housing city-wide.
Outline goals for the Housing Plan.
Property tax breaks (freeze on p.taxes after a certain year) to keep homeowners in there homes.
Public Housing - Preserve and Expand!
The group discussion topics specifically related to City of Austin ordinances on land development - did not cover tax incentives by city, state or federal if they are used. These were not identified by affordability.
These are developer friendly options.
A look at how city funds are used now could reveal available \$.
Against turning roadways into valleys with taller buildings.
Agree but with reservations - which programs would have funding cut from them and which income bracket will this effect in a social demographic?
Agree with this IF the taller buildings allowing density are very close to <u>transit</u> .
Austin should demand that developers provide a decent percentage of housing units as affordable, both sales and rental.
Concern about heights backing to existing residential. Want to be compatible w/ surrounding neighborhood.
Concerns about public transportation taking <u>way</u> too long and not viable or taking kids to child care and then getting to work.
Concerns about: Neighborhood integrity, utilities that tax infrastructure, no guarantee housing will be
Density - does not always create affordability.
Direct funds from multiple sources, from money raising activates such as fees on SWSW.
Discuss gentrification, chapter 25-2 subchapter F of city code limiting McMansions.
Discuss how to get developers to build affordable housing.
Discuss Inclusionary Zoning
Discuss Infrastructure.
Discussed only tangentially the connection between affordable housing and a living wage, which Austin needs.
Does "missing middle" include garage apartments and granny flats? Please clarify.
Don't see any single family housing.
Encourage density to happen only where public transit supports it!
Fewer waivers that increase fees for current water, electric, etc. customers
Focus on affordable buyable homes- not renters.
Get more homes (buy) than for rent (Apts) - Handup (buy) vs. Handout (rent)
Glad to speak with Jonathan.
Have one person or group address everyone at once and offer an overview of there groups discussion at the end.
How long is it going to be okay to have a segregated Austin.
I don't really believe this will make any difference in what Austin decides to do. There are 2 Austin's and in my lifetime, it won't change.
I want to see <3000 sqft lots. Let them follow McMansion + all regulations (David Wittworth)
If affordable housing does not include subsidized housing but reflects the market rate of being affordable.
If this said <u>Rail</u> , I would have strongly agreed.

IF we had a decent transportation system.
Income increase (up from where min was) as well as available houses has lease impact.
Instructions were easy to follow but the group fell off of it when he pace of the conversation shifted.
Issue with open nature of wording. Not in favor where sidewalk and other infrastructure is in place <u>context</u> .
Keep existing affordable housing, but replace affordable housing going forward with denser mega houses and apartments.
Less funding for other COA programs? (social programs)
Lowest income group may need less parking others may not. What are nearby options?
Mueller seems to work... looks like a nice place to live. This strategy works here.
My neighborhood (2,000 homes) will change drastically due to 3 bus routes in 1 square mile.
Need to pay close attention to impact on neighborhood + resources to sustain current quality.
No current data to support that 2nd structures in existing residential neighborhoods would be used as affordable housing
Not enough info about the implementation of these ideas.
Not enough time for instructions.
Offer email updates on how specifically our input shapes the city code/land development code.
Only agree with rail.
Only if it fits in the neighborhood. 4 story Apts on residential streets of a pocket neighborhood is an example of a poor fit.
Our group argued more than problem solved- there was no brainstorming.
Please help ensure housing in the urban core is diverse - allowing for all demographics... incomes, races, singles, families, retirees, etc.
Provide a place for input/discussion for those who strongly disagree on everything.
Questions asked in a too general manner, where the answers are really content based and dependent on many factors not explained in the question.
Rocky start! But informative!
Similar concerns as expressed in comments to topic 5.
Smaller lots will drive the cost of land up further.
Some more specificity on the issues would make our discussion more well informed. A lot of our arguments were moot because we understood different things.
Strongly agree if limited to net new land <u>but</u> neutral to disagree for existing residential neighborhoods.
Tall nodes make sense.
Tax Breaks for landlords of homes that provide affordable housing.
The building owners should be the ones to (finance?) the affordable housing rather than take the money from libraries, parks and public health and raising taxes for it.
The data is clear and the tradeoff makes sense, if people don't need the parking they should save money.
The staff were awesome! Very knowledgeable and patient.
The statements and the activity seem slanted to the developers.
There are many causes that impact affordable housing - not just trying to find ways to help developers?
There is no available land in my neighborhood.
This is the future for Austin! The next generation does not want to depend on cars!
This is where we want to encourage density: near transit! ... but less density in areas further from transit.
Trade off is not okay if the affordable housing is <u>short term</u> .
Traffic considerations.
Very well designed.
We agreed that transportation, wages, economic disparity, and greed all impact affordable housing.
What about permeability issues?

What data indicates that TIF works? Are there increased tax revenues?
What is cost of updating infrastructure (sewer etc.) for without pays? NOT taxpayers.
What is impact on traffic?
What is Tax Increment Funding?
What is the impact on the environment?
What is the relation to % affordable housing and increased height?
Why did the city decline to buy TxDot 45th/Bull Creek?
Will AF residents have to park on the street? What is the impact on nearby established neighborhoods?
Will city planners weigh in on the impact these vertical buildings have on traffic and gentrification, i.e. adjacent rent and property value prices as a result of new real estate development? What's different from bad traffic already caused by 15 story condos downtown on S. Lamar?
Will there be incentives of some kind to employers to locate their company on the bus line?
Will this create "Public Housing" (negative) areas? What is the impact on surrounding areas?
Wording issue - affordable housing for all types of people? Family? - Will they live tall approach?
Yes! This exists now and it should stay, we should have more!
Address Tatn Issue impact on affordability.
All neighborhoods.
Can ARA revenues be used for housing affordability.
Connecting routes are essential to link w/ rail lines.
Discuss additional funding sources that would go toward affordable housing.
Discuss assisted living affordability and accessibility.
Discuss deeper affordability in CLT/ile Colony Park Land
Discuss new developments money vs. new business money going towards affordability issues and expanding transportation Eastward
I have to know what are the new developments for?
Monitor equity in quality of affordable units, and monitor discriminatory practices.
More affordability is a must, especially in the development that will be coming to Colony Park!
More outreach - newspapers, radio, T.V.
Must have access to grocery store, emergency facilities, family facilities, dentist office, etc.
Partner w/ Housing authority for density.
Specific language Re: renters vs. owners or affordability.
We can't do this until we have excellent transit. (like they have for UT!)
Without more Density.
"Neutral" on 4 is based on the idea that it is not necessarily appropriate for all neighborhoods - Redevelopment to divided smaller lots can have significant negative impact in some neighborhoods.
\$40,000 too high, need to reach ELI households as part of this effort.
2300 sq. ft. is not a small house ~ especially with the porch, garage, attic exemption.
5 story buildings are most affordable.
A community land trust model can assure long-term affordability.
Acknowledge that the majority want a house with a yard.
Affordable housing must support a range of incomes, including ELI, and have varying sizes. Lets not invest in "tiny houses".
Against tearing down existing single family housing to build multifamily units. Investors should not be allowed to purchase single family houses. These homes should remain for families intending to reside in these homes, and not as an investment to ear down to make a huge profit.
All of us could not afford to live in our neighborhoods if we had to buy in todays market.
Allow Mobile Loaves + Fishes type communities in the Austin City Limits.

Are work areas accessible from affordable housing? Our custodians drive to our office/warehouse.
Capitol Metro Bus system needs to provide more and frequent service for this to work.
Consider the conditions on the ground. Do not do this across the board.
Discuss protecting neighborhood character.
Do not subdivide current lots in established neighborhood.
Does this make a diverse neighborhood or segregate affordable housing to existing transportation corridors.
Fee in-lieu should not be an option - diverse neighborhoods should be throughout city. Fee in-lieu segregates people.
How many people in the under \$40,000 bracket?
If existing retail space was reconfigured this would be acceptable. Example S. Lamar where Alamo Draft house and other new apartments in that are but make affordable.
Issue of transportation planning for buses- approach that focuses along corridors can result in segregated
Long term Austin residents should receive some sort of benefits for being a long term resident and not pushed out of the city.
Make sure the money doesn't come from transit.
More density does not always mean taller buildings. Attached homes increase density but don't increase height.
Need to make sure that extremely low income households are substantially included.
Neutralize Homeowner's Association control on lot and home size within the development.
No one "deserves" a McMansion. Affordable housing should be available in all neighborhoods.
No TIF Funding!
Only if units stay affordable permanently otherwise it's a band aid.
Protect older, existing affordable housing.
Protect views.
Reduced parking requirements on new construction near transit can benefit household affordability even without on site required affordable housing.
Reducing the parking requirements would be acceptable only if they are directly tied to he affordability requirements.
Taller/denser building provide better household affordability opportunities, in their own respect, <u>without</u> on site required affordability.
The activity was designed to obtain a particular outcome.
The example "income required to afford rent" shows that these units are NOT affordable to people in extremely low income households.
These need to be units with multiple (homes?)
This leads to more impervious cover and more flooding.
This should also go hand-in-hand with improving transit.
Use land trusts to create and preserve neighborhood-scale multi-unit buildings.
We should not prioritize this approach over other affordable housing strategies.
Yes but I depends on where the funds come from - should (make use segregation tuting?)
Yes, but in high income neighborhoods the cost to provide "affordable" housing should not be on the backs of low and moderate income folks.
Yes, but we need to keep our existing affordable housing.
A cost analysis of each building type should be done, to better inform decisions.
All of these opinions are formed with out understanding of cost impact. If actual cost impact of different options are know, I think opinions would change.
Concern was for three groups: Current owners, Future owners, and intentional renters.
It was a little complicated, but very good.
Looking at the safety implications, walking paths and biking paths for the reality of changing where parking

Preservation in areas where living is affordable. And no simply insertion of housing (affordable) to already most wealthy live.
"at a range of prices"? How wide? What is each end?
801 & 803 lines offer a great opportunity to encourage moderate-income afford for folks who work downtown.
A.I (hoc?) density agreements lead to look of (accoutedll?)
According to apartment finder low wage workers at \$26900 annual cannot afford Austin at all. $26900 \times 30\% = 672.30$
Ads at bus stops or in Apts or mailing informational.
Affordable to household below 30% AMI. Also, what about quality livability, you can get affordable housing if you want slum housing...
Affordable yes, but by varying MFI requirements we can both diversify and protect areas.
Again gentrification (pushing the poor people out) is making it more expensive for them. We need housing closer to the urban areas to help with this an again it'll help sustainability.
Agreed no room for urban sprawl, but <u>don't</u> want another NYC. (concrete jungle)
All materials need to be in Spanish.
Assure diversity by assigning seating instead of having like minded people become more ingrained in their
Build more public housing!
Building taller buildings for low-income families. I believe that it gives this city a chance to create more diversity in the inner city instead of letting gentrification happen. (pushing people out)
Can ADP take a hit?
Challenging but fun activity.
City budget reallocations to increase city housing budget. Making rent control legal like NYC. Build more public housing.
COA should limit how many vehicles per person.
Concern about affordable housing gained this way expiring...
Consider the idea of rent control.
Considering population growth small houses may not be environmentally the best option - think about future growth & space.
Corridor rent controls.
Could have used facilitation.
Create more mass transit.
Cut back on public safety.
Decouple parking from multi-family development to decrease parking spaces needed. Make parking space rent an add-on to unit rent.
Define facilitator role a little better or assign one.
Discuss education.
Discuss health, education, employment/ career advancement training opportunities, food access, public safety. Event was 2 hours, so why limit 10 min per issue.
Discuss how City Housing Bond work.
Distrust that city would enforce affordability.
Do we bring any ideas, not open ended enough state policy problems.
Does "taller buildings" = VMU's, or is VMU just an option?
Does affordable mean quality? (accessible, transit limited, new amenities?)
Educate with random flyers mailed out to get a greater sampling.
Felt like certain options were not on the table at all.
Fund more Foundation Communities Projects!
Have informed facilitators for each group instead of electing one o the participants.

Have more sessions in the local libraries.
Hold more community meetings and announce on Spanish TV & radio.
Housing & amenities, residents need, like libraries and parks. Maybe need to kick in for schools.
How are you defining "major roadways"? Highways (I83, I35) OR major thoroughfares (Lamar,
How long do the units remain "affordable"?
How tall?, will there be parking?, if so, where?, surface lots?, underground garage? Will public transit be within 1/4 mile?
How will you encourage this, what specific implementation?
I think if we take taxes from other services & programs. Doing this would mean these programs would take away jobs or cut back salaries. This I fear is counter-intuitive to what our purpose is, we would create more poverty.
I want to know what happens after this.
I was unclear of how you developed your six statements and why you wanted my feedback.
I would like to hear from the folks at other tables.
IF sidewalks are provided & prevalent.
Improve bus service.
Increase Housing Budget!
Increased advertisement, I don't know how I would've known about this outside of UT.
Interactions with traffic and public transit.
Is Austin considering rent control? Where are we in the process? How will our feedback be implemented.
Is the focus on 1-2 bedroom affordable or will it include 3-4 bedroom?
It was slightly confusing not having an actual facilitator guide the conversations some topics vague, some
Liked having an interpreter for Spanish.
Limiting/Concentrating "affordable housing" historically leads to continued impoverished neighborhoods.
List minimum lot/house sizes.
Look at how mature cities - NY, Chicago, Philly, etc. Do "Air Rights", day-light setbacks, etc. developers do not need a pass on this! If so many more costly cities can do - so can we.
Loved the translation of languages aspect.
Maintain affordability of naturally existing housing (property types, gentrification).
Major roadway with transit, not interstate access road.
Make an elevated train on Lamar from I83 -> river.
Maybe reduce everybody's parking requirements not just for affordable housing.
Maybe start of explaining the format to the entire plenary group before breaking off into small groups.
Mixed use construction should include small and/or affordable housing units.
More ways to find out about events.
Need better public transit for this to work.
Need more bus service everywhere.
Need to enforce existing ordinances related to density bonus.
Need to respect neighborhood plans.
Needs to be centrally located close to city center in a location safe from future isolation - or to a central transportation hub.
Neighborhood Association meetings.
Neighborhoods did already opt-in/out of small lot infill as part of multi-year, max public participation processes.
No tax breaks for development, yet provide incentives to include affordable housing.
Not all portions of the city should be treated the same! Historic/Scenic areas are great for tax base.
Not just distance is important, but quality of walk. (sidewalk, lighting, crime, traffic)
Only if they make it true in <u>all</u> neighborhoods.
Our roadways cannot handle # of vehicles we currently have... we need modern public transit.

Our water/waste water and electric infrastructure needs to be increased to handle density.
Parking issues - need more specifics about how many people.
People moving into Austin is the problem causes affordability and traffic issues that no policies will solve.
Preservation of community character while increasing density in SFU neighborhood.
Provide food at meetings for more engagement.
Reach out to church's, clubs and PTA's.
Reach out to struggling students.
Should focus first on diverting future tax revenue (TIF/TIRZ) before increasing spending from existing tax
Single family detached is least efficient form of housing. 2, 3, 4 plex on smaller lot.
Slash public safety budget!
Smaller houses on smaller lots may be better than ADU's but best solution is varied (not "a") solutions.
Smaller houses on smaller lots was discussed but there wasn't much discussion about ADU's, and that's a feasible solution.
Some of the statements (4,5) were worded a little confusingly.
Stop <u>senseless</u> incentivization! Stop waivers for SXSW, ACL, F1.
Supportive but major investments need to be made in bus/train frequencies and system improvements so people are incentivized to not use parking.
Tall buildings everywhere, like New York.
The instructions were easy to follow, while the wording for questions was ambiguous and slightly uninformative.
The question of " Who Needs Housing that is Affordable?" is insane. Everyone needs affordable housing. Define what affordable is before asking who needs it. Households, families, and workers are 3 separate units of measurement make a realistic basis.
There need to be some parking but I like the idea of less parking because it'll help the environment.
This is a great idea for people living in the (Ex urb.?) City downtowns need to steak up + housing in central Austin even if the lots are smaller.
This topic needs to be narrowed. Linking housing and transportation can be interpreted many ways. Explain why current issues are not a factor.
TIFs were not accurately and fully described. I do not feel I am leaving with new knowledge or alternate
Undosu mentod families need city to support them in home ownership like they do in San Francisco - they pay taxes like other residents.
We took many of the topics further than he information provided- transit, arererending , inequity.
What about lowering public transportation fares too?
When discussing "affordable housing" need to be using 30% of income as threshold.
Why new development? - What about providing incentives for large existing developers who do not provide affordable housing.
With better bus service or rail.
Would be interested in knowing the tradeoffs of increasing the budget for all... but strongly support TIF districts.
Would like to see conformity w/ neighborhood plan, also strong desire for permanent affordability.
Yes - with access to enough food, transport, and business.
Yes, if built w/ bond money.
Yes, parking requirement reductions are good in theory, but it should coincide with improved transit.
Approach community groups and ask them to do small groups.
Discuss how the city is interacting with the state to address property tax relief.
Distribute notices in the neighborhood, and/or keep presidents of neighborhoods notified.
Provide flyers and website.
The format is acceptable and provides the opportunity for each individual to express his/her concerns.
Walkable and livable communities.

Gain input at public events that are well established.
I'd like a table at the farmers market.
Always advocating.
More outreach and more similar events!
Discuss Land Trusts!
Provide information of available housing.
Discuss ADU's
Door to door flyers.
Discuss feasibility of transit as an option.
Concern that many still will not want to give up cars.
Depends on neighborhood; could increase street parking in some neighborhoods.
Important to be distributed throughout the city. Important to be close to work and schools.
Increased density creates a greater need for services that could be cut if TIF was implemented.
Subsidization is valuable, but as a small tool in the toolbox. Overall supply/demand is more critical.
Lack of affordable housing can lead to a loss of human resources (workforce) for the city.
Promotes use of public transit, walkability, etc.
Concerns about what would be cut with this option.
Additional Services can be provide by businesses that are part of VMU.
Concerns regarding compatibility with existing neighborhood.
Examples of where this works: Co-op at Lamar & Airport, Triangle.
Must consider available resources - Mueller is a model but is <u>well</u> organized.
Must be a significant amount of affordable housing given the financial gain.
Can decrease stability of neighborhood. As families grow they need more space and will likely move.
Bring this to neighborhood meetings, church, civic groups and parent / teacher events. Staff must go to he residents NOT residents go to city.
This was a good tool for the group to visualize what others think and gave participants the opportunity to explain why they voted.
Affordable housing must be placed in all neighborhoods and areas of he city. STOP placing affordable housing in low income areas only. District 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10. Student housing should not be considered affordable housing.
Food and alcohol always helps encourage attendance, try Circle C's food truck night.
Work-based input sessions work best for me - with 2 young children, my time on nights + weekends is full.
I had to ask the group for some quiet time for reading information since that wasn't part of the exercise, but otherwise okay.
Liked the structure of the exercise.
Conditional on a robust transit system that doesn't disproportionally impact the poor & disabled.
Would agree if mass transit was improved. Also would require some commitments because bus route can change or go away.
I have questions about implementation but he theory seems sound.
VMUs and tall buildings are misleading. They cost more to maintain and build.
My agreement is predicated on a corollary investment in more + improve mass transit.
Counters the "car culture" in Texas.
Disincentivizes option for certain (target) demographics.
Affordable housing needs to be distributed as evenly as possible, reduce any concentrations.
Dispersing affordable housing citywide helps to reduce property taxes.
I would want more info about my specific neighborhood to know if it's the best place for those limited resources.
This sounds good but I am way out of my depth on this topic + would hope that SME's could make best choices on tax strategies.

Stronger & enforceable affordable housing ordinance would be a better tool. Also cap density with option 2 increases if AH is provided on site.
Online surveys ----- online meeting "go to meeting"
Making sure affordable housing is large enough for families.
Advertise through mail.
Improve transit system.
Overall I'd like to see accountability with developers - provide traffic analyses + mitigation. More creative ways to incorporate charming mixed use development but always consider traffic, affordability, transit etc. not in a
The city does a good job of soliciting input.
The 6 discussion topics weren't detailed enough.
The relevant info provided seemed one-sided. I was reminded of a push poll.
Discuss the role that property values and property taxes play. Could really good mass transit decrease the need for density? Cost trade-offs? Direct subsidies?
Provide Refreshments.
I would like to see developers that request zoning changes take on a larger tax burden to support these
Put stories on local TV news and talk to the neighborhood associations.
The wording of the statements is too vague to be meaningful for data collection / usable information.
Would love to discuss specific tools such as land trusts, housing cooperatives, and other limited equity tools.
Continue the online surveys.
How do community members know what is being planned + how do they block / engage with developers to design what neighbors want.
Getting community buy-in for affordable housing.
Coordinate with schools / PTA's
Support A.H on public land.
Info seems biased.
Informational, however wish disadvantages were written on the issue guide.
It would have been more effective had there been a main facilitator aside from the participant "facilitator".
Zoning for pre fab homes.
Food?
City funding for creative tools/programs like housing cooperatives outside student neighborhoods.
Austin is still not a real city it needs to grow up.
New construction is not affordable because of current cost of land.
Look to San Francisco to learn how <u>not</u> to do economic development in tech.
Create communication between citizens & city on development types, use, etc.
This is not a come and go event. It is a 1 hour commitment.
You need <u>lots</u> of amenities and services in order to reduce car use and live near & use public transit.
The market will <u>not</u> address community needs.
Buy parking space separately. Then you pay for what you use.
The web survey is not working / available.
<u>Minneapolis</u> as a model.
Pair this with mobility & transit plans (sidewalks!!!).
Land Trusts should be integrated into the housing plan.
Employers need to play a role on the transit solution: discounts, buses / vans, rebates.
280,000 jobs in city core, Yikes!
Need other services as well.
Create Multiple Hub System.
Support increased TIF to support A.H development.

Affordable housing can't be discussed in a vacuum. Consider public transportation and suburbs
More affordable housing & more diversity (size/ type/ accessibility).
People unable to drive need housing too - access to effective reliable and comprehensive public transit. Large % (co pwbis?) in Austin. What about us!!
Not in favor of pitting A.H against existing general fund services - <u>grow the pie!</u>
Improve public transit network. Expand services so people unable to move out to Buda etc. still can get safe affordable reliable housing too.
Developers should be required to pay for supporting services - transportation, water, sewage, schools needed as population increases.
If have smaller houses allowed on lots could support older generations aging in place - moving to smaller unit on own property or folk with disability.
Do traffic analysis / traffic mitigation - require developers to support necessary infrastructure that comes along with larger developments for actual, complete developments (not dividing developments into parcels of land).
Taller buildings have only been (so far) really rich condos. What I've seen I am not impressed. I do not believe they will help with reliving poverty .etc.
Apts were promised to deal with need. These complexes were built.
What non-general funds are currently going to affordable housing / could go to housing.
City should get corporate underwriting (plan?) events or not have them just like it did for Trail of Lights -- Trivn Prem city budget.
Tax breaks? If the city is giving tax breaks to companies moving to Austin maybe these resourced can go to affordable housing? - how can we grow the resources rather than allocate them?
This should not be used as quantitative data because it isn't - Also people (some) participating don't live in the
Not really every other application of affordable works in each area.
Affordable Housing needs to be defined.
Mix of tall vs middle - transitions are important.
Not enough info to decide.
We (North Shoal Creek) have historically been affordable & we would like to remain so, but that appears less and less likely each day.
A disaster for (existing?) neighborhoods.
We (North Shoal Creek) already has affordable housing. This sounds like free ice cream for everyone. Need to clearly define "affordable"
What's a major roadway?
Should not be one size fits all (1/4 mile will change my entire (North Shoal Creek) neighborhood zoning).
Is this a leading question?
1/4 mile would encompass the whole (North Shoal Creek) neighborhood and thereby completely change the character of the neighborhood.
I'm open to the idea in general, but one size does not fit all.
Include goal + aspirations for which we <u>don't yet</u> have an implementation or funding strategy but that are nonetheless important: e.g. serving 15% MFI + below, tracking number of people with disabilities having accessibility needs met.
Provide meetings in home or neighborhoods for convenience. Flyers - walling neighbors.
There's no housing no where.
Yes we have criminal re-entry rights but what about unlawful evictions or eviction re-entry and low income property should be 2x or 3x the rest to qualify.
Connect to community through Blackland CDC.
Importance of expanding high quality transportation options for affordability options.
Advertise through posters or mail-ins.

Go to existing groups - churches, PTAs etc.
Discuss need for housing for middle income families.
Discuss public transportation.
Advertise the meetings, promote people input.
Reach out to employers + send email to district employees which are mostly considered in the low income
Mayor Adler said in a conference that he would make it easier to give building permits. To be more lenient giving a variance when a variance is required in h 25/100 yr. floodplain, when here was an existent building previously.
More community meetings.
More need for Community Land Trust / Shared Equity model homeownership models.
Reach out to existing groups at area faith-based organizations and Austin Interfaith.
Discuss housing repair for existing stock - focus on those citizens "aging in place".
How do other cities spend their general fund money?
Would request additional information about other programs being cut to increase the %.
A Community Land Trust would allow for more affordable units in a smaller house project.
There is a chicken & egg problem with placing affordable housing without parking by public transit, because Austin public transit is missing too!
Our group likes the idea of property tax increment financing.
More complex, what roadways? Missing public transportation?
Would density bonuses areas be expanded to include additional geographic regions.
Agreed as part of the solution but with other options considered with as much weight.
What about people making \$50,000 or less?
What is the definition of "major roadway"?
The transportation infrastructure has to be in place prior to reducing parking spaces.
Make public transportation options available in West + Southwest Austin.
Agreed with a focus on improving transportation to increase available bus routes within a quarter of a mile - across a broader geographic range in the city.
Disagree given the current "poor" state of public transportation even in main corridors.
Look to non-profit (Foundation Communities, Habitat for Humanity, Mobile Loaves & Fish's, Homeless Community Plan, etc.) to provide housing/provide options for people that own mobile homes/travel trailers etc.
Future solutions.
What is considered the city limits of Austin.
More advertisements.
Things to discuss: 1. Increase the transportation options. 2. Consider the link between housing and medical/there services - need o be close for some who are elderly/disabled. 3. Consider the connection to education + higher opportunity areas. 4. There is no wholistic approval to affordable housing. You have to consider housing, transportation, jobs, schools, health care, etc. The are all related.
This was a good experience glad I was able to come.
Utilize greater social media.
Mixed use properties.
Reach out and provide better informational opportunities to the neighborhoods.
Sheets were very skewed, seemed to lead in a certain way.
How soon can this be started? So many ordinances, codes, political (beliefs?) need to be altered - can this really happen?
Reduce don't eliminate!
Zoning not encourage.
Goldilock Density
Smaller lots via CodeNext!

Reduction would be ok - But not eliminate parking. I.e. - one car parking VS 2 car parking.
I do not like to see all our streets turn into building <u>canyons</u> ; That is what South Lamar is like.
I don't want to see developer/building fees go up it can (tu?) lost revenues.
Density bonus programs actually need to encourage. Don't (override?) with regulation.
Smaller houses on (segment?) should be considered . In my neighborhood I am seeing small homes be destroyed + multiple large homes put on the lot.
Duplexes zoned in every neighborhood.
Everyone's cost of living here should be lower.
Go up, just make sure roads can handle it.
In future developments, existing infrastructure can't handle roads, utilities, etc.
Why can't poor people have cars? You giving up yours?
Capital Metro Service is awful in South Austin.
Going downtown is a huge pain (I won't) so thank you for coming to us!
Was very informative and fun. Felt safe to be open with my group though none of them could relate o my background or life experiences.
Rental industry requirement of income 3x rent\$ is huge roadblock to safe affordable housing. You want to live where rent is \$700/month?
Definition of what affordable housing is built like - no high end finishes, minimal sq. ft. per person. We need efficiency Apts! -zoning issue! Mobile Loaves + Fishes except with kitchen and baths in the city limit throughout town!
Bus system is horrible has been and changes to it seldom help without hurting another part of it.
People with bad credit or even minor/old criminal past can not get housing of any type!! Punished forever.
Discuss homelessness.
Have a campaign with the faces of the people who need this, use the human story.
Great format for a group.
Spend money on land acquisition - model on Mueller.
Waivers for affordable housing scaled as % of development.
I think this will create an opportunity to further develop his idea.
Taller buildings, yes if infrastructure can support it. (transportation and other resources)
Do grassroots outreach don't rely on top down, trickle down dissemination of info.
Very informational.
Would like further developed plan around income requirements -> how you're going to ensure those who need housing most gets it. - i.e. college students qualifying b/c their family's income, or trust funds don't get considered & that in turn pushes more marginalized folks/families out.
Just keep meeting where available.
I would love to attend more meetings on this topic.
Really work to put the word out. (about meetings)
Hire community organizers rom our community to do outreach/engagement.
Provide childcare and food. (at meetings)
Meeting Topics lacked complexity i.e. racially cultural nuances.
The person (Jonathan) was great.
Cultural/Racial nuances Imagine Austin is rooted in racism specifically antiblackness even though it has great intentions.
Legislative action needed in requiring affordable units to be included in new developments.
Trust fund other income sources get factored in. Student housing exceptions like LIHTC
Strongly agree if directed towards lower income folks + not taking away from HHS.
CLT what happens when your children inherit the house.

Let them (the attendees) see how it applies to them. (regarding ideas to encourage attendance).
Making them more aware of affordable housing. (regarding ideas to encourage attendance).
The unwillingness of the City to spend more on affordable housing, 1% is a joke.
Invite to meetings, information. (regarding ideas to encourage attendance).
Not everyone is making lots of money, BUT everyone needs a place to live. If you need good reliable people to work for you, we need a place to live too!
Please take care of the Austin / Metro citizens first before refugees. We are struggling too.
If you're talking with most former homeless people, you would have to provide food or gift cards (what's in it for me).
It wasn't really fun, but it was informational.
I think the city shouldn't give big business such breaks as not paying their share of taxes. Find other perks to give them. If this is done, it might keep property taxes from going up & the Austin citizens would have more money to spend.
The elderly can't afford to stay in their homes. Especially those on fixed income. Can anything be done?
Publicity of growth forecast. (regarding ideas to encourage attendance).
The minimum wage!! Should be a LIVING WAGE! TAX the wealthy.
We need more businesses that hire to relax policy on criminal background make more business second chance companies.
More groups to meet incentives for suggestions. (regarding ideas to encourage attendance).
The handout appreciated informative. Food for thought provoking further desire to be involved + find
Adequate time given to question & answer session.
(when design was addressed in meeting) yard space, connection with nature in future sites all the empty buildings that can be put to use for housing already built. More windows and light to the units (natural light).
1% of taxes goes to affordable housing means they don't even recognize there is a problem.
The City of Austin should be able to dictate # of unit are affordable. NOT developers. NOT the State.
1. Forbes ranks Austin #1. 2. People moving here at a rate of (net) 100/day? 3. Tax + code incentives to help with affordable housing.
Both Public Health + Safety can afford NO LOSS these need more funding ASAP! Affordable housing funding double ASAP!!
Real Estate developers will only pass tax increases on to their renters. So using tax increases is not a sustainable solution.
Austin has <u>many</u> low income jobs, and if I am working a low paying job. <u>Please</u> give me a nice place to live.
Limiting parking is a good idea, but I wouldn't get rid of it because a car can help get someone out of the poverty cycle through more work options.
I think some people don't want Low-income people living close to them. There are not enough low-income single men places to live.
Is the city considering "tiny homes" in the plan?
Affordable housing in downtown has many advantages & opportunity for citizens + city itself.
Please help the Austin citizens first. We are really struggling to afford a house. Especially being disabled. My medical bills are overwhelmed.
What about disability parking, update the plan?
What about my flying car?
Affordable housing with out a parking space, defeats it's purpose. But it's great if you live downtown & work downtown, with no car.
New developments are a great place to get funds to balance what they're doing to rental prices in Austin.
Affordable Housing leads to more opportunities for employed, thus tax payers!

You spend 1% on affordable housing , the cost from homeless is far greater this gets people of the streets to be productive.
The public should be engaged through intense Neighborhood Meetings
Do Not Let City Override Neighborhood Plans
Bias in Survey Against Single Family
o Assumption that it is not Affordable
o Single Family Homeowners are Worried
o Single Family Homeowners are Being Squeezed Out
Public Access to Survey Results
o Statistically Valid & Open
Leading Questions on Survey
o Pre-Determined Outcome
- Gentrification = Racism
- Keep Infrastructure in Sync with Development (Including Transportation)
- Consider All Options – Find Solutions
- Upzoning Reduces Affordability and Increases Value of Land
- Be Truthful About Occupancy Limits, legislation passed by City Council in 2014 actually helps with affordability in Austin and has no impact on Fair Housing
- NHCD Needs to Work for Working People, Not Developers
- Address Preservation of Existing Housing Stock
- Is Target Growth Area East Austin?
- Missing Middle ≠ Affordable
- How to Accomplish Racial and Economic Integration
- CapMetro has Inaccurate Info on the Amount of Density that is Required to Sustain Transit Along Corridors
- \$2 Construction Permit Fee
- Linkage Fees, Dispute Legality Despite Law Department, Look into Ed Wendler Jr.
- Combine Home Ownership with Renter
- A way to Make Austin More Affordable and Encourage Single Family Home Ownership by the City
Guaranteeing Down-Payments for Residents
- Incentives to Builders
- Use Linkages, not Entitlements
Slow Demolition of Existing Affordable Housing
o 90 Day Waiting Period to Counteract Investor Driven Process
o Require Affordability Impact Statements for Demolitions from NHCD
o Community Development Corporations Could Buy Older Properties and Resell as Affordable Housing
o Strict enforcement of property maintenance codes
o An increase in the fines for violations of the property maintenance code
o Require Purchasers Bring Properties up to Code Before demolishing/Reselling
- Don't Prop Up a Failed System
- Share Density Load, Not All Urban, More Greenfield
- Include Policy in Housing Plan to Salvage Small Older Homes before Demolition by Relocating to Cottage
- Enforce permit variances

- Put Affordable Housing in All Neighborhoods
Local Input to Planning Process should contain Transparency & Seat at the Planning Table
- Insure Infill Tools Create Affordability
- Define Affordable Housing for People with Household Incomes at or Below 50% MFI
- Cooperative Housing
- Super Majority Council to Vote to Up Zone
- Separate Neighborhood Planning Department

IV. Comparison of Responses from Statistically Valid Email Survey and Community/Stakeholder Meetings


The results from the Austin Energy statistically valid email survey and results from the various meetings throughout the engagement process are depicted below. Residents who answered the emailed survey more frequently indicated that they were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the housing strategies presented, while citizens who participated in the community meetings were more likely to be supportive of the six strategies outlined. Both datasets indicate that Austinites agree or strongly agree that it is important to have affordable housing in all parts of Austin.

Survey respondents and meeting participants also responded favorably towards building smaller houses on smaller pieces of land. 71% of survey respondents said that they would consider living in a townhouse, row house, triplex, apartment, or some housing option other than a detached single-family home if it was affordable to them. The two datasets show that email survey respondents and community meeting participants most heavily disagree with reducing parking requirements for affordable housing at 39% and 20%, respectively. However, comments from the community meetings reflect that citizens generally agree that there should be reduced parking requirements in targeted affordable housing developments on the condition that the mass transit system in Austin be substantially improved along with better sidewalk and bicycle infrastructure. Eighty-four percent also supported the idea of housing at various price levels located within walking distance of multiple transportation options on the stipulation that the transportation system be enhanced.


Item C-18

293 of 535

Statistically Valid Email Survey



Community and Stakeholder Meetings



V. Other Input Received

Affordability Strategies for Homeowner Retention

Presented [REDACTED] – March 28, 2016

Overview: One of Austin's biggest affordability challenges is the displacement of existing residents due to the rapid acceleration of property values, resulting in unaffordable property taxes. The housing cost spiral has helped fuel Austin's status as the most economically segregated major city in America. One way to approach this problem is to explore creative solutions such as shared equity mortgages and shared appreciation mortgages. Local government officials should create a strong public outreach initiative so that citizens who feel at risk of losing their homes will know where to turn to seek assistance. Below I have listed both new and existing strategies that should be considered. All non-native long-term residents were newcomers when they first arrived. They are just as vital to the community, its culture and its economy as today's newcomers.

Options to Review for Consideration

A. Shared Equity Mortgages and Shared Appreciation Mortgages – These are financing arrangements that allow a third party investor to invest in a percentage of the equity in a home, thereby lowering the payments for the homeowner. When the house is sold, proceeds are split based on the equity ownership percentage. This mechanism should be explored both for renters seeking first time home ownership, as well as a refinancing option for long-term homeowners squeezed by high property taxes.

Online Resources – Please review the Following Links:

1. [“Facilitating Shared Appreciation Mortgages to Prevent Housing Crashes and Affordability Crises”](#) – The Brookings Institution
2. [H.R. 3519 - Preserving American Homeownership Act of 2015](#) (See Attached Bill Summary)
3. [“Shared Equity and Housing”](#) – Andrew Caplin, Economic Data Engineer, New York University
4. [“Shared-Equity Mortgages, Housing Affordability, and Homeownership”](#) – Andrew Caplin, James Carr, et. all
5. [“Housing Partnerships: A New Approach to a Market at a Crossroads”](#) – Book by Andrew Caplin
6. [“The Mortgage Mess, the Press, and the Politics of Inattention”](#) – Andrew Caplin

Determine if the concept of shared equity home ownership can be extended to older homeowners whose mortgages are paid off, but they still face an unaffordable burden of high property taxes. Can shared equity arrangements be worked out with investors willing to share the cost of property taxes?

B. Other, More Traditional Home Financing Arrangements

1. [Shared equity with land trusts and various model comparisons](#) – This website has a tremendous catalog of information and should be considered must-read.
2. [Co-ownership of a home](#) – usually involving relatives or friends
3. Reverse mortgages – should be approached with caution through consumer-based organizations

C. Continue phasing in the full 20% City of Austin general homestead exemption

D. Consider supporting improvements to State law allowing over-65 homeowners to defer their property taxes

1. Reduce the annual 8% annual interest rate on the deferred tax amount.
2. The over-65 property tax deferral option is subject to approval by each homeowner's mortgage lender. We need to find out what criteria the lenders use, and to what extent the current climate for Austin homeowners favors or disfavors approval of tax deferrals by most lenders.

E. Make sure that the City of Austin continues to index the over-65 and disabled homestead exemption.

F. Make sure that the current City review of a tax swap arrangement with AISD includes an offsetting adjustment to lower the tax rate for over-65 homeowners. Their school taxes are frozen when they turn 65. So a tax swap with the City without an offsetting adjustment would violate the intent of that law.

G. Research and review the housing affordability and homeowner retention strategies of other cities.

[See this news article from Portland.](#)

U.S. H.R. 3519 Preserving American Homeownership Act of 2015

(Referred to the House Committee on Financial Services. No further action to date).

Sponsored By Rep. Keith Ellison (D), Minnesota

Co-Sponsored By Rep. Louise Slaughter (D) New York

Co-Sponsored By Norma Torres (D) California

Note: A similar version of this bill was introduced in the Senate in 2014 as S. 2854 by Sen. Robert "Bob" Menendez (D), New Jersey

Bill Summary

Requires the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency and the Federal Housing Commissioner each to establish a pilot program to encourage, through assistance provided under the Home Affordable Modification Program under the Secretary of the Treasury's Making Home Affordable initiative, the use of shared appreciation mortgage modifications that: (1) are designed to

return greater cash flow to investors than other loss-mitigation activities, including foreclosure; and (2) result in positive net present value for the investor.

Requires a shared appreciation mortgage modification to: (1) reduce by specified action the loan-to-value ratio of a covered mortgage to 115% immediately upon modification and to 95% within 3 years; (2) reduce the interest rate if such a principal reduction would not result in an affordable reduced monthly payment; (3) reduce to a specified amount any periodic payment the homeowner is required to make; (4) require the homeowner to pay the investor, after refinancing or selling the real property securing a covered mortgage, up to 50% of the amount of any increase in the value of the real property during a specified period; and (5) result in a positive net present value for the investor after taking into account the principal reduction and, if necessary, any interest rate reduction.

Requires the Director to: (1) provide that an enterprise may negotiate regarding a shared appreciation mortgage modification of a covered mortgage with any mortgage insurance provider for a mortgage on the subject property, and (2) allow advanced claim agreements with respect to such mortgage insurance policies.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2016 2:06 PM
To: [REDACTED]n
Subject: Burnet Rd. corridor and families

Categories: Note

[REDACTED]

I wish I could attend tomorrow night's meeting, but my daughter is performing in a McCallum High School choir concert.

I'm writing in support of Sustainable Neighborhoods' efforts to keep families living in Central Austin. We've got so many pressures working against families in this area, and I'd hate to see our zoning rules promote further erosion of our quality of life and ability to live here. I live on Joyce St. in Allandale, and I already know of two friends in the neighborhood who have had to leave our neighborhood because of the increase in property taxes. I'm sure there are many others.

Affordable housing is in short supply; adding more commercial and multi-family housing to our area will only drive up land prices further. Affordable housing shouldn't just happen when the city makes a developer include some affordable units! There should be zoning policies in place to keep housing affordable in neighborhoods where it already exists; we won't all be able to get into these affordable units developers are building.

Our streets are already very busy (and used by cut-through traffic) to the extent I am nervous when letting my daughters ride their bikes on our neighborhood streets. High-density housing makes our streets more dangerous.

We have lovely neighborhood schools that decades of residents have helped build and support; I'd hate to see them have attendance dwindle to the point that they are under threat of closure the way that Zilker and Barton Hills Elementary were. This is a likely scenario when families no longer choose to live in the area.

Please don't create zoning rules that encourage further erosion of the community that we and those who came before us have worked so hard to build! I know that the voices of the commercial property owners and developers are loud at City Hall. I'm hoping that our community's voice can be heard over their clamoring for their next dollar.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2016 9:31 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Tonight's Code Next Meeting

I'm not able to attend tonight's meeting so I want to give a bit of feedback relating to Austin's housing policy.

I'm a senior citizen who lives along Burnet Road in the North Shoal Creek neighborhood. While I support Imagine Austin's goal of a compact and connected city, I do not support the way the City of Austin is pursuing this goal. Along Burnet, "development" and "density" are code words for large VMU or MF-6 apartment complexes marketed to young singles or couples with no children but with high disposable incomes.

The problem is not marketing to this demographic. The problem is THAT THIS IS THE SOLE DEMOGRAPHIC AUSTIN'S CURRENT HOUSING POLICY MARKETS TO.

City policy also requires or encourages builders to include some level of affordable housing, but it is a) a drop in the bucket compared to the need; and b) artificial in that it can be for limited periods of time like 10 years. It's not a successful approach and it needs to be changed.

Our neighborhood has a large number of apartments built in the 70s, some of which have been converted to condos. As condos, they generally sell in the \$100,000-\$200,000 range and they're generally two bedroom. From my perspective, they represent largely ignored affordable housing or missing middle options but during a zoning case last year, I realized they're viewed by City staff and City Hall as undesirable.

We need to build housing for a range of ages, including seniors. We need housing that families with children can live in. We need housing that middle income people can afford to live in. We need "missing middle," medium and moderate density as well as high density.

I hope CodeNext will be used to give us more of what we need and less of what developers and segments of City Hall want.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 12:22 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Public Hearings on Community Needs - Community Input

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 9:41 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Public Hearings on Community Needs - Community Input

I can't attend the hearings, but I want to provide my input. Re: Economic Development

Austin is the most economically segregated large metro area in the nation, according to a study last year by the Martin Prosperity Institute entitled, "Segregated City." The study noted that "Austin has the highest level of economic segregation of any large metro in the United States, and fourth of the ten most segregated large metros."

For many individuals that are low income and have little or no employment opportunity, starting or maintaining a small business is their best/only option for self-sufficiency.

Some of the investment for CDBG funds needs to be targeted at small business development. The City also needs to evaluate all providers on a competitive basis in dispersing the grants and not just renew grants to prior recipients.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 10:02 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: affordable housing

[REDACTED]

3 words, Foundations In Communities. This group has got the right formula for affordable housing and stewardship. My neighborhood was developed to include duplexes for multi family, and I invite you to drive on Slaughter between Brodie and Manchaca, and Alcott, Jadewood, Japonica, Roxanna etc. see what investor owned properties look like in residential neighborhoods and the constant problems it places on homeowners. Then look at the new FIC property Homestead Oaks on W Slaughter (old horse farm) to see a well maintained property - all their properties are well maintained.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2016 11:50 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Keep Burnet Rd family friendly!

We support the sentiment expressed below by the Allandale Neighborhood Association. We have lived near Burnet Rd in Allandale for over 40 years. We raised our family here, and love the freedom kids had to go around the neighborhood and grow up freely. The huge apartment complex that just went up at the end of our street [Twin Oaks] is a blight. The traffic that will be generated will increase substantially on Burnet Rd. Our street is already a 'cut through' street to Shoal Creek Blvd. Any more dwelling units in this area is going to make the roads even more unsafe for kids or adults walking or cycling. Keep this area family friendly by not adding more condos and apartments.

CODENEXT housing meet at NW Rec Tues, 4/5, 6-8 pm

by Allandale Neighborhood Association | Apr 4, 2016 | Land use issues |

Attn Urban Parents! Imp for those caring about family friendly housing, this per Steven Zettner who works tirelessly on these efforts:

Would you be willing to briefly swing by NW Rec tmrw, Tuesday, 4/5 b/t 6 and 8 pm and provide feedback on the need for family-friendly housing? Or just forward this email to Jonathan Tomko at jonathan.tomko@austintexas.gov with a brief statement of support. Showing up, even briefly, is more powerful, but an email still helps. If possible, please forward this request to friends.

I'm trying to get attention on the risk of CodeNext cementing a permanent housing bias against families in the urban core.

We're at a pivotal moment – CodeNext is in the process of locking down policies that will be in our zoning rules for decades.

Statistically, a community needs at least 70% multi-bedroom housing to avert a long-term structural bias against families. Burnet Rd is on track to have about 50% multi-bedroom housing in 25 years, similar to Downtown. CodeNext policies could make this imbalance worse.

Many things affect whether families will live in an area, but the composition of housing is a permanent physical constraint. It shapes everything else – services, public school viability, parental support networks. The kind of housing we build will determine whether tomorrow's families are permanently segregated from the urban core.

This is a wonky way to approach things, a bit like someone pointing out that an increase in atmospheric CO2 from 280 ppm to 400 ppm might have big climate consequences. Like climate change, it's a long-term thing that we won't feel much in our ordinary

lives. But preserving the ability of our community to have balanced demographics, to be truly inter-generational, would make a

wonderful gift to the next generation. Please take a moment to help our Burnet Rd community retain our diversity

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2016 2:26 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Austin Housing Plan dialog and survey

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Attention

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 12:45 PM

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Austin Housing Plan dialog and survey

I have for nearly 30 years been teaching statistics at the McCombs School of Business. As part of our teaching we do may introduce bias, including voluntary response samples, slanted questions, and even push polls that masquerade as a side of an issue. All of these are problems with the Austin Housing Plan Dialog and Survey. The phrasing of the question and answer choices are clearly slanted to ensure that the desired results are obtained.

At the Housing Dialog, there are 6 statements provided and participants are given sticky tabs to mark their response as Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly disagree. The first 5 statements specifically include the words "affordable housing" and it is likely that participants will agree or strongly agree with the statements. After all, nobody wants to be seen as being against affordable housing even if some of the solutions that are being suggested haven't worked in other cities and ignore issues like the cost of environmental effects.

For example, the 4th question asks whether the City should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than currently allowed. The question makes it sound like the City won't allow small houses (which isn't true.) But even more so, it asks the question in a way that adds in the words about affordability to slant the results. If the statement was simply "The City should allow houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed" the results wouldn't be biased and you could find out whether citizens favor this change in the development code. Adding the words "in order to provide more affordable options" biases the results in a particular direction. Adding the words "in order to provide more profit for developers" would bias the results in the other direction. The online survey makes it worse by allowing a "Strongly agree" response without an option to "Strongly disagree." Instead there is only a "Do not agree." This lack of symmetry in the answer choices further biases the survey results.

In addition, the specific solutions that are being suggested in the dialog and survey (i.e. taller buildings, reduced parking, middle housing) are so well matched to the agenda the staff has been pushing from the start of this CodeNext process that the affordability prescription and the results from the Housing Plan Dialog and Survey have already been drafted.

The citizens of Austin deserve to be treated as intelligent, thoughtful people whose opinions are listened to, not manipulated.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 4:37 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Austin Housing Plan comments

[REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 4:21 PM
[REDACTED]
Subject: Austin Housing Plan comments

A woman called when I was working reception on **Monday, May 2nd**. She described herself as a “senior on a fixed income”. She asked if the following comments could be submitted, instead of doing the survey:

“Is there any consideration for rent control for seniors who live on fixed incomes? Yes, Texas law does not allow rent control, but how can we change the law?”

(Incidentally, she said her rent has increased from \$750/month to \$1,200/month over the course of 8 years. If rent control limited increases to 5% per year, the rent would still have increased from \$750 to ~\$1,100 in that time.)

[REDACTED]

From:**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2016 5:43 PM**To:** NHCD**Subject:** Re: Here's our tally sheet [Re: Reminder: Housing Conversation Kits due by Friday May 27th]

Please let us know if you received this successfully. Thanks!

On Sat, May 28, 2016 at 12:19 AM, ◇ wrote:

Folks,

Thanks for asking our opinion. This is a great idea and I hope it leads to real solutions.

However, we did feel like this HCK didn't really address some of the core issues, though, and so we would like to add the following comments. Please let me know if this feedback should be submitted in some other form.

1. The HCK asks some of the key questions but we agree that some of these questions have in-built assumptions we find unhelpful and sometimes simply damaging.
2. These questions are so general that our feedback can be heeded and yet be 100% contrary to our intent.
3. We think "business as usual" affordable housing is a drop in the bucket and a waste of taxpayer money. Building 100 affordable units in Westlake or Downtown is pointless when, as you point out, several hundred thousand worthy individuals are needing help. We have to think outside the normal lines to solve this problem in any appreciable way. A token effort is worse than nothing because it deceives the casual observer into thinking positive change is occurring. This helps no one. At the same time, this is an opportunity to implement some innovative solutions that will build Austin's reputation as a leadership city.
4. **Topic 1 from the Tally Sheet:** well, this is a tough start. I bet a lot of well-intentioned people will say, "sure! i'm not NIMBY!" but this could be implemented horribly. Building token units in Mueller or Westlake or Hyde Park is nice for the fortunate few, but honestly a waste of precious resources. Rather than shotgun a few affordable units across the whole city, we would much rather see large, economically-built structures constructed on the outskirts of the city, near public transport, where the city's dollars go further.
5. **Topic 5:** We disagreed on this topic, although we both have the same concern. This sounds like a fine idea that's open to abuse. The question doesn't specify, but we can certainly envision a greedy developer accepting this deal and then running the building just like any other, which pushes all the extra cars out into the street and surrounding neighborhood. This topic should specify whether the beneficiaries of the lower rent will be required to reduce their parking space usage to match their lowered rent. If we were certain that these tenants would have a disincentive to parking more cars in the structure - like a per-space parking fee and an upfront agreement about the parking limitations -- we would support it more fully.

SUGGESTIONS

I talked in some depth with both my HCK friend and with other friends about these issues. Item 3 was mentioned in both conversations.

We discussed some blue-sky solutions, the most interesting being a new kind of development that contains **modular units that are office spaces during the day (much like the successful WeWork setups) and residences at night**. This would address the central wastefulness of modern living: that offices are idle at night and homes during the day. The units would be designed much like this home: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f-iFJ3ncIDo>. Locking walls would ensure privacy and deter theft; lounges and overflow units would address special cases like working late or staying home sick. Look to the work being done in the tiny house movement, European cities, and by our own "Professor Dumpster" at Huston-Tillotson. Could you find a developer who'd be willing to try something this different? I would hope we could in Austin... and I would expect that people would support such an effort through crowdfunding. The ROI question would be easily answered: all parties would win if such a project meant a 40% discount on rents for tenants and a resulting 20% bonus on rents for the developer (60% residential + 60% commercial rents).

Even if a residential/commercial hybrid were impossible, many of these concepts could be applied fruitfully to traditional developments. With the rise of Austin's downtown condos, living small and central is trendy and feasible.

Another idea was to **build in the airspace above public parks, starting at 30 to 50 feet above ground level**. The ground-level footprint would only be a central elevator shaft/lightwell and four corner supports and the first full floor would be 30 to 50 feet above ground. The park would still receive plenty of sunlight (and we're already building shade structures in our parks anyhow). Parking would be excavated into an underground garage. In this way, the city could dual-purpose some invaluable real estate while preserving and respecting the park's existing function.

Finally, in the public transport vein: a gondola line (low footprint, low cost) that would serve downtown with lower cost than light rail. A bit outside scope, but fyi.

On Tue, May 10, 2016 at 6:05 PM, NHCD <NHCD@austintexas.gov> wrote:

You are receiving this email because you requested that a **Housing Conversation Kit** for the Austin Housing Plan be sent to you either online or in paper form. If you have completed the kit, please send your results back to us so that your feedback can be incorporated into the Austin Housing Plan. Please include the Group Tally Sheet and any completed Individual Feedback Sheets. You can send your results back to us using any of the methods below.

1. If you have access to a computer and scanner, please scan your Group Tally Sheet and any Individual Feedback Sheets and send them in an email to nhcd@austintexas.gov.
2. If you have a computer but not a scanner, you may send us your Group Tally Sheet and comments using a Word document, which is available to download at <http://austintexas.gov/page/housing-conversation-kit#> or photograph the Group Tally Sheet and any Individual Feedback Sheets then send them in an email to nhcd@austintexas.gov.
3. If you do not have access to a computer, you can drop off the results or send them by mail to:

**Neighborhood Housing and Community Development
1000 E. 11th St., Suite 200
Austin, TX 78702**

Please **submit all information by Friday, May 27th**.

Thank you and have a wonderful day!

Kid's Courtyard

Buildings for single mothers and their children. Self-managing and sustainable.

Saturday, March 28, 2015

Three lines of revenue

This building is specifically designed for single mothers, either working or in school, but also works for other lifestyles as well.

1. Apartments
2. Day care for surrounding community
3. Restaurant/food for tenants (and community)

It's kind of like a giant lemonade stand, with all the profits going to the kids.

Posted by [Andrew Bransford Brown](#) at 9:30 PM No comments:

 Recommend this on Google

Monday, December 8, 2014

This building does not have a landlord and is designed to distribute the landlord interests, management, and responsibilities to the tenants.

Construction is profitable for the initial investors, and ongoing profits are redistributed to the tenants' children.

Ownership is conveyed to the children as they reach 18 and move out.

Investors earn returns from 2 sources:

1. Construction/project fee on each building (\$1 million - \$250,000, as the system becomes cookie-cutter). Demographics show a possible 500-1000 buildings in the United States alone (\$125 million).
2. Retail in the surrounding area. Franchise possibilities. Gas, toys, clothes, bicycles, coffee, etc.

Posted by [Andrew Bransford Brown](#) at 4:19 AM No comments:

 +1 Recommend this on Google


Saturday, November 30, 2013

The Courtyard

Blog Archive

- ▼ 2015 (1)
 - ▼ March (1)
 - [Three lines of revenue](#)
- 2014 (1)
- 2013 (4)

About Me



 Follow 38




Each space in the center is a common-living area: day-care, dining, pool, study, etc. Lots of light and lots of visibility from all sides. Mothers can study inside their private living spaces while keeping an eye on their kids.

Note the elevators at the apex in the back. Some Kid's Courtyards might have a trap door with a slide into a pool. Remote controls on the trap-doors.

One really nice thing about this design is a Kid's Courtyard space can be "retrofitted" onto existing buildings.

Posted by Andrew Bransford Brown at 1:15 PM No comments:

 Recommend this on Google

Saturday, October 12, 2013

Clarification

Note: each building is either a single-fathers' building OR a single-mothers' building. Adults of the opposite sex are not allowed in the building.

Posted by Andrew Bransford Brown at 10:36 AM No comments:

 Recommend this on Google

Kid's Courtyard Synopsis

Kid's Courtyard

"This building is owned by the kids who used to live here."

The mission is to renovate or construct a building to provide "single-parent housing". The vision is a for-profit venture to build or renovate over 1000 buildings around the United States with long term residual income generated from retail in the surrounding area. First location might be New York City or Miami. The goal is a land-lord free, self-managing building providing a core of safe, healthy, sustainable living for the community. Initial funding sources can be private, public, or a combination thereof.

Finances

- \$800,000 initial investment.
- Return is a \$500,000 project development fee after construction/renovation is completed.
- 1,000 buildings are possible around the country (13 million single mother households).
- Retail possibilities include toys, clothing, restaurants, bicycles, and gas stations.

Management

- Initial partners construct or renovate the building.
- Those partners become Board of Directors of the corporation.
- Residents fill officer positions in the corporation.

- All profits from the building itself are rolled into a toy fund and spent by the children.
 - Shares in the corporation are transferred to the children after they move out.
- For a 6-page detailed description of this unique plan, please contact me. As a single father, I designed every detail to make sure my son and his mother were cared for, even if I were not around.


Andrew B Brown - Project Architect

Mr. Brown has over 15 years experience managing software projects and consulting in the accounting, mortgage, banking, and finance industries. He holds a bachelor's degree in accounting from UT Austin.

+66 98 252 4335

andrewbb@gmail.com

Attachment: basic architectural sketch



Posted by [Andrew Bransford Brown](#) at 10:22 AM No comments:



Recommend this on Google

Kid's Courtyard Plan

Kid's Courtyard

"This building is owned by the kids who used to live here."



Summary

This is a building without a landlord that is designed for single mothers and their children. It is a for-profit venture looking for seed capital. Due to this being an entirely new concept in an untapped market, potential is billions.

Create a community for single mothers enabling them to go to college while raising their children in a healthy environment. Depending on the amount of governmental or private grants available the total cost to each single mother family is \$800-\$1200/month and includes a 2 bedroom apartment, food, day-care, and babysitting.

With the number of single mothers in the United States today, this project can create over 500 buildings around the country which would provide homes to 150,000 single mothers and their children. The project development fee on each building is \$250,000 to \$1,000,000 which leads to over \$125 million in development fees before retail is considered.

A building of 300 single mothers with over 1,000 children in the area will form a core to the community that will provide new jobs and encourage small businesses such as children's clothing, bicycles, skateboards, etc.

Market

Over 13 million single mothers live in the United States with 6-7 million of those families' children under the age of 10. Since most mothers do not have sufficient financial support to supervise and be a stay-at-home mom, working, going to school, and raising children is a near impossible challenge. Day care averages over \$600/month and single mothers do not have the finances or time to attend college while working in low-wage jobs to support their children. A building and community specifically designed for their unique needs has never been designed before.

Problem Statement

While there are many sources of private and public money dedicated to assisting single mothers today, no one has addressed the unique living challenges of single mothers raising small children by themselves while working or going to college. Bringing many such families together in a common environment allows those families to share responsibilities while increasing the time they have available to spend with their children. This allows them to improve their future, attend college, obtain advanced degrees, all while raising their children in a healthy, safe, holistic, sustainable environment. The design of Kid's Courtyard holds all those goals in mind while providing safe, fun, social environments for all the children living in the building and the surrounding community. This builds a solid, healthy core to the neighborhood community and brings new jobs and small business opportunities to the area.

Objective and Project Description

This project creates a sustainable, healthy living arrangement for women in similar lifestyles. Shared supervision and shared daily living responsibilities ease the burden of their similar situations and allow more time to raise their children and provide for their future. With 20-25 single mother families on each floor, fewer than 2 hours of time would be required by each mother per day to assist with supervision or cooking. This leaves her with 14 to 16 hours every day to study, work, or play. If a few mothers go out at night, their kids throw a slumber party in a bunk bed room. Babysitting and daycare are free provided

A licensed, full-time child care professional is on-staff to assist and schedule the children's supervision. This provides a link to the community with total accountability and allows the building to serve as a multi-purpose day care facility. Neighborhood children can be cared for during the day at a low cost to neighborhood families (<\$300/month). This creates a strong community and fosters communication throughout the neighborhood. Mothers in the neighborhood are welcome in the building during the day and are another resource for assisting with building responsibilities. Donating time for supervision or cooking might reduce their monthly child-care cost.

The building is managed by the residents and is formed as a non-profit corporation. All officer positions are filled by one mother and one child serving as co-officers. A few of the co-officer positions would be CEO, Finance, IT, Health, Food/Beverage, Maintenance, and Security officers. Each office is limited to a maximum of two terms of 6 months. These officer positions provide valuable experience to graduating students. Health officers must be EMT-certified and most/all pre-med students are strongly recommended to hold that certification. In this way, all aspects of the building are managed internally. Costs and revenue are under the direction of the building's residents where they might improve food quality, purchase items in bulk, do maintenance themselves or focus on revenue through offering day-care or other services to maximize the non-profit's cash flow.

All profits generated by this non-profit corporation are rolled into a toy fund that can be spent freely by the children. This allows less-advantaged children and mothers who are not receiving child care support to play. It also encourages the children to work together, learn to manage money and their expectations, share, and respect, while encouraging and fostering interpersonal awareness and social skills. The toy fund can grow depending on how well the mothers and children manage the building.

Depending on the source of financing, it is strongly preferred that one third of all financing for this project be raised through private loans from the local community. These loans would likely be at 6% for 30 years and the loans sold in \$100, \$1,000, \$10,000, and \$100,000 increments. That encourages community awareness and involvement and also spreads the non-profit corporation's liabilities over a large segment of the population which provides legal and financial safety to the building.

The non-profit corporation holds ownership to the building. The corporate shares are to be passed to the children after they move out and reach contractual age. In the meantime, the shares are held in a trust secured by the investors and note-holders on the project.

The capstone will say "This building is owned by the kids who used to live here." It is an everyday reminder that the children will own the building after they move out. If the children don't behave they might not be placed on the ownership list. This will instill a sense of ownership, pride, and responsibility to the children encouraging them to take care of the building and fosters their sense of self and their place in their community. This solves long-term management issues as the children who own the building will always have strong emotional ties to the building and neighborhood.

This solution builds a community and provides a unique living experience that prepares both the mother and child to do anything they might imagine in the future. With nearly 1000 children present on a daily basis along with 300 single mothers, a healthy core of safety, security, and emotional stability is provided to the local community.

Building Design

The building is multi-story with each floor designed for children in a particular age range (Eg. 0-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-11, 12-14, & 15+). Two bedroom apartments comprise the exterior of the building with private bathrooms and no kitchens. A commercial kitchen and dining room comprises one of the floors in the building with the kitchen staffed by residents on a rotating basis. A hallway surrounds a glass-enclosed central area of approximately 80x80 feet. Each play area might include video games, arts and crafts tables, and toys designed for a particular age range. Infants and small toddlers require less space and those floors might contain bunk beds for slumber parties if a few mothers are out for the evening.

Depending on climate, a pool is on the roof with an interior pool on a lower floor. One floor is designated as a commercial kitchen and dining area that is operated and managed by the mothers and children. A food and beverage co-officer position manages the dining room.

The exterior of the 15 story building includes a large backyard play area and conforms to minimum child-care facility dimensions (minimum 45/sf per child) so 1.3 acres for a 300

B-260

Ownership and Management

Ownership of the building is to be held in a non-profit corporation with all shares held in trust. Project developers form a temporary partnership and serve as officers until construction is complete. Corporate officer positions are filled by the residents in a co-officer arrangement of one single mother and one child from a different family. The project partnership is dissolved when the residents take over management of the building. All shares in the non-profit corporation are passed to the children after they move out and reach contractual age.

Building Finances

Assumptions:

- 300 single mothers with 450 children
- Day care for 450 neighborhood children (\$300/month each)
- Over 100 sq ft of interior play area per child
- Building \$190/SF, including furniture & fixtures
- Land \$100/SF
- \$30,000,000 in grants
- \$800/month for food, rent, day-care and babysitting

Building	42,670,587
Land	5,547,214
Project costs	10,000,000
less: GOB or other	(30,000,000)
Total loans	28,217,801
Interest rate	6%
Term	30
Payment	(2,049,993)

Yearly cash flow:

Rental income	2,880,000	800	per family/month
Income from day care	1,620,000	300	per child/month
Loan payment	(2,049,993)		
Food	(1,620,000)	450	per family/month
Maintenance	(22,458)		
Utilities	(269,498)		
Child care manager	(70,000)		
Taxes	0		tax-exempt
Insurance	(250,000)		
Toy fund	218,051	485	per child/year

The cash flow above assumes \$30 million in grant money. If the project is financed privately the monthly cost to live there, including apartment, food, and day care is \$1200-1300. With \$30 million dollars in grants the cost lowers dramatically to \$800/month which allows the mothers to be full-time students while not requiring any external financial assistance. Over 10 years, over 3000 single mothers can be assisted and the subsidy allowed by the grant money becomes <\$10,000 for each mother while educating them in advanced degrees, revitalizing the local community, providing jobs, and creating healthy families.

Andrew B Brown - Project Architect

Mr. Brown has over 15 years experience managing software projects and consulting in the accounting, mortgage, banking, and finance industries. He holds a bachelor's degree in accounting from UT Austin.

+66 98 252 4335

andrewbb@gmail.com

6/3/2016

Item C-18

Kid's Courtyard

315 of 535

Posted by [Andrew Bransford Brown](#) at 10:21 AM [No comments:](#)



Recommend this on Google

[Home](#)

Subscribe to: [Posts \(Atom\)](#)

Simple template. Powered by [Blogger](#).

JULY 2015 CONVERSATIONS: AFFORDABILITY



18 opportunities
11 conversations
27 hosts
48 voices

Austin area residents gathered at a variety of community spaces throughout the month of July 2015 to discuss affordability in the city. Conversations centered on what affordability meant to those in attendance, and what barriers existed between individuals and the quality of life they desired.

One of the major themes to emerge was the need for strategic growth in the city. Resident's lamented the results of the "don't build it, and they won't come" mentality of earlier years, and the "big city problems" Austin is now facing from years of rapid growth into a major city. There was a sense of concern for those who can no longer afford to live here, and worry over what may happen to Austin in the future if the problem of affordability isn't addressed. There was, however, a sense of hope that the creative spirit of the city and its residents will come through in new solutions to the problems of growth and gentrification.

While there were conflicting views on the merits of higher population density as a solution to Austin's affordability crisis, there was consensus on the need for more low-income housing, mixed-use development, and flexibility in zoning restrictions. Several ideas were put forth as solutions to the need for affordable housing, such as rent control, cooperative housing, and micro-units.

Rising property taxes were a major concern among participants, with a special concern for disabled, low-income, veteran, and elderly Austinites. There was a sense of frustration that the growth and economic development the city is experiencing isn't translating into any tangible benefit for residents. Participants raised the idea of incentives, such as caps, for long-term residents to better enable them to stay in their homes.

Participants expressed frustration with alternative transportation options offered by the city, with many saying they would love to be one or no car families but feel unable to because of issues with the ease and accessibility of bus routes, bike lanes, and the lack of rail and other options. The upfront and upkeep costs of car, bus, rail, and bike transit, and the barriers this raises for low-income Austinites, was also raised. Many said they found accessing services and resources, such as employment, grocery stores, city and state services, and outdoor recreation, through public and alternative transit difficult.

Education and workforce development came up in several conversations, with participants concerned about the affordability and equity of educational services offered by the city. Participants expressed a desire for better career and technical programs, a higher minimum wage, fewer incentives and concern for large corporations and outside talent, more support for small businesses and entrepreneurs, and incentives for employers to help address their employees' affordability concerns. There was a consensus that the way the city handled these two areas would strongly define the future character and make-up of communities throughout the city.

Participants also expressed concern about the efficiency and efficacy of city services and policies and their impact on affordability. Suggestions that come up in conversation were to streamline and consolidate city

services, make city and county spending more transparent, and to listen to citizen input and use it to create policies that positively impact the cost of living and quality of life for Austinites.

District 1**Bennu Coffee***0 attendees*

District 2**Dove Springs Community Center***0 attendees*

District 3**South Austin Recreation Center***0 attendees***Juan in a Million***0 attendees***Ground Floor Theater***11 attendees*

- Affordable housing, mixed income properties.
 - Participants agreed that rising housing costs seem to affect everyone in Austin. There is a concern that if folks can't afford to live and stay in Austin they will be leaving.
- Property tax caps
 - We hear of longtime residents who have watched their taxes rise considerably over time and would like some sort of cap or relief in some way.
- Zoning
 - More flexibility in Zoning permits to allow residents more options to make improvements to existing properties that may allow for either additional income or savings.
 - Examples include: zoning in residential areas to allow owners to have secondary housing for rental income to assist with rising costs. (Sometimes called 'granny flats' or 'mother-in-law units') Additional income could allow owners to offset rising costs and property taxes, especially those owners on fixed incomes.
 - Additionally zoning to permit more flexibility in home-based business and tax deductions therein would help residents who want to generate additional income.
 - Expedited Zoning / more streamlined application and approval processes. Participants expressed their concerns for what seems to be an unnecessarily complicated and often convoluted application process.
- Public Transportation
 - More public transportation options.
 - Participants pointed to experiences in other cities where residents don't need personal vehicles because the public transportation is so efficient, accessible and reliable with

'round-the-clock service. Some wouldn't mind using public transportation including rail service, but at the current state it does not meet their logistical needs.

- Traffic solutions and Utility Options
 - Participants commented on the amount of expense going toward fuel and utilities.
 - Sitting in traffic congestion increases fuel consumption and expenses.
 - For housing, options like solar power for residences at low cost or subsidized installation would help offset expenses and provide benefit to the environment and conservation.
- Additional notes:
 - It is evident that the Community members who participated are very passionate and concerned about Austin and want it to improve. Most all are longtime residents and some from multi-generational Austinite families.
 - Most all have expressed a disappointment and discomfort in how Austin has been changing and how it is having real and lasting impact on their lives and ability to live in Austin, but they also felt that Austin, having such creative and passionate people, can find creative solutions to the many issues they face and continue to enjoy and contribute to Austin.
 - There was a sense and a general consensus that the many many facets of local government agencies must be proactive, listen to the community and be creative and expeditious in collaborating and creating solutions.
 - It was evident that no one was asking for 'hand-outs' but rather 'hand-ups'. They don't mind making certain concessions or adjustments if the options are viable and don't impose too much.
 - There was a general feeling that we are on the right track, using studies, and getting input from residences and programs like Conversation Corps. are all good tools to inform policy.

District 5

Strange Brew

14 attendees

- People with lower-income jobs (hospitality and retail) find it difficult to afford housing in Austin; Austin employers finding it difficult to fill lower-income positions. Can Austin establish a living wage or higher minimum wage? Why isn't there enough Section 8 housing?
- Property taxes are a really heavy burden for many people, but especially those on fixed incomes because of age or disability. What can Austin do (if anything) to slow the increase of property tax? Is that what the homestead exemption is supposed to do? If it only saves me \$15 a month, how is that supposed to help me stay in Austin?
- We are facing big city problems now. All the new people coming here bring themselves, which is great, but they don't bring infrastructure with them - "more road doesn't come with the moving van." The increased tax base is great, but those dollars - given the fast pace of our growth and the slow pace of construction and redevelopment - they don't actually pay for anything until years after the investment was initially needed. How do we catch up to where we are? How do we change the tire while the car's moving? A successful city needs the hallmarks of a successful city - affordable restaurants, actual public transit, healthy arts & culture, consistent educational resources across districts, equal access to digital resources. "Great cities have great public transportation."

We have all the problems of a big city, but few of the positive things that big cities "should" - and the good things we do have, like live music and lots of green space, are at risk. One group subscribes to "slow down construction, we're growing too fast" thinking. Others say we're already underbuilt for all the new Austinites who deserve a decent place to live that's near where they work. Lots of people criticizing the leadership that said (?) "if we don't build it, they won't come" yet are the first people to say not to build anything new.

- There's a real storm brewing - in this district anyway - between those who want to preserve their neighborhoods exactly as they are (mostly older homeowners) and those who want amenities and jobs and denser housing in their neighborhoods so they don't need to drive (mostly younger people, renters, and new residents). A decent mass transit system could potentially ease this tension, because those who don't want to drive would have more transportation options. "Bring back bus route #338
- Protect the Broken Spoke
- Protect the Red River Cultural District
- Restaurants are getting too expensive because it's too expensive for them to pay their rent
- "The City gives too many corporate incentives" - needs to do more to support local small businesses"

Patika

2 attendees

- Schools - Rating + quality
 - Disparity of school relating to location.
 - aisd vs charter schools. Better fit?
 - May drive prices up. Wait lists if you can afford to live by the right schools.
- A grandfather :20 years in Austin - tax incentive.
 - Tax incentives - property tax appraisal reform for east side -> business + housing.
 - Taxes being frozen (immunization from property taxes to qualifiers) ie: disabled, poor, vets, elderly
- AISD- career and technical program could be better.
 - Workforce development focus.
- Brining in other jobs from CA has forced others without those skills to abandon the city.
- Stop incentivizing large companies and incentivize middle skill workers." Security for austinities = transit (accessibility / options) + schools + market

District 6

Hope Presbyterian Church

0 attendees

Spicewood Springs Library

4 attendees

- Fight economic segregation & segregation writ-large
- Seniors w/o sufficient income to survive in Austin

- Measure costs as % of person's income (housing, utilities)
 - Apartments advertised as "affordable" really aren't
 - No knowledge on how to access what services exist
 - A decent & safe place to live. Means of transportation to work, reasonable taxes with clear and communicated ROI
 - Employment opportunities
 - How to adjust other costs for seniors like prop tax? Cap utility fees @ 65yo
 - Lack of info about what others are facing in affordability
 - Not just any employment... service sector employees still can't afford to live
 - Improve public transit to cut costs and be a 1-car family instead of 2-car
 - Are there peer cities that have addressed this?
 - No connectivity on bike lanes prevents the option of not having a car
 - Incentivize employers to address these problems
 - Need more transparency at Travis County on spending. City does it well.
 - Consolidate government services to get efficiency
 - Build more housing to stem the rising rents, housing for low-income
 - Enforce codes on unsafe rentals
 - Greater density (granny flats) helps address economic segregation
 - Empower Regional affordability committee... public input, accessible meetings, hone accountability
 - Greater efficiency in government to free up resources to do affordability work
-

District 7

Original Pancake House

2 attendees

- Low-cost housing: Habitat style or Mueller - give incentives to builders to build nice housing for low- to moderate-income people to qualify.
- High rents: Stop rent climb. Discussion of apartment-dwellers who need to move annually to afford it.
- Control development: Basic fear of gentrification at this alarming rate. Different options for people like multi-family homes, boarding homes, etc.
- Education on spending for everyone - start young. Premiums put on loans for low-income (not good). Teach finances and how to handle them early on.
- Affordable transportation i.e. driverless cars, trains, etc. Train to Palmer Event Center mentioned. Take disabilities into account.
- Question arose whether Austin looks beyond itself?
- "Development at all costs is scary"

North Village Library

5 attendees

- Housing, particularly rent, is a major factor of affordability for young adults as well as seniors. Creative options to the owner or renter models are needed. Co-ops are an underused alternative.

- Affordability entails a wide array of factors - effective community planning & design are essential to realize truly affordable neighborhoods that allow people to live and work close to home and require limited travel.
 - Austin currently offers few areas with adequate sidewalks, grocery stores, restaurants, community services, etc.
 - Alternative transportation options vary by age. Younger people might ride a bike or motorcycle rather than car, senior might use capital metro, Drive Senior, or share rides. Planning needs to take this all into account.
 - City policies greatly impact cost of living and quality of life. Fixed utility charges make it difficult for people to save, even when they are responsibly conserving water and electricity.
 - Promoting growth adds to the problem.
 - Wages are a component not always considered in the affordability question. Opportunities for increased income, particularly for individuals and families currently struggling, need to be part of the conversation.
 - Several participants commented they are already making numerous "trades" and remain concerned about the long term affordability of Austin. This included young people living centrally and seniors worried about sustainability for their children and grandchildren.
-

District 8

Hampton Library

4 attendees

- Improve our education.
 - Since we will never agree on what a community is we need to improve our education so we can get what we want"
 - We need to have places for everyone - build a community who wants freedom vs ownership. City government can't change this without citizen support and the citizens have to change and want the change. We need to have a balance with what we want vs values.
 - Density.
 - The city needs to be more aggressive and allow for more welcoming dense housing. And offer people enough space. But even with density doesn't come affordability.
 - Change the zoning. Make more a more efficient zoning permit process that also include new approaches like tiny houses.
 - Rent control.
 - People push back for growth because they like nature so maybe introduce more shared yards with parks."
 - Tax Rates. Why if the houses go up in cost do the taxes go up? Why isn't growth paying for itself? The tax structure should be structured to get the growth and rising house cost to cover the city costs so people don't have their taxes raised so they are forced to leave their homes because they can't afford them.
-

District 9

YWCA

0 attendees

University Presbyterian Church

2 Attendees

- Promote energy efficiency and water efficiency to reduce costs and increase affordability. Figure out how to do this for renters as well as homeowners, but be sure energy efficiency improvements don't just result in landlords increasing rent prices.
- Address the tax appraisal system, so that speculation and house flipping do not artificially inflate home values of neighborhoods. Be more strategic about population growth and be realistic about the cost of growth and expanding infrastructure. Encourage housing innovations, such as tiny houses neighborhood, micro units, and other new concepts to hold on to affordability in the urban core.
- Support work options such as satellite locations for large companies in the suburbs, co-work environments, telecommuting, so that people who are forced out to find affordable housing are not required to commute so much.

Twin Oaks Library

1 Attendee

- Not needing to spend 50% of income on rent and utilities
- Construction quality vs cost (rent/buy) Minimal travel time (proximity to groceries and other frequented businesses; convenience of mass transit)
- Participant wants to be able to enjoy some of the things that Austin has to offer and not just work to pay the bills
- Rent/price does not necessarily reflect the quality of living environment
- Participant would not consider time riding mass transit as travel time, but would consider time spent getting from home to transit, transit to work site, and transfers
- Mary was a particularly relatable scenario for this participant, who doesn't want to move out of central Austin.
- Participant makes an effort to conserve financial resources by taking lunch to work; taking over leases at reduced rates; minimizing furniture and purchasing it at resale shops; and minimizing driving, when possible.
- Participant does not find mass transit convenient for her work needs, nor easy to navigate."

District 10

Howson Library*1 attendee*

- Higher density is not the solution to affordability. There are no statistics that support the argument that increased density lowers costs. To the contrary, the highest density cities are the most expensive to live in.
 - “Affordability has been a code word for density and increased property rights” (development rights). The attendee feels that “the push for density is very scary.”
- "Capital Metro should do a much better job of serving Austin residents, and especially the most needy. Cap Metro’s strategy does not help affordability. Rapid Service, for instance, serves new development (real estate interests) rather than established residents. Service along Guadalupe was greatly reduced when Rapid Service started. Increased fares and reduced service excludes people who need public transit the most.
- The City should pay for some AISD costs, such as transportation and campus police. Substituting City funding to cover the expense of these services would increase City taxes, but it would lower AISD taxes. While there would be no impact on citizens, less AISD money would get transferred back to the state.
- The City should not encourage growth nor try to attract companies from out of state, especially if they bring their employees with them.
- Why did we have only one attendee? Attendee said that people who are active have only so much time, and they want to make it count. They need to be very confident that their opinions will be heard. Her experience is that agencies (especially Cap Metro) don’t listen. (That is to say, they don’t seem to act on what they hear, even if they hear it from many people.)

La Madeleine Country French Café*0 attendees***Lakewood Clubhouse***0 attendees*

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Erica Leak, Manager, Neighborhood Housing

FROM: Liz Jambor, Manager, Data Analytics and Business Intelligence

DATE: May 4, 2016

SUBJECT: Response to Affordable Housing Survey Concerns

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the concerns raised by Councilmember Houston and Betsy Greenberg regarding the affordable housing survey. While some of the concerns were valid and addressed prior to survey launch distribution and within the final report, some of the concerns are based on limited information that I would like to address here.

The survey was developed by a team of 4 staff members whose combined research and survey experience exceeds 80 years. This experience has covered vast areas of research, from laboratory experimental research to online market research studies. The team has conducted similar research for Austin Energy, Austin Resource Recovery, the City Manager's Office, and Austin Transportation Department, to name a few. The team consists of professionals who value quality data, holding themselves and the research process to the highest standards of market research. The survey utilized by Neighborhood Housing was written using best practices and a standard 10-point scale. Additionally, because the survey was written and deployed outside of Neighborhood Housing, the team was able to maintain a clearer sense of objectivity and neutrality.

Surveys need to be crafted in a way that eliminates or minimizes bias with a broad universe. That is one reason why a 10-point scale is utilized. There are very few research modalities that do not have some level of bias within the process. However, we do what we can to lessen the bias by writing questions that are as neutral as the topic allows and combining different types of questions to solicit balanced answers. For example, one of the original rating statements posed by Neighborhood Housing was "Our community is better off when low-wage workers and their families can find affordable housing in Austin." This statement was changed to be more neutral and read "People who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin." A follow-up question was added – "How likely are you to be willing to pay higher taxes or higher fees to build affordable housing?" Bias can often be eliminated when targeting questions to a more personally impactful level.

Neutrality often becomes a challenge when dealing with a topic that may be politically charged, such as affordable housing. Even the meaning of the phrase affordable housing is a difficult term upon which to agree. In discussions with Neighborhood Housing, we agreed that we would assist the survey respondent with the term “affordable” by categorizing for whom the housing would be available – households making less than \$40,000 per year. While the term “affordable” may still be debatable, for the survey, respondents had an idea of the household income level for which affordable housing would be directed.

In any socially-charged topic such as affordable housing, green energy or support of low income families, people generally respond in a way that they believe is the “right” and socially acceptable way to respond. That is why we never stop with the first level of questions but add layers of questions to get beyond possible bias and what they believe to be the appropriate answer to what is their more true answer. For this specific survey, we added questions related to the funding of affordable housing. When asking who will pay for affordable housing, we can go beyond socially acceptable answers and possible bias because the answers now have a greater impact. We have seen this in other surveys and have once again seen it in this affordable housing survey. Citizens may be in favor of affordable housing, in general, but may not be in favor of paying for it themselves or changing current rules impacting housing.

The scale semantics are not an issue as Dr. Greenberg notes. The lack of symmetry is not a concern because of the presentation of the ratings of 1 through 10. The wording simply allows for the understanding of the value of the scale – understanding importance, likelihood or agreement. As the results shows, if there was a need for an additional or different wording at the lower end of the scale, we would have seen more use of the 1-3 ratings than we saw in the results. Even without the wording, we believe respondents are savvy enough to know that a rating of 1 or 2 indicates the lowest rating.

Finally, it is important to note that online surveys cannot be validated in terms of respondent and the results should be used with caution in terms of decision-making. In other words, because the survey was open to the public and not sent to a specific recipient, the validity of the responses is not the same as those tracked to a specific IP address, as is the case with the email survey. We found that approximately 21% of the online surveys were completed by redundant geo-location and IP address combinations. While the results are valuable, it should be used in conjunction with or as a companion to the email-based survey. The email-based survey can be validated to a statistically valid sample within the Austin area. Any recommendations should be focused on the email-based surveys. This should also address some of the concerns noted by Dr. Greenberg.

I believe as Neighborhood Housing makes the results available, many of the concerns reported by Dr. Greenberg and noted by Councilmember Houston will be alleviated. Overall, the results indicate that a majority of the respondents are in agreement that people who work in Austin should be able to afford to live in Austin and that it is important that there is affordable housing in Austin. However, not all are in agreement on the specifics of affordable housing, including how to pay for it and where it should be located. Citizens appear to understand the need for affordable housing in Austin. The challenge remains how to fund and where to accommodate.

VI. Feedback on June 6, 2016 Draft

FEEDBACK LOG FROM RECEIVED COMMENTS

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
1	8/9/2016	Austin Apartment Association	Letter	Despite the many factors and forces that affect the rental housing industry we view the city’s goal to be attainable given proper stewardship, and as partners in housing we will do our part to help facilitate success for the betterment of Austin.	Comment Noted
2	8/9/2016	Austin Apartment Association	Letter	<p>The AAA finds many of the program and approaches outlined in the SHP document to be time-tested and fully appropriate. These strategies have worked well in a wide variety of housing markets and are worth full staff efforts and/or cost benefit analysis including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">☐ Preservation tax exemptions to communities at risk.☐ Strategic investments in economic development, transit and education.☐ Land banking.☐ Homestead Preservation Districts and TIFs.☐ General Obligation Bonds for affordable housing.☐ Utilization of the National Housing Trust Fund.☐ Maximum participation in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program.☐ Revisions and expansions of existing density bonus programs.☐ Small lot development and relaxed regulations on both internal and external accessory dwelling units in conjunction with overall increased housing diversity in new subdivisions.☐ Multifamily property tax exemption program.☐ Incentives for transit oriented development.☐ Prioritized infrastructure investments in activity centers and along activity corridors.	Comment Noted

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
3	8/9/2016	Austin Apartment Association	Letter	<p>Additional affordable housing strategies and approaches not mentioned in the SHP but we believe are worth staff consideration and analysis are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Shared equity ownership - a housing ownership funding mechanism for ensuring that the initial subsidy given buyers to reduce the purchase price of a home creates a lasting asset that can help one generation of homebuyers after another. ☐ Creative funding program to facilitate small community developments having 20 units or less and/or are too small to participate in the LIHTC program. ☐ Timely and coordinated code amendments that increase acceptance of innovative construction materials, techniques and housing concepts. 	<p>1. Language added: Expand the use of Community Land Trusts (CLT) and other forms of Shared Equity Ownership: Between rental and conventional homeownership, shared equity ownership ensures that homes remain affordable to lower income households on a long-term basis.</p> <p>2. Language added: RHDA can be utilized for developments of all sizes, even those that may be too small to participate in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program.</p> <p>3. Language added: Consider Building and Fire Code Modifications to Allow Six Stories of Wood Frame Construction: The City should review the possibility of stretching economical wood frame construction even further. This could take the form of building code changes to increase the height limit or allowed number of wood frame stories. This action needs careful vetting to ensure fire and life safety protection. For example this could be accomplished by expediting review and approval of emerging building technologies such as Cross Laminated Timber (CLT) as is being done in other cities around the world.</p>
4	8/9/2016	Austin Apartment Association	Letter	<p>The AAA finds that strategies mentioned in this document that rely on changes to state law are not bona fide housing strategies and should not be included in a strategic housing plan. The SHP should focus on the tools and planning programs at hand, and staff efforts should be directed toward their fair and efficient implementation. Given the Texas Legislature's stated priorities and past history on property rights and related issues, hinging attainment of the city's affordability goals on legislative pursuits would be an unfortunate diversion of city time and resources.</p>	Comment Noted
5	8/9/2016	Austin Apartment Association	Letter	<p>The AAA suggests that any housing strategy and/or concept listed in the SHP that that is currently operating in some form or fashion be clearly identified in the document. Having a listing of current programs and strategies underway will make the Strategic Housing Plan a more useful and dynamic document for directing future actions, conducting public housing policy discussions and determining funding needs in the effort to reach Austin's housing goals.</p>	The stack diagram has been modified to visually represent current programs and strategies in conjunction with proposed programs and strategies

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
6	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	The Austin Board of REALTORS® is pleased that the City of Austin is taking a proactive measure in adopting a policy-driven Housing Plan for Austin. The Housing Plan represents an important stride by acknowledging that market-rate housing that is affordable to Austin's workforce is critical to the mission of NHCD and the long-term economic success of the city as a whole. The recognition of the market-dependent aspects of a successful housing policy allows the City to take part in a conversation about how local policy aids or hinders affordability and how housing fits amidst other key priorities.	Comment Noted
7	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	ABoR's primary comment on the Strategic Housing Plan is that, while there are valuable recommendations on density bonus programs along corridors and for missing middle housing, more attention should be given to specific policy recommendations for creating market-rate units affordable to households in the middle range of Austin's income scale — in particular, the 27% of Austinites identified in the report who fall roughly between 80% and 120% MFI. These recommendations should include policies for both income-restricted and market units to lay the path for the well-rounded housing market described by the Plan's goals.	Language has been added that speaks to the need for market rate units affordable to 80-120% MFI
8	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Clarify Strategy Tied to Housing Demand. Embracing a specific count of 75,000 units to satisfy demand over the course of the next 10 years is helpful for setting general priorities. There is, however, insufficient detail and explanation for these targets in the Plan. While the Plan breaks down the source of potential affordable units (Figure 7), there does not appear to be a similar breakdown for market-rate units. The policy recommendations in the Housing Plan should be additive toward reaching the goals set forth in the plan, but it is impossible to know this without specific projections, or even projected ranges. To the extent possible, policy recommendations should be tied with projected outcomes.	Language has been added to indicate that market rate production is based on previous trends
9	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	To this end, the Plan should address how many market units are needed at different MFI levels and should, as applicable, identify specific strategies for generating market units at those different levels. For instance, the recommendation to relax restrictions on internal and external accessory dwelling units should be tied with a projection of the potential production capacity that would stem from implementing this recommendation.	Information has been added that shows how many households live in Austin at different income levels. Affordable housing goals are broken down by MFI category reflective of this information.
10	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	In the same vein, a significant portion of the affordable unit strategy vaguely falls under "Other Tools." To be of greater value, the Plan should be amended to include more details about how these units break down in order to create a clear policy pathway to the goal established in the report.	Prioritization of strategies and tools has been added to the plan in the Implementation Section of the Appendix

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
11	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Assess Strategies for 80-120% MFI. The laundry list of suggestions compiled by staff from stakeholder meetings does not provide adequate direction to policymakers concerned with the “missing middle” and how Austin can increase its total supply of geographically dispersed market-rate workforce housing. ABoR agrees it is important to have strategies for both income-restricted and non-income-restricted housing. These strategies, however, should be linked to a greater goal and assessed by their potential positive impact on housing production where it is needed most.	An implementation table has been added that highlights potential impact of each strategy in the plan.
12	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	In general, ABoR is supportive of measures that reduce regulatory barriers to affordability and allow for a greater variety of housing types across the city. Adding navigability to create more missing middle and small lot housing, as well as adding options to subdivide existing larger lots and buildings into smaller spaces, has the potential to improve affordability while retaining residential neighborhood character.	Comment Noted
13	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Flesh Out Potential for Public Land. The Plan makes a recommendation regarding maximizing the use of public property, but it is not specific about how the City can amend its policies regarding public land to carry this out. Given long-standing questions in the community about how City land can be used to create workforce housing, more specific direction is needed in terms of how public land can be catalogued, assessed, reviewed for use, and developed to create more housing that meets defined priorities.	Information has been added to the plan that discusses the need for the City Council to set policy regarding prioritizing city-owned land for affordable housing.
14	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	To accomplish this, the City should ensure all its land is catalogued where it can be easily accessed by stakeholders and a policy is in place to periodically review the use of all City land in light of the highest and best use.	Comment Noted
15	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	In particular, the concept of co-locating housing with other public facilities is promising and this should be fleshed out and made into a separate recommendation, enabling more focused and timely progress on innovative, impactful strategies like these that leverage resources the City already owns.	Comment Noted
16	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Identify Departmental Nexus to Promote Coordination. A well-documented and ongoing challenge in the City of Austin is a lack of departmental coordination stemming from spotty inter-departmental communication and a lack of formalized shared objectives. The Housing Plan can help work against this by specifically identifying when a policy recommendation involves another City Department and ensuring that the affected department is aware of the recommendation and buys into the policy for its part before it is taken up at Council.	An implementation table has been added that highlights key partners for implementation of each strategy
17	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	For instance, the policy recommendation that calls for relaxing regulations on housing cooperatives will require review and buy-in from the Neighborhood Planning Department regarding zoning issues, the Code Department regarding building code and occupancy, and the Transportation Department regarding amending parking standards. By identifying these situations in advance and starting the communication process at this planning stage, implementation is likely to be more successful.	An implementation table has been added that highlights key partners for implementation of each strategy

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
18	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Spell Out Fair Housing Recommendations. The Plan recommends implementing the “City of Austin’s Fair Housing Action Plan” recommendations in their entirety. There are, however, dozens of recommendations in the Action Plan of varying degrees of priority, leading to the possibility of confusion in how to implement them, or worse, ignoring them altogether due to lack of specificity. We believe it would be more effective for NHCD to include top priority recommendations separately in the Housing Plan, taking care to cite their source in the Fair Housing Action Plan, making expectations clear to all involved.	High priority actions from Fair Housing Action Plan have been added.
19	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Insufficient Linkage to CodeNEXT. The Plan is in a key position to demonstrate the relevance of CodeNEXT to affordability issues, yet there are only four instances of CodeNEXT appearing in the document—unusual given that many of the policy recommendations rely on it as a vehicle for implementation. There should be more specific and direct treatment of the question of how these recommendations intersect with CodeNEXT and how that initiative will or will not provide an avenue for implementing these recommendations. In addition, NHCD should provide backup documentation to document and support these recommendations when a draft code is released.	To promote a stronger link, specific language has been added about recommended changes that should occur as a part of CodeNEXT
20	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Jettison Policy Recommendations without Specific Deliverables. Some of the policy recommendations in the Plan are objectives confused with principles, such as calling for ensuring that “new development covers the cost of growth”. It is not clear what this priority signifies in this context, and it should therefore be condensed into a specific policy recommendation or stricken from the Plan. This will help provide the clarity and accountability necessary to ensure this plan is a useful tool to the many departments and stakeholders who must work to implement it.	Comment Noted
21	8/10/2016	Austin Board of Realtors	Letter	Goals should be more transparently tied to demographic forecasts. The Housing Plan sets a goal of 75,000 units over the course of ten years, but it does not clarify how this goal is tied to demographic projections. It is critical we make that connection between housing production and projected demographic trends to ensure our community does not confuse true housing relief with merely keeping pace with increased demand driven by a growing population, enabling all those involved to bring appropriate urgency to address the need.	Information has been added to make it clearer how goal was arrived at.
22	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT highly commends NHCD for the plan’s focus on the need for housing for those with incomes at 30 percent and below MFI.	Comment Noted
23	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In the list of other issues impacting affordability, jobs and wages is another impact. However, we must remember that the jobs that pay lowest will still need to be done and someone will have to do them; Those individuals will have to live somewhere. So just getting everyone training and education and better jobs doesn’t solve the city’s problem.	Comment Noted

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
24	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	One thing that kept disturbing us when reading this report was the couching of the affordability crisis as on the horizon, as opposed to the present and even a bit in the past. Of course, we can't change the past and must deal with present reality. But this crisis is not coming at us, it is here now and getting worse, the plan should openly admit that.	Language amended
25	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	With the housing affordability problem as out of control as it already is, is it realistic to aim for housing that is 30% of a family's income? Even though this is a good goal, it might be better to say that 30% is our goal but 50% may be a more realistic short-term goal. When rents are over people's entire monthly incomes, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We know this is a HUD rule, but maybe you can advocate with them.	Comment Noted
26	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	While ADAPT favors income integration and opportunity, with our current city-wide affordable housing desert, developing housing where it is connected to transportation and services is more important than spending huge chunks of scarce funding to develop in more upscale neighborhoods. If such development can be done for fairly equal funding to developing in less prosperous areas (by using public lands, etc.) these projects should get strong city support.	As stated in Imagine Austin (HN P10), one of the neighborhood policies is to, "Create complete neighborhoods across Austin that have a mix of housing types and land uses, affordable housing and transportation options, and access to healthy food, schools, retail, employment, community services, and parks and recreation options."
27	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	As for lowering property values of current residents by developing affordable housing, if those moving into these affordable housing units are willing to risk their family's dignity and stomach the crap by living near snobs and bigots, the snobs and bigots shouldn't complain about these brave pioneers who come to live among them.	Comment Noted
28	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	It is really good to know that overall, citizens appear to understand the need for affordable housing. It's exhausting feeling you are resented	Comment Noted
29	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In the discussion of the need on p.6 and elsewhere it is very important to include the fact that a considerable amount of affordable housing is being converted into unaffordable housing at a steady rate. This has displaced many, many low income people and forces most further and further away. It reduces the number of options for very low income people, including people with disabilities, uprooting their lives	Information has been added about market rate affordable housing and attrition of both market rate affordable and subsidized housing
30	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Also ADAPT is concerned that a realistic picture of the services housing should be near be included in this plan. While some people with disabilities definitely care about being near good schools, this is not an issue for many and I would assume that goes for many seniors as well. Grocery stores, drug stores, general Target, Walmart, type places and laundry – places that address daily, weekly living needs are the high priority. Many of the mixed use places in Austin have stores downstairs but they are tattoo parlors, expensive hair care, and boutiques; places that are fine to have but are used only infrequently. We love tattoos in ADAPT but getting them is hardly a weekly affair. We can travel farther for these kinds of things. Maybe "amenities" might better describe what we mean?	Language has been added to make it clear that Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors would have a mix of uses and are intended to provide opportunities for a range of amenities, services and other daily needs.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
31	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Attendants and other direct care workers, janitors, and many others who do the work that makes life livable for our families earn less (often closer to \$16,000) and these folks should not be left out of the picture in this plan. Their work saves our community and the state lots of money and frees up family members as well.	Comment Noted
32	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	It is really good to see such good information/data on households at 30% MFI and below. ADAPT believes however that breaking it down even further to 15% or at least 20% and below would help focus on the most deeply affected population in Austin. Most of ADAPT's members are in this category and disability benefits remain abysmally low. Without deep subsidies there is really no way these individuals could make it in Austin.	Goals by MFI level have been added to the plan
33	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	The description of the squeeze on the middle cost housing is terrific.	Comment Noted
34	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In looking at the demand and future demand we are constantly disappointed with how little attention the city demographer pays to people with disabilities, there is almost never any data in this regard included. Where it is included, it focuses on diagnosis as opposed to need for housing, transportation, etc. This is something the city could pay a lot better attention to and probably get much better information than a volunteer consumer group can get.	Comment Noted
35	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In addition, this plan should take into account the people who are institutionalized in Austin in nursing homes or other such facilities who want out but are held back by lack of housing options. They are neither counted as homeless, nor as members of the community (the Census explicitly says it does not include these populations) so they belong in a kind of limbo from which it is very difficult to escape, since they are invisible to planners, the general public and pretty much everyone else. Austin should include them in its planning, especially housing planning since housing is one of the main barriers to getting out of a nursing home and getting services and living in the community. CMS has data on these numbers for people in nursing homes, in a study called the Minimum Data Set. Question Q 1A asks about people who would rather be living in the community. TDHCA's 811 program provides funds for just this population and the city should get some of those funds.	Comment Noted
36	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT believes the city Housing Plan should not include any support for, promotion of, or acceptance of townhomes as housing options, or housing options that receive any city support. Townhomes deliberately discriminate against people with mobility impairments and the builders have succeeded in exempting them from any access requirements. Austin should not support deliberate discrimination.	To meet the market demand of our growing and diversifying population, the range of available housing choices must expand throughout the city. Alternatives to the typical larger-lot single family and garden-style apartments that characterize much of Austin's housing stock are needed, including a greater variety of starter and move-up homes.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
37	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	On page 10 you list low wage workers and you should include attendants and other direct care workers. The city does little to assist this critical category of workers who help people with disabilities and seniors to live in the community, and in so doing, help families live more free and less burdened lives as someone else is doing the personal care of their loved ones. Attendants and other direct care workers are paid less than fast food workers, often considered the poster children for people who don't earn enough to live on.	Information that covers attendants and other direct care workers has been added.
38	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In the equity and inclusion section you again use the future tense to describe people being displaced when past and present are probably more appropriate. A commitment to fairness and equity for the future seems a bit like closing the barn door after the cows are gone. This commitment should extend to those who have already been driven out but would like to return. We agree with conclusions here regarding the negative impacts described in this section. Do we really want to be one of those communities which doesn't want those who help make the city the way it is (via the services they provide to the community) to live here?	Tense changed
39	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Page 11 brings up many issues for us. Throughout the document you talk about the percents of MFI that are impacted. In some places you very positively include dollar equivalents for those percents, making the information a LOT more accessible, and that's great. But it's always in terms of a 4 member family, whereas you say in several places that future families in Austin will be smaller than that. Perhaps a better way to do this is to include the chart with the percentages and amounts for a single person, a couple, as well as the four person family.	A chart which breaks down the Median Family Incomes for the Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) has been added.
40	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Here you talk about housing by zip code, in other places by City Council district; it seems like the plan should be consistent on which geographic area it is using. In addition, especially if you go by the smaller zip code areas (smaller than Council districts) it is important to look at how this works with closeness to transit etc.	Changes have been made for consistency referencing Council Districts throughout the plan
41	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT strongly objects to your Housing for all targets. In your Housing for All Target it seems terribly low to say only 20 people with incomes at 20% or below and since this same plan says there is a shortage of 48,000 units for people 30% and below MFI. 20 people is not even a drop in the bucket. Adding to this is your call for 50 PSH units per year. There are a lot more people with incomes at 20% and below MFI than there are people wanting or even eligible for PSH, yet you target more than twice as many units for PSH as for 20% and below income folks. In addition, individuals eligible for PSH are also, in all likelihood, at 20% and below MFI, and could potentially monopolize those 20 slots as well. PSH units however are not available to everyone at 20% and below.	The plan has separate goals for PSH and non-supportive affordable units. Goals are broken down by MFI; the 20 units at below 20% is a department goal.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
42	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	We like your call for access and adaptable design in your targets. However, your call for 50% of the units to be adaptable may or may not meet Fair Housing, which requires ALL new units in buildings with 4 or more units be adaptable if they are on the ground floor or reachable by elevator. ADAPT would like some statement about compliance with Fair Housing and Section 504 be included here, for example "All units and project which use City of Austin funding must comply with Fair Housing, Section 504 and the City's Visitability requirements."	Comment noted. Department goals have been updated to specify that 25% of all affordable units funded by NHCD will be accessible
43	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Linking housing and transportation is very important to the disability community and the low income community. While a quarter mile is a noble goal, ADAPT believes you should raise requirement that 25% of housing be within ¼ mile of transportation to 100% be within ¼ mile, 50% within a ½ mile and perhaps have a stair step means of giving the most points to projects within ¼ mile and a smaller amount of points to projects that are within a half mile.	Transit does not cover all portions of Austin, so restricting 100% of housing to certain geographies would run counter to Imagine Austin which strives to "Create complete neighborhoods across Austin that have a mix of housing types and land uses, affordable housing and transportation options, and access to healthy food, schools, retail, employment, community services, and parks and recreation options."
44	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Another factor is that for ADA paratransit you must live within ¾ mile of a transit line, so all projects built outside this distance will not have Metro Access service for people with disabilities and seniors who need that type of transit. Perhaps you should better align this kind of requirement with the transit requirements.	Language added to ensure 90% of affordable housing created or preserved within ¾ mile of transit service, this ensures Metro Access service for persons with disabilities and seniors.
45	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Also how will you deal with the fact that transit corridors move?	Comment Noted
46	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Last but not least, what is your definition of high frequency?	Definition of high frequency has been added, (this is transit service that provides service every 15 minutes or better throughout most of the day, on weekdays and weekends)
47	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	It is great to include the information you have on the next page, but many of the affordability periods are WAY too short. 40 years should be the minimums for all these programs; and SMART Housing's 1 to 5 year requirements are a joke. Even the 10 to 20 year periods are too short. These timeframes will pass in the blink of an eye and by the time this plan is completed many of the projects started when the plan was adopted will no longer need to be affordable.	City staff, policy makers, and other stakeholders generally agree that the current SMART Housing affordability periods are insufficient. There are efforts underway to look at a comprehensive revision of the SMART Housing policy that will result in regulations that are more in-line with the City's other developer incentive programs and are responsive to current City affordable housing goals.
48	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In your prevention of displacing low-income homeowners, do not let funds for accessibility be used for other kinds of home improvement like repairs and weatherization. These funds should be separate or the access funds will be drained for other work. Local agencies have lobbied hard at the state level to allow this kind of bleeding dry the access funds and it should not be permitted locally. Just because someone needs access improvements should not prevent them from getting repairs or weatherization. Cost savings on doing these projects at the same time should not mean access funds pay for it all.	The Architectural Barrier Removal Program (ABR) provides up to \$15,000 in grant funds to homeowners and renters. The program will only assist income eligible elderly and disabled persons. Repairs under the program are restricted to home accommodations and/or modifications to make the home more accessible. The program is funded with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. The applicant and the property have to meet eligibility criteria. NHCD has not repurposed funds from ABR to any other program.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
49	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Your focus on preserving and creating ownership options for households at 80% to 120% discriminates against lower income families. The Home of Your Own program has successfully made people on disability benefit levels of income homeowners and the city continues to belittle this program. The city should not knock these kinds of programs out of the picture, but instead seek to expand and/or partner with them.	Comment Noted
50	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	At the top of page 14 it seems you are targeting all these options to households at 80 – 120% MFI but many of these strategies could be used to help create/support rental housing for people with lower incomes and perhaps even homeownership for people below 80% MFI. Why extend these options to people above MFI (120%) and restrict lower income households? ADAPT believes this is wrong. This is especially true for the sale of public land. Expanding SMART housing to higher incomes will not lead to some kind of trickle down, but will further limit the assistance available to the lowest incomes and the same is true for density bonus programs.	Goals based on Median Family Income (MFI) have been added to the plan. Language to consider affordability levels of S.M.A.R.T. Housing has been added.
51	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	“Missing middle housing” must still meet Fair Housing requirements, visitability ordinance and for live/work housing the ADA as well. This is also true for the flexible housing listed a few bullet points below. While you can have accessible or adaptable versions of the housing described in missing middle and flexible housing, this needs to be carefully monitored. The city should make this need for compliance abundantly clear throughout the plan.	A section titled "Provide Additional Funding for Monitoring and Real-Time Database of Housing" has been added under "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin."
52	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In addition, ADAPT strongly believes this plan should not promote housing that discriminates (like townhomes).	Comment Noted
53	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT strongly supports simplifying the permitting process and increasing its user-friendliness for everyone, not just affordable housing. This will benefit the entire community.	Comment Noted
54	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	It might be good to tone down the jargon in the ideas listed on page 14. For example, what are “form based code districts”?	A definition of form based code districts has been added to the plan, (these are areas coded for a high quality public realm, rather than a separation of uses)
55	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Another idea for maintaining affordability would be to increase tax, levy a fee, for developers who convert affordable multifamily housing into market rate or higher income housing.	Municipalities have no inherent power to tax. Municipalities, like other political subdivisions in Texas, derive their ability to tax from the Texas Constitution or from state statute. Because neither the Texas Constitution nor state law authorizes a city to charge such a fee, the City may not levy them because they would constitute an illegal tax.
56	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Also in some cities, they have a flipping tax, where homes that are simply flipped are taxed at a different (higher) rate at time of resale	Municipalities have no inherent power to tax. Municipalities, like other political subdivisions in Texas, derive their ability to tax from the Texas Constitution or from state statute. Because neither the Texas Constitution nor state law authorizes a city to charge such a fee, the City may not levy them because they would constitute an illegal tax.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
57	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In Austin's expansion of community land trusts you should allow for scattered site CLTs so that all the units in a project do not need to be in the same location.	Currently nothing prohibits scattered site Community Land Trusts (CLTs) in Austin. Any individual, group or organization in any part of Austin can deed land into a CLT.
58	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Tenant relocation assistance is vital and should address the additional difficulties people with disabilities often face in finding new housing that is accessible to them. Some of these include the greater difficulty of finding available accessible housing in the right price range, greater costs of moving since many will need to pay for assistance, lack of assistance from service providers in moving, difficulty in finding affordable and accessible housing near needed amenities, and similar problems.	Comment Noted
59	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT strongly supports the city in any efforts to protect renters from discrimination based on source of income. What the state did was a travesty and extremely hypocritical considering their constant drone for local (state control vs. federal control) control. One method for ending such discrimination we do NOT support is any form of financial reward for taking vouchers, as that is basically rewarding discrimination, and will tend to make the problem worse. We recommend the City push the Austin Apartment Association to create a voluntary program in conjunction with the city and the Austin Tenants Council to promote acceptance of vouchers. If their members are as big hearted as they claim they should want such a program, but just in case they are not quite as big hearted, they should work with these other entities.	Comment Noted
60	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	The city should also explore ways to provide a working-with-landlords to accept section 8 (like the one referred to below in the PSH section), possibly support developing an agency or agencies to assist landlords with the scary section 8 paperwork. Working with on such efforts could help spread any costs and use of other resources. Collaborate with HACA and Travis County Housing Authority and an independent committee of landlords and the Austin Tenant's Council, to make accepting Section 8 and other vouchers more attractive and user friendly for landlords, while not infringing on tenant's rights.	Comment Noted
61	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	The city should repeal its code requirement on occupancy limits that sets those limit is at 4 unrelated people. This is anti-lower income people and will negatively impact them. The city should however realize group homes for persons with disabilities are not a positive option, though the reasonable accommodation language here is appropriate.	Comment Noted
62	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Why is this plan completely silent on board and care homes? These are among the most abusive housing situations for low income people with disabilities but they are unaddressed here. This is wrong!!! The plan should include quantitative and qualitative information (like how many are there? How many people live in them? What are the experiences these people have living there? What are ways to address the abuses?	Noted, there is a taskforce looking into this issue
63	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT supports the City's' efforts to pursue inclusionary zoning and encourages the city in this regard.	Comment Noted

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
64	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Preservation of housing that is affordable is a logical tool, however ADAPT wants the city to recognize that preserving housing usually means preserving inaccessibility.	Comment Noted
65	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT enthusiastically supports the city pursuing GO Bonds for affordable housing. Future campaigns for such bonds should be carefully designed to better describe the intent (than happened the last time) but this is a very important tool to help create more affordable housing in Austin.	Comment Noted
66	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT has long called for the city to challenge private sector players to participate in funding affordable housing. UT should be high on the list to be tapped! ACC and AISD might provide some teacher housing. However, don't let rich employers experiment with low income housing they know little to nothing about, just get them to fund it. Low income people should not become the lab rats for social experimentation just because they need housing.	Comment Noted
67	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT strongly supports the use of public property to include affordable housing. The Austin State Supported Living Center should be shut down and turned into an area for affordable housing. The Austin State Hospital could co-locate its current services with affordable housing; they have already done so with market rate housing. There are many other locations around town that can be tapped. When the Health and Human Services Commission redoes their buildings at 51st and Guadalupe (the Winters Building Complex) they should include housing for workers and for clients of their services.	Information has been added to the plan that discusses the need for the City Council to set policy regarding prioritizing city-owned land for affordable housing.
68	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	We also think the colocation idea is very interesting.	Comment Noted
69	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	While social impact bonds are a creative and interesting idea, they have no place in this housing plan. Services should not be linked to housing.	Comment Noted
70	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	The National Housing Trust Fund is vital and the city should most definitely utilize these funds, however your talk about better targeting the dollars should not be a code message for using these funds for homeless people only. Many people with disabilities and seniors need this housing, not to mention other low income persons, and they do not want or need services tied to their housing. Since TDHCA manages these funds, the City should monitor how TDHCA is planning to use them and advocate for mission-driven non-profits to be able to provide housing to people at 15% and below MFI.	Comment Noted
71	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	The City should also monitor, promote and partner with TDHCA in their Section 811 program. This is another source of funding for accessible, affordable, integrated housing.	AHFC encourages applicants to use all available funding sources. The Section 811 program is administered by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA), the department designated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
72	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Low income housing tax credits have created a lot of affordable housing and are a good tool. However, they do not achieve affordability for the lowest income populations and this needs to be better recognized because they leave out a lot of people.	Comment Noted

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
73	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In addition, the city should not allow duplication of vouchers and subsidized units where the houser is receiving double benefits and the actual number of people being served is less.	Comment Noted
74	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT very strongly supports the creation of deeply affordable units serving people at 20% MFI and below. Services should not be tied to these units, nor should eligibility for these units be tied to a diagnosis or receiving services.	Noted, services do not have to be attached
75	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	PSH should be provided in integrated settings like the working-with-landlords approach noted at the bottom of this paragraph. It should be recognized that while services may be voluntary in these programs, the way it works here, eligibility is tied to services since certain service providers approve people for this type of housing for their clients, so you must be getting services through these agencies to get PSH. Housing first is a positive development in this type of housing. However, ADAPT is very concerned that this kind of housing is allotted a much greater percentage of available funding for extremely low income housing, greater than the percentage of population eligible to be served.	The plan has separate NHCD goals for PSH (with services) and deeply affordable units without services.
76	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	The city should begin an Affordable, Accessible, Integrated Housing initiative to promote this kind of housing, without services attached or even part of the eligibility process. This kind of housing has a long, proud and effective history and successfully serves thousands of people with disabilities and seniors.	The plan has separate NHCD goals for PSH (with services) and deeply affordable units without services.
77	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Affordable housing goals that distribute affordable housing throughout the city are laudable. However, this needs to be balanced with the goal of creating as much truly affordable housing as possible.	Comment Noted
78	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	In addition, 10% by zip code doesn't make sense since there are more than 10 zip codes in Austin. Perhaps what is meant is council districts and if so this should be clarified.	Changes have been made for consistency referencing Council Districts throughout the plan
79	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT has long called for the lengthening of the affordability period for SMART housing. 1 to 5 years is just a travesty and basically does little to nothing to create affordable housing.	City staff, policy makers, and other stakeholders generally agree that the current SMART Housing affordability periods are insufficient. There are efforts underway to look at a comprehensive revision of the SMART Housing policy that will result in regulations that are more in-line with the City's other developer incentive programs and are responsive to current City affordable housing goals.
80	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Consistency in density bonus programs is good but your emphasis here for more bedrooms doesn't align with your prediction of smaller family sizes in the future.	Comment Noted
81	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Any density bonus for missing middle housing must ensure compliance with Fair Housing, Visitability and other accessibility requirements and should not promote inaccessible types of housing, like townhomes. This is also true for smaller houses.	Comment Noted

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
82	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Some kind of emphasis should be given to ADUs that are accessible, or at least visitable. Multifamily tax exemption programs are terrific and can also assist people with disabilities. They could also help in creating developments in more costly areas of town.	Language has been added to ensure ADU regulations ensure accessibility and/or visitability. Comment Noted - The City of Austin can only exempt the city's portion of property taxes through a tax exemption program.
83	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	Helping reduce transit costs is important. As discussed earlier it might be a good idea to make your development requirements more in line with the requirements for transit under the ADA. ADAPT would be happy to help with this and we can probably get help from Capitol Metro too.	Comment Noted
84	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	ADAPT has fought for over 25 years to increase funding for sidewalks and we strongly support this recommendation. However, the Sidewalk Master Plan is something we have also worked with the city to develop for many, many years and current Sidewalk Master Plan priorities in it are there for a reason. (Sometimes people must travel from less busy areas to busier ones to get to the transit routes.) We are hesitant to call for amendments less than a month after the current plan has been adopted. The Sidewalk Master Plan is based on actual experience from years of trying to deal with our current patchwork of sidewalks, streets and paths, as opposed to something based on theoretical plans.	Comment Noted
85	8/8/2016	ADAPT of Texas	Letter	It is exciting to see housing that appears to be Visitable highlighted in illustration in this plan. Sad that so many of the graphics in here have steps.	Comment Noted
86	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	We encourage the adoption of the Austin Strategic Housing Plan as it outlines a variety of policies which would begin to address many of our current challenges in offering housing choices at attainable prices/rental rates. The City has long had policies such as VMU Bonuses and the SMART Housing Policy which incentivize affordable housing in larger, developer-driven housing developments. The Austin Strategic Housing Plan goes further, encouraging flexibility at the individual homeowner level which will benefit a large number of existing Austinites.	Comment Noted
87	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	Small Infill Projects are of great importance. Many of the opportunities for providing additional homes exist within the backyards of individual residents. These residents could greatly benefit from having an additional dwelling on their property, either in the form of rental income which makes their household more affordable, or by bringing young adult children or aging parents closer. This type of one-off "infill" should be encouraged.	Comment Noted

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
88	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	1. Limit new regulation. Additional requirements only increase the barrier to entry for residential remodel and new construction. All new initiatives, no matter how worthy a cause, should be carefully scrutinized for the unintended consequences that may result in additional fees, permitting time, and construction cost. Whenever possible, programs should work as an optional incentive with some added benefit to the project rather than an across-the-board requirement which might exclude participation all together.	Comment Noted
89	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	2. Prioritize remodel/addition and ADU permits. Updating an existing home in most cases results in less perceived change of scale and character from the average passing neighbor. The city should expedite permits which fall in these categories.	Comment Noted
90	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	3. Incentivize protecting existing trees. Existing trees (regardless of regulatory classification) define the character of many Austin neighborhoods and provide important shade, heat reduction, and in many cases visual separation between homes. Critical root zones can impose significant challenges when combined with set-backs and other restrictions. The City should offer slight bonuses of FAR and/or Impervious Cover allowances to effectively incentivize the preservation of existing trees.	Comment Noted
91	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	Utility costs are a major factor of household affordability. The City should review existing programs which encourage weatherization as well as efficient household appliances, fixtures, and mechanical systems. Consider how to actively seek participation from both renters and landlords.	Last section has been retitled Household Costs and language about utilities has been added: Increase Opportunities for Households to Reduce Utility Costs: The City should review existing programs which encourage weatherization as well as efficient household appliances, fixtures and mechanical systems. Programs should be explored that reduce initial costs for sustainable features such as solar energy. Incentives should be provided to actively seek participation from both renters and landlords.
92	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	Transportation options can open more residential opportunities. We applaud the plan for addressing the invaluable role the pedestrian and transit network plays in the housing equation. However, in order to be effective for daily life, transit must work as a round-trip system. This means pedestrians must be able to safely cross the street near each end of their trip. Crosswalks are a critical component if we hope to leverage transportation options relative to housing needs. This is especially true on core transit corridors and other busy streets where long blocks, multiple lanes, and speeding cars prohibit safe crossing.	Comment noted the City of Austin's 2016 Sidewalk Master Plan can be found at: https://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Public_Works/Street_%26_Bridge/Sidewalk_MPU_Adopted_06.16.2016_reduced.pdf
93	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	Missing Middle Housing typologies offer a transitional scale while providing diversity of home types that accommodate the housing needs of various age groups, family sizes, and incomes. Missing Middle Housing can provide options for context-sensitive urban infill.	Comment Noted

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
94	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	Subdivision requirements could allow for better utilization of available land. Currently, new single-family subdivisions (regardless of land area or relative location) are required to dedicate a 50' wide right-of-way for streets and require a 25' front yard set-back on each side effectively resulting in a 100' wide swath of unbuildable land. Multiplied across the 50' minimum lot width this equates to 5,000sf of under-utilized land for each pair of homes on a double loaded street. At this time, the best option for avoiding such significant losses is to apply for an up-zoning to SF-6, a time consuming and expensive task hardly appealing to seasoned developers let alone smaller organizations attempting to construct a more modest project. The city should look for opportunities to either loosen the subdivision standards or expedite up-zoning on urban parcels available for subdividing in order to maximize the efficient use of these parcels in providing additional homes.	See sections on Small Homes on Small Lots and Subdivision Diversity
95	8/10/2016	AIA Austin	Letter	Small Residential Developments require city assistance to facilitate Affordable Housing Bonuses. The City should consider the options available that would allow for a City-run trust similar to the one utilized at Mueller, which would assist smaller for-sale condo developments in managing the 99 year term for affordable units sold at a loss in exchange for density bonuses.	Small Residential Developments require city assistance to facilitate Affordable Housing Bonuses. The City should consider the options available that would allow for a City-run trust similar to the one utilized at Mueller, which would assist smaller for-sale condo developments in managing the 99 year term for affordable units sold at a loss in exchange for density bonuses."
96	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	First and foremost, we extend our deep appreciation to the City of Austin, and specifically Neighborhood Housing & Community Development, for creating the draft of a formalized and well-considered affordable Housing Plan. This effort aligns with key recommendations we provided in our 2011 CHDO Roundtable Position Paper (see attached). Nevertheless, it is our resolute position, as the consortium of affordable housing providers in the City of Austin, that the Housing Plan needs considerable work to achieve its full potential as a robust, goal-setting framework with clearly defined strategies to successfully address Austin's burgeoning housing affordability crisis.	Comment Noted
97	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	IDENTIFYING THE NEED + SETTING THE GOALS. On pg. 6, the 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Study is rightly referenced as one measure of need – a housing shortage of 48,000 units at or below 30% MFI. However, there is an additional massive and growing shortage of housing for families 30-120% MFI. These numbers are generally current. In ten years, these needs will only increase.	Comment Noted
98	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	1) INCREASE AFFORDABLE UNIT GOAL: AHC's (Austin Housing Coalition) position is that the Housing Plan's Goals & Targets (pg. 11) are not sufficiently ambitious. The goals should directly aim at current conditions plus projected 10-year increases. The Housing Plan's 35,000-unit goal (80% MFI and below) is dramatically low and fails to account for almost certain significant loss of unsubsidized affordable units.	Goals have been updated

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
99	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	We recommend NHCD work with the City Demographer, or other departments, to identify a rigorous methodology for developing a comprehensive affordable unit goal. We would not be surprised if the result doubled or tripled the currently identified goal.	Goals have been updated
100	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	2) GOALS BY INCOME LEVEL: The Housing Plan needs defined sub-goals targeted by income level. The deeper analysis of need, as described above, must inform these goals.	New goals have been established by MFI levels
101	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	3) HOME OWNER SUPPORT: The Housing Plan needs well-defined goals for affordable home ownership units and home repair (also by income level).	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
102	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	4) ACTIONABLE STRATEGIES: The Housing Plan needs to identify an overall, integrated strategy for success that goes beyond the diagram on pg. 12. The City needs a complete roadmap with actionable strategies with a timeline organized by 1-year goals, 2-3 year goals, 3-5 year goals, etc.	Sections on implementation and prioritization of goals and strategies have been added to the plan.
103	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	5) 20% MFI UNITS: There is a deep need for units at or below 20% MFI for renters without access to housing vouchers. We commend the included Target to address this need, but it should be considerably higher.	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
104	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	6) AFFORDABLE, ACCESSIBLE, INTEGRATED: AHC supports the model of affordable, accessible, integrated housing for people with disabilities. 100% of all new-construction affordable housing units should be adaptable.	Adaptability goals have been amended in the plan. Additional information about adaptability, accessibility, and visitability have been added.
105	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	7) INCLUDE PUBLIC HOUSING: Neither the City of Austin's nor Travis County's public housing authorities' goals are included in the Housing Plan. HACA and HATC are key players and they need to be included.	Information on local public housing authorities has been incorporated into the plan.
106	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	8) REGIONAL PLANNING: Though the City of Austin cannot set regional goals alone, the Housing Plan needs to stress the importance of regional affordable housing planning efforts.	A new section on regional context has been added to the plan.
107	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	9) REMOVE MARKET UNIT TARGET: Since NHCD has no agency in the production of market units, we believe it is neither necessary nor useful for NHCD to specify a market-unit goal.	The experiences of other cities have shown that affordability crises such as ours cannot be solved by subsidized units alone. When there is a lack of housing units relative to demand for those units, prices for all types of housing rise. Increasing the supply of market-rate AND subsidized units will help get the level of supply closer to demand and prevent prices from rising as quickly. The plan advocates for strategies that would incentivize additional market-rate development or preservation, including strategies dealing with development regulations and property taxes.
108	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	KEY POLICIES + PROGRAMS. Starting on pg. 13, the Housing Plan describes a laudable list of potential policies. However, the language used and description of said policies does not rise to the necessary level of clearly defined strategies with timelines and prioritized action steps structured to achieve success.	A section on implementation and prioritization of strategies has been added to the plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
109	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	10) PRIORITIZE MOST IMPACTFUL: The policies and programs need to be re-organized to prioritize and highlight those with the most potential impact. Example: "Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program" (pg. 20) has enormous potential impact on affordable unit production by market rate developers (if the program is revised quickly and well). This program should be prioritized in the Housing Plan accordingly.	A section on implementation and prioritization of strategies has been added to the plan.
110	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	11) WHAT AND BY WHEN: Each program or policy needs to be written with actionable language with explicit guidance to City Council on what steps need to be taken and by when. Example: Under "Prevent Displacement of Low-Income Homeowners" (pg. 13), the City cannot merely "explore". Instead, actionable steps need to be clearly identified.	A section on implementation and prioritization of strategies has been added to the plan.
111	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	MONITORING + WELCOME CENTER 12) CENTRALIZED MONITORING STRUCTURE: To achieve the affordability goals, a large percentage of projected units will have to be developed by market rate developers (S.M.A.R.T. Housing, density bonus programs, etc.) Currently, there is no centralized structure for the City, for developers or for potential income-qualified tenants to track units, know where they are located or identify vacancies. With the dramatic increases in such units required, NHCD needs the budget and staff to implement such a centralized structure for everyone's sake.	The goal of creating a "real-time" database of available affordable housing units, services, resources, and incentives to better connect buyers and renters with affordable housing was identified in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, to which this Housing Plan will be an amendment. At the department level, additional local funding for staffing and administration will be necessary and this need has been added to the Housing Plan.
112	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	13) WELCOME CENTER: If we are going to have any hope for success, market rate developers must be welcomed with direct support and assistance in building affordable units under S.M.A.R.T. Housing or density bonus programs. With a thoughtful, customer service-oriented approach, a Welcome Center could transform what currently occurs as another hurdle put up by the City into a catalyst for market rate participation. This Welcome Center needs to be one of the first priorities in the Housing Plan.	Discussion of the need for additional local funding for staffing and administration has been added to the plan.
113	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	VISIONARY LEADER. With the current vacancy of the NHCD Directorship, City Council and the City Manager have the opportunity to hire a visionary leader that can guide NHCD and invigorate the implementation of the Housing Plan over the next 10 years. Please carefully review the Director's job description with an eye to leadership with a powerful voice for advocacy and implementation. However, please do not postpone the adoption of the Housing Plan until a new Director is hired. We need an updated Housing Plan now	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
114	8/9/2016	Austin Housing Coalition	Letter	As NHCD suggests (pg. 10), without sufficient and dispersed housing for Austinites at a range of incomes, Austin will become a city accessible only to the affluent and privileged with paradigmatic consequences for Austin's quality of life, transportation network, job retention, fair housing legalities, and environmental condition. Finally, the Austin Housing Plan needs to be just that, a Plan with explicit strategies and a correlated implementation timeline. Please give NHCD staff the support they need to revise the plan to become the most actionably ambitious Housing Plan in the country	Comment noted. Sections on implementation and prioritization of goals and strategies have been added to the plan.
115	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	<p>1. Core values: In 2007 Council adopted core values for affordable housing programs. These values guided the City's recent audit of the Neighborhood Housing Department (NHCD). However, the draft plan does not mention these values, which are:</p> <p>a. Deeper Affordability Targets: It is desirable to reach deeper levels of affordability, i.e., to serve lower-income households.</p> <p>b. Long-term Affordability: We value housing units that will remain affordable over the long term; and,</p> <p>c. Geographic Dispersion: Affordable housing should be dispersed throughout the city.</p> <p>Recommendation: Use the core values to frame the plan as detailed below.</p>	The five focus areas listed in the plan (Prevent Households from Being Priced out of Austin; Foster Equitable Communities; Invest in Housing for those Most in Need; Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin; and Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs) have been designed to replace the three core values. The core values are still reflected in these new focus areas, which are broader and reflect current issues.
116	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	<p>a. Deeper Affordability</p> <p>The plan reports 48,000 households with income below \$25,000 need affordable housing now, or in U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) terms, extremely low-income families or families with income below 30% of Median Family Income (MFI). Yet the Funding Mechanisms on p. 12 show a goal to house 30,000 families with income up to 80% MFI, which the plan projects will be added to current needs over the next 10 years.</p> <p>Recommendation: Set goals to meet the housing needs of all low-income families by funding source and by 0-30, 30-50, 50-80% MFI groups</p>	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
117	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	<p>Housing mismatch data misrepresents need</p> <p>The plan states: “there is not sufficient product for people with both very low and very high incomes. These households are being forced to compete for limited housing supply in the middle.”</p> <p>People with \$100,000 incomes are not “forced to compete” for low cost homes. They choose to spend less. Nothing says that creating units in their “affordable” price range will cause them to leave their current homes for more costly ones. Publishing mismatch data distorts our focus on housing the most vulnerable Austinites as the Concordia PUD developer did when he used similar City data to justify 135% and 150% MFI rents over commonly accepted affordable rents.</p> <p>Severe cost burden statistics from HUD are much more relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74% of households under 30% MFI; • 36% of households from 30 to 50% MFI; • 9% from 50 to 80% MFI; • 4% from 80 to 100% MFI; and • less than 1% above 120% MFI pay over half their income for housing. <p>Recommendation: Replace text about forced competition and Figure 3 with a new figure and an explanation of the burden of paying over half of one’s income for housing and how severe cost burden disproportionately affects the lowest income households.</p> <p>Remove references to incomes of \$100,000 and \$150,000</p>	<p>Language discussing households choosing lower-cost housing amended.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
118	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	<p>b. Long-term affordability</p> <p>The affordability periods in Figure 7 on p. 12 are shorter than the horizon of the draft plan and possibly shorter than the affordability periods actually in use. For example, the plan projects that SMART Housing will create 4,210 affordable units in the next ten years. However, these units will be affordable for only one to five years. The City audit faulted NHCD for counting these short affordability periods toward long-term goals. Also, the draft plan states that federal funds have shorter minimum affordability periods. However, a longer period could be set.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise all City housing programs to meet 40 to 99 year standards and count only programs with 40 year or longer affordability periods</p>	<p>Information has been added to the plan about market rate affordable housing and attrition of both market rate affordable and subsidized housing.</p> <p>City staff, policy makers, and other stakeholders generally agree that the current SMART Housing affordability periods are insufficient. There are efforts underway to look at a comprehensive revision of the SMART Housing policy that will result in regulations that are more in-line with the City's other developer incentive programs and are responsive to current City affordable housing goals.</p>

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
119	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	<p>c. Geographic dispersion</p> <p>The draft plan clearly describes the importance of housing choice and the consequences to the city of denying choice. The plan repeats that the City will complete the action steps in its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing and notes that 10% of housing in each zip code should be affordable to people below 30% MFI, but does not elaborate on how this goal will be met. The plan sets a goal that 25% of housing created under the plan will have two bedrooms so as to promote choice for families, but does not address how it will end a pattern of City-supported 2-bedroom units serving households without children.</p> <p>The draft plan refers to CodeNext as increasing housing choice in activity centers and corridors. A line on p. 11 would set a unit goal for centers and corridors but the goal is blank. The plan refers to a density bonus and suggests “missing middle” housing might be affordable, but with no details. Without details the public should not support the CodeNext sections. Furthermore, all future affordable housing cannot be segregated to activity centers or corridors.</p> <p>Gentrification is rapidly limiting the choice of families to remain in certain neighborhoods. On p. 13, the plan recognizes the value of programs such as GO Repairs, weatherization, or Architecture Barrier Removal in helping families to remain in their homes in gentrifying neighborhoods, but sets no goals</p>	<p>A goal of family friendly (multiple bedroom) units is included in the plan.</p> <p>Several strategies discussed in the "Prevent Residents from Being Priced out of Austin" can be applied to gentrifying areas. Additional strategies dealing with preservation of currently affordable housing have been added to the plan.</p> <p>The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement. The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.</p> <p>Recalibration of density bonus programs is being undertaken. Community benefits and requirements will be assessed through this process and could result in changes to existing density bonus programs or recommendations for new programs or benefits.</p>

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
120	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set a preference for renting or selling family friendly housing stock created with city support or incentives to families with children. • Include goals to help residents stay in their gentrifying neighborhoods. • Provide details on CodeNext so that the public can comment on whether missing middle housing and incentives will meet affordable housing goals. • Take the City's entitlement incentives (e.g., density bonus) to the next level: Require incentive units to accept rent vouchers; Grant nonprofits a first right of refusal to purchase for sale incentive units for rent to families below 30% MFI; Mirror the bedroom mix of market rate units in incentive units; and Monitor how incentive program units serve members of protected classes. • Establish a greenfield affordable housing density bonus to meet demand for single family housing outside of activity centers and corridors 	<p>A goal of family friendly (multiple bedroom) units is included in the plan.</p> <p>Several strategies discussed in the "Prevent Residents from Being Priced out of Austin" can be applied to gentrifying areas. Additional strategies dealing with preservation of currently affordable housing have been added to the plan.</p> <p>The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement. The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.</p> <p>Recalibration of density bonus programs is being undertaken. Community benefits and requirements will be assessed through this process and could result in changes to existing density bonus programs or recommendations for new programs or benefits.</p>
121	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	<p>2. Comprehensive planning, monitoring and evaluation of City housing plan The draft plan provides no description or schedule for evaluation.</p> <p>a. Comprehensive process: For years, the City planned its affordable housing programs in one process in which Council passed the housing budget, including local budget items in July, in time to meet a HUD deadline. With a change of city manager, the local housing budget process was divorced from the federal budget process and transparency of the local planning process suffered.</p> <p>Recommendation: Adopt a single budget action plan annually with a combined local / federal evaluation process in conjunction with the current federal process.</p>	<p>Information on tracking and annual reporting added to plan.</p> <p>The City budget process follows a separate schedule from that required by HUD.</p>

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
122	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	b. Incentive units: With increasing production of affordable units through incentive programs, the city auditor has noted the lack of resources to monitor compliance with incentive requirements. One aspect of monitoring, which the City included in the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, is to monitor incentive units for compliance with fair housing, specifically to assure that members of protected classes under the Fair Housing Act have a chance to rent or buy incentive units. Recommendation: Conduct a best practices study to determine how other jurisdictions affirmatively market and monitor incentive units	Discussion of the need for additional local funding for staffing and administration has been added to the plan.
123	8/7/2016	K. Paup	Letter	3. Correspondence of data: Some data does not correspond with other data. a. p. 8 references overlapping income groups, \$0 - \$25,000 then \$20,000 - \$39,000. b. p.8: references 121% MFI instead of 120% MFI. c. p. 12: Should Strike Fund units be counted on acquisition or when they go into an affordable program? Should units with affordability under 40 years count? d. p.18: "GO Bonds...provided rental assistance" How does that square with City policy to use bonds only for activities with a longer life than the bond term? e. p.18: How does the goal for adaptability surpass visitability requirements? f. The appendix states that an average cost of \$31,500 was used to project units. But p. 3 uses a different per unit cost to close the gap.	A-B: Income categories and percentages of households have been updated with recent Census data. C: Comment noted. Policy to be determined. D. Developments funded with existing or future general obligation bond funds must have an affordability period of 40-99 years. E. The adaptability goal has been reworded to be consistent with the City of Austin's visitability requirements. The accessibility goal exceeds HUD requirements for federally assisted housing. F. Regarding cost assumptions, the \$6.48 billion figure reflects total estimated construction costs. A footnote has been added to clarify. Cost assumptions in Appendix A are based on average City of Austin subsidies.
124	8/1/2016	S. Hersh	Letter	The 6/6/16 Austin Strategic Housing Plan draft is not a path to housing affordability for Austin, but is a good description of what others are doing elsewhere.	Comment noted.
125	8/1/2016	S. Hersh	Letter	Page 11 of the draft sets a 40,000 market rate housing unit goal. This seems unnecessary since market rate housing is created by builders and bankers. The 7/19/16 City of Austin Multi Family Report reminds us that "there are now over 40,000 upstream units headed toward what has got to be a maturing market". Why would market rate housing be a strategic goal for City staff given what is already in the pipeline?	The experiences of other cities have shown that affordability crises such as ours cannot be solved by subsidized units alone. When there is a lack of housing units relative to demand for those units, prices for all types of housing rise. Increasing the supply of market-rate AND subsidized units will help get the level of supply closer to demand and prevent prices from rising as quickly. The plan advocates for strategies that would incentivize additional market-rate development or preservation, including strategies dealing with development regulations and property taxes.
126	8/1/2016	S. Hersh	Letter	What is the 160 home repair goal with \$3,000,000 in 2016-2017 funding recommended by the Austin Home Repair Coalition and the Austin Housing Coalition not in the City staff draft budget when we supposedly embrace homeownership and safe housing for the poorest among us, particularly in neighborhoods facing gentrification pressures?	Comments noted. Department production goals have been added to the appendices. If approved by City Council, goals contained in this plan will inform future department budgets.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
127	8/1/2016	S. Hersh	Letter	Where are the goals in the draft 2016-2017 budget that move us toward the 35,000 affordability housing unit production highlighted in the Strategic Housing Plan?	Comments noted. If approved by City Council, goals contained in this plan will inform future department budgets.
128	8/1/2016	S. Hersh	Letter	What are the affordability sub-goals for Mueller, the University Neighborhood Overlay, Colony Park, city owned land and other sites where S.M.A.R.T. Housing production is expected? I hope we can discuss this at a future Committee and Council meeting.	Information has been added to the plan that discusses the need for the City Council to set policy regarding prioritizing city-owned land for affordable housing. Information on affordability goals for areas with master/regulating plans has been added to the document.
129	8/9/2016	ECHO	Letter	On Page 11, the Plan states, "Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Targets: Support the production of 50 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units each year, with half of those being Housing First." This goal originates from City Resolution No. 20141002043 passed October 2, 2014 that sets, "a community target of 400 PSH units, with a minimum of 200 dedicated to 'Housing First' PSH, to be delivered through coordinated, community-wide efforts in the next four years. While the goal does not put the burden on the City alone to fund the 400 units, it is a goal set by the Austin City Council and thus implies leadership and ownership of the goal. As such, the production of just 50 units each year as stated in the Draft Plan is too low. ECHO suggests that the target be "production of 100 units each year," and that the resolution be referenced in the plan (as other resolutions are throughout the plan.)	Discussion of the City and community efforts toward achieving the 400-unit PSH goal has been amended in the plan.
130	8/9/2016	ECHO	Letter	On Page 18, the Plan addresses several tools to "Invest in Those in Most Need": <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pay for Success <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Trust Fund <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Income Housing Tax Credits ECHO requests that NHCD recognize that each of these can be used to develop Housing First PSH. Until enough Housing First PSH exists in Austin, these tools and others should be aligned to ensure production of PSH. NHCD will need to examine their current policies and practices using such tools to understand what modifications need to be made to yield more Housing First PSH.	The section "Support Housing for the Chronically Homeless through Housing First/Permanent Supportive Housing and Landlord Participation" has been amended to reference these other types of tools suitable for PSH
131	8/9/2016	ECHO	Letter	On Page 20, the Plan addresses different uses of a density bonus, but nowhere does it mention that the Downtown Density Bonus is currently dedicated (City Resolution No. 20130627-105) to low barrier, Housing First Permanent Supportive Housing. ECHO is concerned that as time goes by waiting for the funds to materialize from using the Downtown Density Bonus, policy tweaks might lose sight of this badly needed dedication.	As noted in the comment, the Council Resolution does direct policy by dedicating Downtown Density Bonus funds to Permanent Supportive Housing. This level of detail is not included in the Housing Plan to keep document length down; the policy direction provided by the Resolution remains in effect even though it is not specifically called out in the plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
132	8/9/2016	ECHO	Letter	ECHO and stakeholders have worked with staff, council members and mayors to develop the resolution and to identify tools like affordable housing bonds, Pay for Success, trust funds, tax credits and density bonuses that could amount enough funds to develop the needed number of PSH units. We need this plan to further encourage actual use of all these tools to implement the goal	Comment noted.
133	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	Housing Needs: 1. This section should address the fact that the entire Central Texas region, not just the city of Austin, is seeing a dramatic increase in population and housing needs. How much of that is Austin's responsibility to provide? How much should other counties and municipalities participate? Of course, there is nothing that the department or city can do to force other cities in the region to live up to their responsibilities to provide affordable housing, but calling attention to this might be the beginning of a critically necessary regional conversation about housing.	Additional information on housing need and regional context has been added to the plan.
134	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	2. The needs of people with disabilities should be highlighted. For example, we have estimated that out of the 48,000 gap, 7,440 are households with persons with disabilities, of which 1,844 have mobility impairments.	The plan has been amended to include a section on more housing units for people with disabilities, which more clearly acknowledge that the population at 30% MFI and below does comprise people with disabilities who therefore have unique needs.
135	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	3. The plan should recognize the importance of the affordable, accessible, integrated housing model for people with disabilities (please see attached white paper by ADAPT of Texas). It should recognize that disability-related services (e.g. medical and mental health care) should be provided separately from housing. o A person should not lose her services if she loses her housing and vice versa; and in order to protect privacy, one's housing provider should not be one's service provider. o Furthermore, the vast majority of people with disabilities either do not require services to stay housed or are capable of being independent consumers of whatever services they do need.	The plan has been amended to specify separate goals for PSH and units affordable to extremely low income residents that are not linked to supportive services. Acknowledgement that PSH is not the right housing model for everyone has also been included in a new section on more housing for residents with disabilities.
136	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	4. Similarly, the needs of ELI (extremely low income, i.e. households with incomes lower than 30% MFI) households who do not have any form of rental subsidy should be highlighted. The last time the Housing Authority of the City of Austin opened its waiting list, it had over 40,000 applicants for 2,500 spots.	Acknowledgement of people without rental subsidies added to plan. Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
137	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	5. The plan should take into account the units that Austin is projected to lose over the next 10 years due to subsidized properties aging out of their affordability periods and rents rising in non-subsidized currently affordable properties.	Information has been added about market rate affordable housing and attrition of both market rate affordable and subsidized housing
138	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	Housing Production Goals. This section should be clearer, with better defined goals. Specifically: 6. The Plan should specify housing production targets by income level: >80% MFI, 50-80%, 30-50%, 15-30% and <15% (or 20%).	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
139	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	7. These goals should bear some proportionate resemblance to the needs of income groups and target populations.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
140	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	8. The Plan should include a goal for serving households at <20% (or <15%, aka Deeply Low Income, or DLI) MFI. This approximately represents the amount an individual on Social Security Income earns.	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
141	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	9. We commend the department for including a goal for serving ELI and DLI households without vouchers; but we believe that goal needs to be raised to meet the severe need in the community.	NHCD department goals are set based on available funding and projected funding constraints.
142	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	10. 100% of newly-built units should at least meet adaptability standards.	Adaptability goals have been amended in the plan. Additional information about adaptability, accessibility, and visitability have been added.
143	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	11. Overall, the plan should recognize that some goals and targets are ambitious and aspirational, and it may not be clear today how to achieve them all; however that they reflect a commitment by the community to solving these problems. o For example: The Comprehensive Market Study found that 25% of people with disabilities lived in housing that does not meet their accessibility needs. In the state of Massachusetts, they addressed the problem by creating the Mass Access Housing Registry, (http://www.massaccesshousingregistry.org) which contains live listings of accessible properties. Obviously this is ambitious and expensive; but setting it as a goal reflects the commitment by the City to addressing this problem.	Comment noted. The goal of creating a "real-time" database of available affordable housing units, services, resources, and incentives to better connect buyers and renters with affordable housing was included in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, of which this Housing Plan will be an amendment. At the department level, additional local funding for staffing and administration will be necessary and this need has been added to the Housing Plan.
144	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	12. The draft plan currently states that "At least ___% of new housing units should be within Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors." Additionally it should add: "At least ___% of housing units within Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors should be affordable to households below 50% MFI and ___% below 30% MFI." This point should be made for any housing planned for transit corridors.	This section has been revised; goal referenced in comment incorporates housing at all MFI levels.
145	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	13. The plan should clearly identify which entity is responsible for achieving which goals, and how performance will be monitored and measured. For example, some goals may be achieved through AHFC funding; others through the PHAs, Imagine Austin or state funding. The plan should recognize the goals of the local public housing authorities (PHAs) and incorporate them into the larger targets.	Sections on implementation and prioritization of goals and strategies have been added to the plan. Information on local public housing authorities has been incorporated as well.
146	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	Strategies. 14. Include partnering with TDHCA's Section 811 program to achieve affordable, accessible and integrated housing for people with disabilities (not counted in no-voucher goal). For more information, see http://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/section-811-pra/index.htm or talk to Spencer Duran, Program Manager, at (512) 475-1784.	AHFC encourages applicants to use all available funding sources. The Section 811 program is administered by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA), the department designated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
147	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	15. The plan should identify models for serving ELI and DLI households without vouchers or rental subsidies; and the City should test such models and track their effectiveness.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
148	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	16. The National Housing Trust Fund is a new and exciting source of funding primarily for renting households under 30% MFI. Although it is small now, it has the capacity to grow. It is currently being managed by TDHCA. The City of Austin should work with TDHCA to ensure that it is being used to target the lowest income Austinites, preferably under 20% MFI and without vouchers, and that it is accessible for use by smaller, mission-driven nonprofits, and not just large tax-credit developers.	Comment noted.
149	8/9/2016	AHA!	Letter	17. The plan should recognize the opportunity presented to develop certain key sites, for example the Austin State Hospital and the Austin State-Supported Living Center into affordable, accessible and integrated housing for people with disabilities and other low-income households	Information has been added to the plan that discusses the need for the City Council to set policy regarding prioritizing city-owned land for affordable housing.
150	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	This paper is more prescriptive than descriptive, which is unfortunate. This white paper could be the place where NHCD and its extensively skilled and credentialed affordable housing experts could demonstrate the depth and breadth of their scholarly understanding of Austin's affordable housing crisis. What this document furnishes instead are mostly milquetoast recommendations that are not sufficiently supported by empirical evidence and comparisons with other American cities. It also demonstrates a lack of knowledge and engagement with how cities around the world have both historically and recently tackled housing affordability crises.	Comment noted.
151	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	This plan mostly focuses on affordable housing production not preservation. This is shortsighted. The "preservation fund" resolution passed in 2014; why does this report not have concrete recommendations for how to fund it?	More information on preservation strategies have been added to the final plan. This "preservation fund" is still under development at this time.
152	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Nowhere does this document discuss public housing. In a city that literally helped to pioneer the idea, that is a disturbing example of amateurish thinking when it comes to the question of affordable housing.	Information on local public housing authorities has been incorporated into the final plan.
153	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	There is no discussion of environmental justice or of human rights. The Human Rights Commission recently found gentrification to be a human rights violation, not a technical matter. Advocacy for expanded density bonuses produces environmental impacts that further harm our quality of life. Density bonuses have also not nearly produced the amount of affordable housing that our city requires	The impact of gentrification on the city's affordable housing shortage has been added to the plan.
154	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	We must properly quantify what "affordable housing" truly means. 50% of MFI is a number that could work for Austin. Calling 80% MFI housing "affordable" is at this stage intellectually dishonest.	The Housing Plan uses the federal definitions and criteria developed by HUD for consistency, as this definition is required to be used for federal housing resources.
155	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	City council districts 1 and 3 currently house a disproportionate share of the city's "affordable" housing. This document needs to produce a strategy for preserving and upgrading that existing housing instead of over-focusing on the placement of new supposedly affordable housing in so-called "high opportunity" areas. On this issue we should be able to walk and chew gum at the same time.	More information on preservation strategies have been added to the final plan. Affordable Housing Goals in the final plan <i>correspond to each council district</i> rather than zip code as in the previous draft.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
156	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Produce affordable housing preservation and production targets for each city council district that reflect the actual need. The goal of 30,000 housing units at up to 30% MFI is too unambitious. 75,000 units would be an ambitious goal	Comment noted. The 30% MFI unit goal is taken from the 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Study analysis.
157	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	This document needs to dive deeper into discussing veterans housing issues. Granular local research into this area would go deeper than just discussing veterans homelessness.	Comment noted.
158	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	This document should talk about the Fair Housing Act itself, not just the usually ignored "impediments to fair housing choice" document mentioned on page 17. A sincere focus on fair housing in Austin would discuss the preservation of existing affordable housing, not just focus on the construction of new housing in high opportunity areas. A refusal to seriously discuss the loss of existing affordable housing, particularly in East and South Austin, is to aid and abet gentrification.	<p>The plan provides a holistic approach to affordable housing through both preservation and production.</p> <p>The City of Austin is required to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) which means to further the purposes of the Fair Housing Act. This obligation to affirmatively further fair housing has been in the Fair Housing Act since 1968. As provided in the rule, AFFH means "taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws."</p>
159	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	This document should furnish discussion and analysis of previous Austin efforts at generating affordable housing. Without such analysis not only is there no proper institutional memory and training material available for existing and future NHCD staff, it becomes difficult if not impossible to assess what is and is not working. Two noteworthy examples that should be discussed and evaluated include Mueller and Frontier at Montana. There are others one could choose.	The plan has been updated to include a discussion of past efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing in Austin. Descriptions of successful efforts, including Mueller, have also been incorporated. The primary focus of the Housing Plan is on the next 10 years, therefore much of the plan discusses implementing new strategies and continuing effective extant strategies to meet demand.
160	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 3: What is the 2016 HUD MFI for Austin? What is 30% of that? And what is the rent at that level?	A chart which breaks down the Median Family Incomes for the Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) has been added.
161	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 10: "Environmental Degradation." Exactly how is this term being used here? Has the gentrification of East Austin produced "environmental degradation" as it is being used here? It bears noting that the National Environmental Policy Act takes a broad view of the "human environment" that goes well beyond a discussion of natural resources.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
162	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 13: 80% of \$77,800 (the 2016 Austin MFI) is \$62,240 per year. 30% of that is \$1,556. Do you consider numbers such as this to be affordable? (rather unambitious). Then why are they described as “aggressive?”	The Housing Plan uses the federal definitions and criteria developed by HUD for consistency, as this definition is required to be used for federal housing resources.
163	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 15: Please discuss how the proposed preservation property tax exemption would work. What are the proposed numbers? Our city already offers generous tax abatements for historic properties. Yet many of these properties in East Austin were demolished anyway	This exemption would be used to keep rents low, regardless of a property's age.
164	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 17-19: The research literature on TIF's is clear: they are a recipe for corruption and for further gentrification. The plan does not produce a coherent argument (no argument at all, actually) for why Austin should deepen its commitment to property tax diversion schemes of this nature.	Comment noted.
165	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 18: why only “small scale” preservation?	This strategy targets properties that are unlikely to participate in existing programs which typically serve larger developments
166	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 20: Why each zip code? Why not each neighborhood planning area? Or some other geographic boundary such as city council district?	The goals have been revised to pertain to City Council districts, rather than zip codes.
167	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 22: ADU's increase affordability? Based upon what evidence? Cite your sources. The dogma that "alley flats" or similar zoning easing schemes improve affordability should be subjected to empirical analysis.	Additional discussion of ADUs and affordability impacts added to the plan; citations have been included.
168	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 23: The focus on PUD's is a diversion. They should not be discussed in a document of this nature.	Comment noted.
169	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Page 24-26. Linking transportation costs with housing is a good idea, but why stop there? Basic needs budgets should also include discussion of things such as food, child care, health care, debt, out of pocket medical expenses and other necessities. Our city needs to have a realistic discussion of what it means to be poor in Austin. While biking and walking are laudable goals, they need not and should not be discussed in a document of this nature.	This section has been expanded to include other household costs. Walking and biking options are discussed in this section as they are strategies that can help reduce auto-related transportation costs, which helps reduce overall household costs.
170	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Austin needs to re-commit itself to maximizing and optimizing its public housing. As the oldest branch of city government dealing with affordable housing, Austin's housing authority could and should do more. It can start by building back up to its Faircloth limit of 1931 units and recommitting itself to preserving and upgrading its historic public housing stock. There is no shortage of tax credit developers in our city, and the housing authority should focus on what it was founded to do first; directly produce and manage publicly owned housing.	Information on local public housing authorities has been incorporated into the plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
171	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	It needs to finally be conceded that market-based technical solutions will not truly tackle our city's affordable housing crisis. It is only when this concession is made that we can have truly productive affordable housing discussions that rise to the level of the problem. Affordable housing is not and should not be dependent on market rate development; the linkage between the two is artificial and unproductive; the city's public housing history demonstrates this. The fundamental reality is this: the private housing market cannot or will not produce housing that is truly affordable; this was understood during the New Deal. A productive discussion, therefore, would be about what government can and should do to preserve and produce the level of housing that is required. Wonkish discussions about the technical details of density bonuses, property tax diversion mechanisms, or zoning abatements are just ways of continuing to talk around the problem.	The experiences of other cities have shown that affordability crises such as ours cannot be solved by subsidized units alone. When there is a lack of housing units relative to demand for those units, prices for all types of housing rise. Increasing the supply of market-rate AND subsidized units will help get the level of supply closer to demand and prevent prices from rising as quickly. The plan advocates for strategies that would incentivize additional market-rate development or preservation, including strategies dealing with development regulations and property taxes.
172	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Housing, including affordable housing is more than just a matter of quantity, it is also a question of quality. This document should discuss how Austin can start to move in the direction of implementing the Passive House standard in all existing and future affordable housing. Existing greenbuilding standards are not as rigorous or straightforward.	Comment noted.
173	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Austin should re-calibrate how it spends its CDBG and other federal grant funds. While business development see,s a reasonable expenditure at first glance, block grant money is too precious to remain sub-optimally focused on the main problem, which is the preservation and generation of maximum amounts of affordable housing. If the money can be proposed for the destruction of public housing projects such as Rosewood Courts, it can also be purposed for that housing project's preservation and revitalization	The City of Austin is required to follow guidelines from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regarding citizen participation and consultation in determining community needs, setting priorities, and allocating resources. An action plan is prepared annually and a consolidated plan every 5 years.
174	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Lessons from New York: nearly 60% of the \$7.5 billion used to finance New York City's housing programs is derived from the city's capital budget; that is from the issuance of municipal bonds. What is Austin's percentage? The policy recommendation explains itself.	Less than 1% of the City of Austin's 2015-16 budget is allocated on affordable housing. Link: https://austintexas.gov/financeonline/finance/financial_docs.cfm?ws=1&pg=1 By comparison, the NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development's 2016 Preliminary Budget is \$719.9 million (including City and Non-City funds). This represents about one percent of the City of New York's total budget for that year. Source: Report on the Fiscal 2016 Preliminary Budget and the Fiscal 2015 Preliminary Mayor's Management Report (March 10, 2015) Link: http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/2016/Pre/hpd.pdf
175	8/8/2016	F. McGhee	Letter	Austin needs to move in the direction of impact or linkage fees, perhaps both. They are easier to administer, furnish regulatory certainty, and most importantly, produce funding that can be used for affordable housing preservation and production. Political leadership should rise to the challenge.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
176		B. Williams	Letter	Support Housing for the Chronically Homeless through Housing First/Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Landlord Participation: Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is housing for extremely low-income people at or below 30% MFI (\$24,300 or less for a 4-person household in 2016) with voluntary supportive services available, and often targets households <u>individuals</u> experiencing chronic homelessness and have multiple barriers to housing stability (such as substance abuse issues, no income, medical or mental health issues, etc). Housing First PSH focuses on quickly housing people who are experiencing homelessness first, and then providing supportive services as needed. Core elements of the model include lower screening criteria regarding sobriety, criminal history, credit history, or other behaviors generally held to indicate a lack of "housing readiness." <u>All newly created Permanent Supportive Housing is expected to align with the local Continuum of Care's Coordinated Assessment system to ensure those households identified as most vulnerable will be served.</u> Working with private landlords to accept chronically homeless residents is another way to increase the supply of PSH.	The changes suggested have been made in the plan.
177	6/11/2016	Brad Parsons	Email	Quick review of the Housing Plan, I was pleased to see that the vast majority of assistance is expected to go to those in High Need: Homeless/ Special Needs: 31,795 expected to assist Renter Assistance: 2,998 expected to assist Homeowner Assistance: Homeowner Assistance provides services for low- and moderate-income individuals. 3,527 expected to assist. Out of a total of 39,194 expected to assist. The dollar figures mentioned for Expected Resources look reasonable.	Comment noted.
178	6/19/2016	Lee Stork	Email	Cohousing involves building smaller houses with a large clubhouse in the middle where people socialize, have meetings, eat sometimes and share. It would be a lot easier to get a cohousing neighborhood built in Austin if these items might be modified.	Co-housing discussion has been added to the plan.
179	6/19/2016	Lee Stork	Email	On page 22 which is Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots. Would it be possible to change this to Allow the Development of Smaller Houses? Would it be possible to affirm tiny houses here also?	The size of homes is governed by the City's Building Codes; therefore, this type of comment is more appropriate for the CodeNEXT process. More information on public involvement in CodeNEXT can be found here: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement
180	6/19/2016	Lee Stork	Email	On page 23 which is Relax the Regulations on Housing Cooperatives (Co-ops). There is no mention of cohousing here. Would it be possible to include cohousing in this section. Cohousing is a housing trend that is very appropriate for our aging population that is in search of a more social type of neighborhood that uses smaller housing.	Co-housing discussion has been added to the plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
181	6/19/2016	Lee Stork	Email	On page 24 which is Reduce City Codes and Permitting Processes. I would think most people not directly paid by this department would be approving of this idea.	Comment noted.
182	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	1) The Austin Community 10-Year Affordable Housing Goals & Targets chart on page 11 is very unclear to me upon first read	This figure has been updated.
183	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	Are the 40,000 Market Rate Units "preserved" housing? A result of pure market forces, i.e. the filtered down housing that would be "naturally" affordable? I have no idea where this comes from, and its not that clear in the text below.	Market rate units are housing units selling at market prices, these are not affordable units, they are not income restricted, or subsidized - this has been defined in the section
184	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	2. "Ensure that New Development Covers the Cost of Growth" The premise of this value is flawed. a) It is baldly stated that property taxes are regressive. Tax incidence is hotly debated by economists, but depending on one's view, the main debate seems to be whether they are progressive or neutral. The more wealth one has in the form of real estate, the higher the tax. They are also fairly broad. Impact fees, however, reduce overall housing supply by reducing on the margins the number of units being built. Over time, this is clearly regressive. Whether one agrees with all of my analysis here or not, this is clearly more complicated than being presented in this paragraph	This section has been removed from the final plan.
185	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	b) Impact fees must be appropriately structured to take into account for the costs of sprawl, both as an externality and for city services over the long run. Newly built, low density subdivisions in greenfields may seem cheaper, but over time, generate less property tax revenue that can be used to maintain water, wastewater, emergency services, etc. Although some impact fees still under development, I would urge caution in this "new growth should pay for itself" model.	This section has been removed from the final plan.
186	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	3. "Use Incentives to Support the Production of Jobs for Lower -Income Residents" The title of this one seems misleading, although the paragraph below seems correct. We are already producing many low-paying jobs, as is documented in the early part of the report. We need to focus on quality jobs for lower SES residents, not more poverty wage jobs.	The title of this section has been revised.
187	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	4. "Density Bonus Programs" Although generally, density bonuses can be a good thing, it is important to calibrate them carefully and re-calibrate periodically to ensure that we are not choking off more housing supply. We need to set density bonuses that will be significant improvements over regular zoning, while being careful not to downzone significantly. Downzoning will drive down housing supply and increase prices generally compared to the status quo, swamping any improvements in affordable housing.	Information about calibration of density bonus programs has been added to the plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
188	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	5. "Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions" This is a strong recommendation, but should not be limited to activity corridors and centers. All neighborhoods should be connected, and all new subdivisions should have a variety of housing types. They should also be zoned for multi-family or missing middle from the beginning, so that housing types can change flexibly over time, even if the initial buildings are single family homes.	This section has been revised to broaden the recommendations' applicability to subdivisions in areas other than activity centers and corridors.
189	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	6. General comments: It seems that there should be some discussion of targeting affordable housing production to need - x number of units for below 20% median income, x number for 20-40%, etc. There is some discussion of this for supportive housing and housing first, but more should be done	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
190	6/23/2016	Brennan Griffin	Email	Many of these recommendations should be regularly re-examined and policies evaluated for efficacy. If we find that market conditions have changed, and we are not producing enough units for the new conditions, we should have a mechanism to identify the problem.	Sections on implementation and prioritization of goals and strategies have been added to the plan.
193	6/14/2016	Oscar Gonzalez	Email	There you will find "Tax Increments" (pg 12), NEW debt obligations (pg 12), creation of Tax Increment District (pg 14), Rent Control (pg 17), Increasing limit of assessed value within TIF Districts, (pg 19). Raising taxes, incurring new debt obligations, and rent control is not the solution. Please stop this taxing and spending. In the long run it hurts the middle class, retired, and elderly on fixed income	Comment noted.
194	6/18/2016	John Neal	Email	I fully support the current affordability plan. It is paramount that the city address its antiquated development codes to encourage density and reduce parking requirements in core locations. It's also imperative that the city address the many restrictions that compatibility codes put on increasing density where the town needs it most.	Comment noted.
195	6/18/2016	Jon Brewer	Email	Thank you for the opportunity to share our suggestions regarding housing availability within Austin. While I could elaborate in great detail, the solution to this problem is quite simple. We don't have a housing crisis...we have a density and zoning crisis. We have created a city of sprawl by forcing people further and further away to find affordable housing. Because of a severe lack of demand in the central Austin region, prices have risen dramatically. The solution is to relax zoning laws and allow increased density from 290 to 183 and MoPac to 35. We need more missing middle housing, more ADUs, and more opportunities for Austinites to live where they work.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
196	7/25/2016	Ruth Kaplan	Email	<p>This is my narrow view, as a landlord of one small house in Zilker neighborhood. I wanted to build three or four, studio apartments/condos to provide lower cost housing, but zoning has prohibited that. Instead, I am building one, 1100 sq ft house that will rent for 3 times what each of the studios might have. Restrictions such as these (2 family zoning), combined with property taxes topping \$1000 a month, and I cannot reduce rents or provide more affordable housing.</p> <p>The property tax protest system is capricious at best and arbitrary at worst. The expense and difficulty of changing zoning prohibits any attempt to provide additional affordable units. Address these problems and the market will expand to meet demand without increased rental prices.</p>	Comment noted.
197	7/27/2016	Darren Bates	Blog Post	http://www.darrenbatesllc.com/newsroom/a-new-strategic-housing-plan-signals-a-shift-that-could-save-austins-cultural-heart-and-soul	Comments noted.
198	7/27/2016	Lee Stork	Email	Would it be possible to put other figures in it as an addendum for this is for a family of 1 through 8 or so on the qualifications. You list for a family of four which is great if you have a family of four but not so great if you don't	A chart which breaks down the Median Family Incomes for the Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) has been added.
199	7/27/2016	Lee Stork	Email	I also would like you to give more thought to having smaller houses on any size of lot.	Comment noted.
200	8/4/2016	Jo Kathryn Quinn	Email	100% Permanent Supportive Housing units should be Housing First. (not 50%)	Comment noted.
201	8/4/2016	Jo Kathryn Quinn	Email	Identify dedicated tax or fee revenue for construction of Permanent Supportive Housing.	Texas state law limits the City's ability to levy taxes or fees for affordable housing. Currently, the City can utilize funding from the Downtown Density Bonus program, General Obligation bonds, and Housing Trust Fund, among other sources, to fund the construction of Permanent Supportive Housing units.
202	8/5/16`	Cj Northcott	Email	There needs to be affordable housing for families	Comment noted.
203	8/5/2016	Daryl Stewart	Email	<p>I'm currently running a Tiny house meetup group (~1200 Austin members) and am looking for if/how a Tiny house on wheels (THOW) will be a legal option.</p> <p>As I know it right now it is illegal to reside in one of these type homes, correct?</p> <p>They can be on property as long as they're behind a 6' wooden privacy fence, but you can't live in it?</p> <p>Opening up the ability to actually live in one would not only increase affordable housing but limit the main home owner from the expense of build a stand alone AD</p>	Tiny houses on wheels have been included in Plan in the "Create new and affordable housing choices for all Austinites..." Section
204	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	<p>I strongly support the vast majority of the Plan recommendations with the following qualifiers/suggestions.</p> <p>1. Overall goals should be strengthened</p>	Comment noted. Housing goals have been revised.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
205	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	a. The stated goal of 35,000 affordable units at 80% MFI or below should be broken down into more specific income levels. If our top need, as stated, is for rental units for those earning less than \$25,000 per year, the majority of these affordable units need to be targeted for a much lower MFI than 80%.	Affordable housing goals have been revised and an updated affordable housing goal broken down by MFI has been added
206	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	b. Zip code affordability goals should be increased to at least 15%-20%. The Plan draft calls for only 10% of rental housing per zip code at 30% MFI, which is clearly insufficient. Please consider raising this goal to at least 15%, or ideally 20%.	The 2014 Housing Market Study recommended the 10 % affordable housing goal per zip code. Changes have been made to the plan that move from zip code goals to council district goals.
207	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	c. Target lower MFI for ownership goals. The goal of “25% ownership housing units affordable at or below 120% MFI” does include the term “below,” but realistically it is unlikely that we will see many home ownership opportunities targeted for those earning less than 120% MFI unless we specifically stipulate it. I do not believe we should give up on home ownership – historically the most common way to build wealth – for anyone making less than 120% MFI. For these reasons, I would specifically target some lower MFI percentages in this goal.	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
208	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	d. Increase “Housing for All” goals (page 11). These numbers seem painfully low – please increase.	The goal section has been revised.
209	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	e. Lengthen affordability periods (page 12) to a minimum of 40 years for each category, unless specifically prohibited by law. The potential one-year affordability period for the SMART Housing program makes it essentially meaningless. Even a 10-year affordability period does not provide enough time to raise a single child from birth to high school graduation.	City staff, policy makers, and other stakeholders generally agree that the current SMART Housing affordability periods are insufficient. There are efforts underway to look at a comprehensive revision of the SMART Housing policy that will result in regulations that are more in-line with the City's other developer incentive programs and are responsive to current City affordable housing goals.
210	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	2. Tie all new entitlements, including parking reductions, to a strong affordability requirement and ensure safety for all proposed parking reductions. All new entitlements – including any reductions in parking – must be strongly tied to an affordable housing requirement. Reductions in on-site parking requirements within a quarter-mile of transit MUST be context-sensitive as the proposed area will include many streets where stealth dorms have already resulted in dangerously congested parking conditions that hamper emergency vehicle access.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
211	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	3. Replace or supplement weak, confusing density bonus program with broad-based low-cost affordable housing linkage fees for all new commercial and residential construction. Per the 2015 auditor's report, the density bonus program has not performed well, is not monitored and at best has produced only 1200 units over ten years. Experienced multi-family developers have also stated that it generally produces only very small efficiencies which say would be rented at 80% MFI regardless of the density bonus due to the small size of the units.	Information about calibration of density bonus programs has been added to the plan.
212	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	Rather than doubling down on this ineffective program, Austin should begin a transition to affordable housing linkage fees. Linkage fees are applied per square foot of new construction or major remodeling and are paid at the time the building permit is issued. Linkage fees would be far simpler to administer than Austin's current developer incentive programs because they require no long-term monitoring. And because the city controls the funds generated, it can target deeper affordability and under-served locations, as well as unit size and configuration to serve families with children.	The City of Austin is developing a Request for Proposals for a consultant to undertake an affordable housing nexus study to determine options for instituting linkage fees in Austin.
213	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	4. Retain current impervious cover requirements for proposed smaller lot sizes, absent modeling to show that there will be no increase in runoff and flooding impacts.	Comment noted.
214	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	5. Occupancy limits should be raised for only housing units that: will be demonstrably affordable at 60% MFI or lower: meet safety standards for MF housing (egress, sprinkler, etc.); and will not create hazardous street conditions due to multiple vehicles and lack of adequate onsite parking. Occupancy limits were adopted to discourage the construction of more "stealth dorms," which present health and safety hazards both to student renters, who may be sleeping in third floor bedrooms without egress or fire sprinklers, and to nearby neighbors whose streets have become so congested with parked vehicles (up to 12 SUVs per unit) that emergency vehicles cannot obtain access (please also note all pre-existing units were grandfathered). These should only be repealed for truly affordable housing that does not pose safety concerns.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
215	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	6. Proposed separate use category for co-ops must be crafted to prevent it being used by fraternities, sororities or other group uses that are inappropriate in general residential areas. With that caveat, co-op use should be allowed in all MF zoning districts (currently they are allowed only in MF-4 or greater), but be a conditional use only in SF zoning.	Comment noted. Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
216	8/5/2016	Susan Moffat	Email	7. Questions regarding methodology. The "statistically valid" survey sample appears to have captured only English language speakers with computer access, and, while the survey was sent to residents in all 10 Council districts, there is no indication that returns were equally representative of all districts. In addition, the cited increase in young people as a demographic appears to assume that these young people will never age. In reality, many of these single 20-somethings may well be settling down to start families by the second half of this 10-year plan	Please see the response memo from Austin Energy regarding the validity of the survey in Appendix C of the Plan under "V. Other Input Received"
217	8/5/2016	David Aronofsky	Email	I just read the draft affordable housing plan. A lot of words and few concrete solutions, although the communiy trust option has some merit ifr aggressively pursued. Here are two ideas which can matter. First, identify all city land which is not environmentally protected and can be built on, preferably where infrastructure (water, electricity, sewers) already exists. Then either donate it to any developer(s) who promise to build only the targeted housing, preferably condo style to increase access; or alternqatively, get a bank loan or bonds and build these units directly. I see no reference in the plan to city land potentially usable for this purpose even though the plan accurately states that eliminating land costs makes affordable housing more realistic. The city might also actively pursue partnering with other public agencies to increase the land available for this option.	See section, "Invest in Housing for those Most in Need" which references the policy to "maximize public property to build or include affordable housing."
218	8/5/2016	David Aronofsky	Email	The second option is to find the least expensive privately owned land in the city, declare eminent domain to get ownership, and use it to pursue option 1. Housing costs will be higher but maybe affordable. I have no problem with the concept of spreading housing throughout the city but until transportation situation improves this will not likely work well so why not concentrate the siites and bring transportation to these sites? The issue is housing supply, not location; and if we get more supply with fewer concentrated sites we solve the main affordable. decent quality shelter problem	The policy of dispersing housing throughout the City is responsive to the 1968 Fair Housing Act and subsequent legislation that prohibits restricting access to opportunity by concentrating affordable housing in select locations

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
219	8/5/2016	Dianna Holman	Email	Create a Austin housing dream program that can provide education housing application and assistance with a down payment and closing cost. Houses can be offered all over the city that relates to a person's years of employment and payment history single mothers as well. I will be happy to talk more	See NHCD program web pages for information: Down Payment Assistance: www.austintexas.gov/departments/down-payment-assistance Housing Smarts Program: www.austintexas.gov/housingsmarts
220	8/5/2016	Deborah Hornickel	Email	The idea of it is wonderful....but the plan looks onerous to me. I am solid middle class and work very, very hard for what money I have. I am being taxed to death with the property taxes on my home and as I face retirement I am worried sick that I can afford the taxes on my home. I live in Central Austin so you might assume I am rich. Again, trust me, I am not. I AM SOLID MIDDLE CLASS. And so if any of these ideas are proposed to be funded by my taxpayer dollars, then I am adamantly opposed to the plan. Austin real estate is expensive and not sure what you do about it. The City wants X dollars every year to waste and spend in some areas wisely. So if there is to be subsidized affordable housing in parts of our city, the X dollars are going to have to come from some place and I suspect the City assumes they will do as they always do and just raise our taxes. I am angry and bitter about this. Yes it is a shame that our fire fighters, teachers and police officers cannot afford to live in Austin but should I be forced out of my home to pay for housing for them. I think not. Thank you.	Comment noted.
221	8/8/2016	Karen Lilley	Email	I am concerned about the incredible number of new apartment units going in along I35 south. Between Wm Cannon and Slaughter Creek East there are many new complexes going in. We have a TRAFFIC PROBLEM. Almost any time of the day Traffic slows to a crawl between Wm Cannon and Slaughter. I can't imagine what it will be like when those units are occupied. Was there no planning regarding these apartments??? I don't see any improvements that will handle this much traffic. Good luck if you live in Buda or Kyle! You will need half a day just to get to work!	If Austinites are provided with more housing choices in the compact and connected Centers and Corridors of the City, they could commute shorter distances and use other modes of transportation besides personal vehicles.
222	8/8/2016	Susan Guerrero	Email	Is it going to be affordable housing? What is it going to cost tax payers? No, if it is going to raise property taxes.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
223	8/6/2016	Susan Wilson	Email	<p>Please include planning for multiple tiny home communities in safe areas of town, with access to adjacent and convenient public transportation. Also include various zoning changes that permit homes of less than 500 to 700 square feet.</p> <p>With the rapidly escalating tax rates and cost of housing in Austin, seniors, service industry employees and many young adults are being forced to move out of Austin. We're losing the economic and experiential diversity of Austin as well as becoming an elite community. The gap between the haves and have nots is eliminating the middle class in many communities. Housing is a major contributor to Austin NOT becoming one of the nation's out priced desirable communities.</p>	Language has been added to the plan that discusses tiny houses as a more affordable housing product. As noted in the plan, CodeNEXT will be addressing changes to the City's Land Development Code through CodeNEXT. Draft code language will be released in January 2017.
224	8/7/2016	Molly Munroe	Email	<p>I was born in Austin and have seen many changes. My comment is to please include conservation areas with nature trails in the plans. It is easy to come to the conclusion that greed has taken over in our city when I see so many housing developments with houses squeezed together without any natural areas or room to keep original trees or to add trees. Also, natural areas help people with stress and anxiety. We need that with Austin being overcrowded. Lastly, these nature areas will help reduce the flooding that occurs in Austin. Please consider creating more nature trails. Our nature trails / parks are already overcrowded. We still have vacant land with beautiful, old trees. Please don't let Austin look like Kyle</p>	<p>The Housing Plan is expected to become an attachment to the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, which includes goals and strategies for conservation, open space, watershed protection, and development. View the plan at: https://www.austintexas.gov/imagineaustin.</p>
225	8/7/2016	Marsha	Email	<p>Smaller houses smaller lots. Number 1 urgent on plan This should be the first and most urgent priority . Also double the amount of this type house and speed up execution of these Put the hardest limits on big fat houses and condos. People are sick of no choice in the middle The middle class is now the new poor in Austin and that is who wants what is on page 22. Do not create another circle C Move Texas for the blind and deaf out of city center and put these small house/small yard houses in ASAP! Austin is not Houston We want trees n a yard but not the gigantic crap of suburbs Think east coast And don't give it over to developers let it be done by local architects and local builders Cap school taxes on these folks trying to make it in town Locals get a tax break if here 10 years n more. Newbies get taxed more from other rich states. Stop the crazy growth!!!!!! Stop turning Austin into Mexico for the rich from other states.</p>	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
226	8/7/2016	Pat Jackson	Email	Hello. I serve in the Criminal Justice arena, as a Volunteer. One if the basic needs for Reentry is housing. Since these people have barriers, will any of these housing projects be made available to the formerly incarcerated individuals and their families? I mean those who have felony and sex offender charges? They really need it.	The plan has been updated to include more discussion of the need for low barrier (i.e. lower screening criteria) housing for individuals with significant housing barriers (including criminal histories).
227	8/8/2016	Lori Kline	Email	When will Tinys be allowed as legal ADU (accessory dwelling units - ie mother in law suites? I know the city would probably put some fee so they make money, but would be nice for the city just to do something because it's right, not because of what they will benefit financially from.	Language has been added to the plan that discusses tiny houses as a more affordable housing product. As noted in the plan, CodeNEXT will be addressing changes to the City's Land Development Code through CodeNEXT. Draft code language will be released in January 2017.
228	8/9/2016	Mark Blake	Email	Dear Ladies and Gentlemen, We live in Honolulu part time and they have free fast track approval process to build back yard guest quarters. This is a great low cost approach and will also spurn economic development. Also, loved the plan in yesterday's Statesman to stop treating homeless folks as criminals and helping them find homes instead. Could we help get druggies into rehab as well. The prison option does not work.	Comment noted.
229	8/9/2016	Ted Simpson	Email	My sincere belief is that market forces should dictate. Period. When markets are out of whack, they correct. When prices are too cheap, they rise. When they are too high, they fall. And remember, nothing goes straight up or down. Markets ebb and flow. They rise and fall. When the City or any entity intrudes upon these natural market forces to create something synthetic, there will be a greater cost down the road -- whether it's to taxpayers or to the actual people supposedly being enabled. Leave it alone. Do nothing different. Affordable housing is here. It is just not in the CBD. I cannot live there, so I don't. I must drive until I can afford it. That's life and that's natural.	The free market would create some affordable housing, however these housing units would be clustered together and perpetuate socioeconomic segregation which has negative effects for the community as a whole and residents. Additionally, such units would not reach the deep level of affordability which is an identified need in Austin.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
230	8/9/2010	Doreen Chaput	Email	<p>It's awesome that Austin is aware of the current crisis for affordable housing. I agree we have to start building smaller homes. One issue that I see that wasn't listed is the fact that investors are buying up all the small homes in the Austin area and expanding them. It seems almost impossible for first time home buyers to purchase the older, smaller homes before investors scoff them up. It's too bad we couldn't somehow make those homes available to those in need first. Or maybe even have the city purchase some of those homes and make modest upgrades to offer first time home buyers or low income families. Many elderly are loosing their homes also and selling out to investors who again modernize them to elaborate conditions and sell them at premium prices. Austin is definitely a place for the fortunately wealthy. But the poor need to be centrally located in order to have resources close by. The wealthy will make do no matter where they live. I hope the city of Austin can stop this current home crisis or at best make some strides toward making housing more affordable for all.</p>	Please see the section "Preserve Households from Being Priced Out of Austin" which discusses Community Land Trusts and other Preservation strategies
232	6/9/2010	Gena Pelham	Email	<p>I am a 22 year resident of Austin. I raised my son here, and he has now purchased his own home. I am ready and excited at my future possibilities as an empty nester. I dream of staying here in this amazing city, but I am determined to go tiny. However, I am learning that Austin is a little slow to embrace the tiny living idea. Can you tell me when will Tiny Houses be allowed as legal ADU (accessory dwelling units - i.e...mother in law suites)?</p> <p>Please don't run all us empty nesters out of town ;)</p>	Language has been added to the plan that discusses tiny houses as a more affordable housing product. As noted in the plan, CodeNEXT will be addressing changes to the City's Land Development Code through CodeNEXT. Draft code language will be released in January 2017.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
233	8/10/2016	Carol Lilly	Email	<p>As a single baby boomer, I support the development of new housing co-ops in the Austin area to address issues facing today's seniors. Housing cooperatives bridge the divide between renting and buying and provide community, especially for single adults. The model is very appealing to seniors who want to live in community with others but who don't want to pay traditional rents to absentee landlords. Buying into a housing co-op allows members to hold onto owner equity and participate in property management as empowered seniors—active instead of passive members of local neighborhoods, capable of taking care of themselves and thriving in retirement.</p> <p>As a founding organizer for a proposed senior housing cooperative and small business incubator in Austin (Boomers Collaborative), our group would like to see new emphasis on promoting similar models as a solution for affordability and sustainability in retirement. For the benefit, health and welfare of senior beneficiaries, all such developments should be thoughtfully designed for sustainability and located in walkable urban areas along public transportation lines.</p> <p>Please do what you can with policies to encourage and expedite these kinds of developments. Currently, our group has our sights set on The Grove at Shoal Creek. Although we understand why there have been delays with this project, we ask public officials to keep in mind that delays only add to the costs of development, negatively affecting all other efforts to address affordability in housing</p>	<p>The "Relax Regulations on Housing Cooperatives" section discusses general recommendations for housing cooperatives and cohousing developments. Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement. The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.</p>
236	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	<p>I have served as a Capital Metro representative to the City's Housing+Transit+Jobs (HTJ) Action Team for approximately two years. The HTJ Action Team is focused on priority projects or programs that help align the City's policies and incentives with the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Capital Investment Grant program. The FTA program typically provides 50% for the most competitive, highest ranked in the U.S. including commuter rail, light rail, and bus rapid transit. The FTA program was updated several years ago to include affordable housing units as one of six quantitative criteria that need to be evaluated in relation to a new transit project seeking grant funds. Therefore, the HTJ Action Team is interested in improvements to the City's programs related to affordable housing.</p>	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
237	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	With that context in mind, I read the Draft Housing Plan and wanted to say “great job!” This is exactly what I’ve been interested in seeing, a compilation of the City’s affordable housing goals and a list of the most promising options to preserve and build affordable housing. I applaud NHCD staff, the City’s affordable housing advocacy groups, and concerned citizens who provided the hard work and input for this draft plan. I especially applaud the community goal on page 11 linking housing with transportation with “25% of affordable housing created or preserved to be within ¼-mile of high frequency transit.” Affordable housing units near transit are not very helpful to struggling families if the service frequencies are not adequate. Affordable housing site considerations should include transit at the front end of the deal and not at the back end of the deal.	Comment noted.
238	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	My constructive feedback would be to include a breakdown of City Council Districts current affordable housing units and proposed future units based on fair share, equity, and access to opportunities.	For information on current subsidized housing units by Council District please see HousingWorks Austin's 2015 City Council District Analyses at: http://housingworksaustin.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2015-City-Council-District-Analyses.pdf
239	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	2) Page 3 – The last paragraph cites the 2014 housing market study and a gap of 48,000 housing units for 30% MFI households. What is the gap for 60% MFI households? This is the threshold that the FTA uses for its Capital Investment Grant program.	Please see the 2014 Housing Market Analysis Section II pages 26. For 51-80% AMI there is a 33, 028 unit rental gap. https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/NHCD/2014_Comprehensive_Housing_Market_Analysis_-_Document_reduced_for_web.pdf
240	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	3) Page 8 - “While 25% of the city’s households earn 60% MFI or below, only 15% of the city’s housing stock is affordable to them.” Again, I’m interested in the actual gap of affordable housing units for 60% MFI households.	Please see the 2014 Housing Market Analysis Section II pages 26. For 51-80% AMI there is a 33, 028 unit rental gap. https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/NHCD/2014_Comprehensive_Housing_Market_Analysis_-_Document_reduced_for_web.pdf
241	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	4) Page 11 – The Draft Plan includes 10-year goals and targets such as 35,000 affordable units at 80% MFI and below. Why is 80% MFI the target?	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
242	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	5) Page 11 – The Draft Plan indicates that each zip code should contain a specific breakdown of unit per MFI households. Why are there no targets for 60% MFI households?	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
243	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	6) Page 11 - Since the Draft Plan includes 10-year goals and targets, it would be helpful to include a brief implementation framework based on short-term (1-2 years), mid-term (3-5), and long-term (6-10) timeframes. A yearly tracking system or mechanism would also be helpful. The FTA provides points for good plans, but provides even more points for actions taken and concrete results.	An implementation table has been added that highlights key partners for implementation of each strategy
244	8/10/2016	Joe Clemens	Email	7) Page 14 – Potential strategies identified by stakeholders to maintain affordability includes: (third bullet) de-incentivizing the construction of new big, expensive houses through fees. I suggest that this also could be done through zoning and the Code Next process. For example, one of the primary drivers of increasing property values and subsequent increasing property taxes in East Austin is because the City’s current zoning allows tear-downs and re-models that “supersize” the previous home’s building envelope into two- or three-story modern homes. The bungalows that characterize many East Austin neighborhoods could be preserved and modernized by new homeowners if they purchase them. The homes that are beyond saving could be incentivized for missing middle housing types, not supersized single-family homes. This is a zoning issue.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
245	8/10/2016	Marsha	Email	<p>Why doesn't the city buy out state and UT property? Aren't they the biggest land owners in central area of our town?</p> <p>I put my life in my hands when attempting biking in this town; it's just terrible. So much going into big fat highways but not inner city bicycling</p> <p>Bring back the Dillo ! Run it from Capitol to Ben white; East 6th to hula hut; Lamar</p> <p>Lots of ways to clear up congestion inside the city</p> <p>Property taxes give nothing back</p> <p>Cities smaller than ours have NFL teams, major art centers etc</p> <p>Clean up the fast food chains at Barton springs. How disgusting that a jack in the box holds huge land right near what could be a charming art/music/ area. So ugly along that strip and it's embarrassing that corporate chains like that are at these intersections</p> <p>Hooters? Really? All around Threadgills and Lamar n Barton could be wonderful cultural areas</p> <p>6th street is scary. So sad all those crumbling old buildings are now a danger zone- clean up red river.</p> <p>Go private public funding- ft worth is a great example.</p> <p>My taxes have gone from 2,000 a year to 15,000. Nothing on the planet inflates like that.</p> <p>Why doesn't the city go local? Get local green architects and builders involved . Tired of big developers and seeing Austin becoming a little Houston . People are paying more for less here.</p> <p>Affordable housing- stop calling it that! People think of the poor. We are all in a bind- I know of so many middle class folks that have moved after living here 20 to 40 years</p> <p>My mom has to move to onion creek</p> <p>Could no longer afford a garden home/condo in town. Now I can't run over if she needs something.</p> <p>Why doesn't the state pay the city big money for all the things that eat up the central area land- does the school for the blind really care if it is near round rock! Or the school for the deaf? Can you imagine how many small homes with small yards could be built?</p> <p>No more condos!!!! Ugh! We say we are dog friendly and bike friendly and green, so</p>	<p>Please see sections in Plan that discuss public land, property taxes, and missing middle housing choices. As noted in the plan Council action would be needed to develop a strategy around public land for affordable housing, however this is a recommendation of the plan.</p>
246	8/10/2016	Mary Kennelly	Email	<p>Good afternoon. I've recently become extremely interested in Tiny Homes as a way to remain a responsible member of the community once I retire. I just turned 64 and plan to work for 6 more years. Fortunately, I'm currently healthy, strong and vibrant, but living check to check. To avoid becoming a burden on my children or my community, I would like to own my abode. However, the only home I could ever afford would be a Tiny House on Wheels. I see secondary apartments as Special Use Infill options. I'm hoping that Tiny Houses on Wheels (THOW) will ultimately be included as a Special Use Infill option. It's a forward-thinking discussion that absolutely has to happen here in Austin.</p>	<p>Language has been added to the plan that discusses tiny houses as a more affordable housing product. As noted in the plan, CodeNEXT will be addressing changes to the City's Land Development Code through CodeNEXT. Draft code language will be released in January 2017.</p>

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
247	8/10/2016	Ann Armstrong	Email	<p>I cannot attend tonight's meeting regarding the draft of the latest plan. I am excited see that smaller dwellings (like ADU's) are being, included in it. I would also like to encourage consideration/inclusion of other small housing types, specifically: tiny homes on wheels. Has the city considered a pilot program that would test the feasibility of tiny homes in various neighborhoods around Austin? I am not convinced tiny homes are the answer to all of Austin's housing problems, but I think they could provide: increased density in our urban core (with out the need for tearing down existing buildings), a more affordable option for those willing to live more compactly, and similar to ADU's--an alternative income stream to help homeowner's pay their mortgage. I also believe they are a low risk experiment/exploration---as they could be easily relocated if necessary.</p> <p>Is there any talk of integrating tiny homes, or small homes that aren't necessarily ADU's but freestanding on their own lot?</p>	Language has been added to the plan that discusses tiny houses as a more affordable housing product. As noted in the plan, CodeNEXT will be addressing changes to the City's Land Development Code through CodeNEXT. Draft code language will be released in January 2017.
248	8/10/2016	Linda Anderson	Email	<p>So many folks now are in need of and looking for affordable community housing. How are the codes going for auxiliary dwellings or co-housing communities?</p>	<p>Sections "Relax Regulations on both Internal and External ADUs" and "Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions" discuss general recommendations for ADU and co-housing strategies. Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement. The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.</p>
249	8/10/2016	Tricia Blakistone	Email	<p>I recently reviewed the proposed Austin Strategic Housing Plan and I would like to urge the council to remember the middle class Austinites in this discussion. I work for the State (and therefore work downtown unfortunately) and cannot afford to buy a house/condo/townhouse in Austin. 50% of my paycheck goes to rent. If I were supporting a family I would have to move to Roundrock or Buda in order to live (which is what many of my co-workers have done). There are a lot of city and state employees as well as educators, bank tellers, repairmen, nurses, non-profit employees, etc. who cannot afford Austin anymore. I understand that the State has laws in place that hinder a municipality's ability to implement rent control, but I would like to see that option further explored.</p>	Please see section in plan titled "Foster Equitable Communities," which includes information on Rent Control

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
250	8/10/2016	Carol Hawkins	Email	<p>My parents bought their 850 sf house in 1948 for maybe \$6000. It's in West Austin and for many of the almost 70 yrs. they lived there they had a hard time paying the payments. Now my mother is 90 yrs. old and going strong. Thanks to her genes she will probably live to be over 100. Her mother lived to 103 1/2.</p> <p>I am an artist of very modest income and built a studio behind my mom's house in order to help her take care of Daddy, who has now passed on. The taxes went up 2000 % the year after I built the studio and continued to go up 10% a year every year since then. Between really high taxes and astronomical utility bills it makes it virtually impossible for a 90 year old and a 70 year old to stay in their Austin home.</p> <p>And the City's building a few "affordable units" in some other neighborhood would not help US at all, especially if we'd have to get on a 5 yr. long waiting list to qualify for such "affordable" housing</p>	<p>The plan includes a strategy to "Target a Preservation Property Tax Exemption to Communities at Risk of Displacement." More broadly speaking, laws governing how property taxes are levied are set at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p>
251	8/10/2016	Jessica Worden	Email	<p>When will Austin adjust the code to allow for use of Tiny Homes one wheels as ADUs?</p>	<p>A section on tiny houses on wheels has been included in the plan. Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/departments/codenext-community-engagement. The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.</p>
252	8/10/2016	Edwin Huber	Email	<p>While it is an admirable goal to dramatically increase affordable housing , many of the items in the plan cause great concern.</p> <p>The main one is how it is to be funded. By issuing bonds and giving tax exemptions/incentives to developers and apartment owners, the result is an increasing tax burden on property owners.</p> <p>This is the main problem I have with this plan.</p> <p>It is going to be difficult to implement any plan tp provide affordable housing. But to my simple mind , why not pursue what New York has done and have a rent control program? This was mentioned in your plan. And you could fund the program with an income tax!</p> <p>The existing homeowners are fed up with continued property tax increases in Austin - esp seniors.</p>	<p>Noted: The City utilizes funding tools to develop affordable housing that are currently available to it. State law limits the ability to provide affordable housing through other means, such as rent control or an income tax. The plan does mention some strategies which would require legislative changes, and also details many regulatory changes (that are within the city's control) that could also promote the development of affordable housing.</p>

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
253	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	There are very interesting and helpful areas of analysis that could have been done to give a better picture of the housing problems residents of all income levels, tenures, ages, and protected statuses face today. Instead, only confusing charts barely comparable to MFI levels were presented to residents to vaguely explain the housing gaps. Although the goals are made by zip code in an attempt to promote mixed-income development/communities, the data provide no basis as to where we are now in terms of income and racial segregation, concentration of subsidized housing, where affordable options generally exist for various MFI levels, or the presence/lack of access to jobs and transit for certain MFI levels.	A chart which lists Median Family Income levels and rents affordable to each level has been added to the plan. The goals have been revised to reflect City Council district boundaries, rather than zip codes. For information on how each Council District is doing on affordability, please see HousingWorks Austin's 2015 City Council District Analyses at: http://housingworksAustin.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2015-City-Council-District-Analyses.pdf .
254	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Analysis of existing conditions: This entire section is very disconnected. It is not clear to me as a reader what my takeaways should be as to NHCD's priorities based on data and how the data is making the argument that the Community Goals should in fact be our goals. Page 8 has a typo. The total percent of households earning 60% MFI or less should be 35%, not 25%, if we are using the numbers you stated in the preceding sentence on that page. Page 10 Figure 5 doesn't have the 30% threshold line on 30%.	This section has been updated.
255	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Community Goals: Why does the goal start at 80% MFI and below when the plan spends so much time making the case that the need is greatest at 60% MFI and below?	The US Department of Housing & Urban Development classifies 80% MFI and below as being "low-income." While the need is greatest below 80% MFI, additional units at a variety of MFI levels will be needed to effectively address the city's affordable housing shortage now and in future years.
256	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Community Goals: If we have a population projection broken out by income brackets (Figure 3), then why can't we create unit goals at all MFI breakdowns? Including 120+% brackets so that the community knows when they are getting too much luxury product.	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
257	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Community Goals: What is the thought process behind the 10% goal for housing for 30% MFI in each zip code? Where are we now? This case should be made before I see Community Goals and the fact that it's missing indicates that NHCD probably does not have these data, which puts into question whether these goals could be monitored at all.	The 10% goal was derived as a recommendation from the 2014 Housing Market Study. The revised goals are now based on City Council District, rather than zip code. For information on how each Council District is doing on affordability, please see HousingWorks Austin's 2015 City Council District Analyses at: http://housingworksAustin.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2015-City-Council-District-Analyses.pdf .
258	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Community Goals: MFI rate for homeownership is too high. Median income (100% MFI) families cannot even afford to buy in any central zip codes in Austin. The 25% affordable homeownership goal needs to be broken down to 80, 100, 120% MFI goals	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
259	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	LIHTCs: As written, the recommendation is a throw-away. Something the city could do to get more LIHTC projects on the ground is engage in local community revitalization planning (areas of the city that would only qualify for an allocation of tax credits were they covered by a locally-focused, concerted, actionable plan) to make it easier for developers to be competitive in the application process. Mueller is one such area that could use this plan to encourage LIHTC applications.	Redevelopment plan standards are quite narrowly articulated in Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs' (TDHCA) Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP). However Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) developments have been developed in Mueller, both Wildflower Terrace and Aldrich51 received LIHTC funding.
260	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	"Allow Homeowners to Rent Part of Their Houses: Pursue code changes to allow homeowners to convert existing interior residential space into accessory dwelling units to help them afford to stay in place." Doesn't this completely contradict the occupancy limits/stealth dorm resolutions on the books	If code changes to allow interior accessory dwelling units were made, consideration would need to be given to how these changes might affect other existing ordinances, such as occupancy limits.
261	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Strike fund: I cannot stress the importance of the Strike Fund enough in acquiring older, de-facto affordable units. NHCD needs to show Council the existing level of affordability of the unsubsidized affordable multifamily units that could be acquired by the strike fund. If the greatest need in the city is less than 60% MFI, and those that are living in these candidate complexes are making between 60-80% MFI (I have lived in these apartments that would be candidates for the strike fund and tenants are quite often musicians, servers or bartenders) then the goal needs to be to at least retain this level of affordability. It is not okay to find a few investors to seed the fund and tell the city that it isn't "profitable" to deeply subsidize these units, as Adler told the Statesman a few days ago. The strike fund NEEDS to reach these lower incomes because these are our transit-dependent populations that are being displaced by cosmetic property flips every year. If you want to "minimize the displacement of core transit riders" the city must ensure units acquired by the Strike Fund are deeply affordable (i.e. attainable for 60% MFI or less). We must do everything we can to retain and enhance affordability along Imagine Austin transit corridors.	Data in the report Taking Action: Preservation of Affordable Housing in the City of Austin http://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Housing/Reports_and_Publications/Community_Reports/PreservationStrategyWebFinal.pdf commissioned by NHCD identified approximately 62,000 unsubsidized affordable units in Austin. The Strike Fund is a tool that is remains under development. The City of Austin continues to work closely to identify high priority areas and specific properties which might be the best candidates for such a fund.
262	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Flexibility to occupancy limits: It was also found in 2014 that many working class individuals took advantage of the higher unit occupancy limits, so not only will students and the disabled be affected, but also lower income workers who are also likely to be people of color. Consider this demographic when recommending flexibility to occupancy limits to avoid fair housing violations. This report was presented to council in 2014: http://civicanalytics.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2014-03-17-Civic-Analytics-Occupancy-Limits-Analysis.pdf	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
263	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	"Adopt Affordable Housing Goals to Guide Policy." Adopt goals to reach the community goals? What is the point of this plan if NHCD is not offering the goals we need?	The adoption of the Housing Plan by City Council <i>is</i> the adoption of the goals.
264	8/11/2016	Melissa Beeler	Email	Create a Multifamily Property Tax Exemption Program: How is exempting a property of city property taxes going to subsidize several units, including large units, in a meaningful way? City of Austin taxes are a fraction of total property taxes. This plan could be much more robust if it took into consideration development economics to test the feasibility of some of these recommendations.	Comment noted.
265	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	The current market situation needs clarification: at present it has some data from 2010, some from the 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis (which used data for 2012) and some from the Austin Balanced Housing Model which are not clear as to the date of the base data used and year forecast. I would like to see the document start with a description of the current situation, and trends over the last ten years.	Additional data has been added to the introduction illustrating trends in rental prices, home prices and wages in Austin over the last 10 years.
266	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	The 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Study was based on ACS data for 2012. Even at that date it found that there were 60,000 renter households earning less than \$25,000 a year, and just 19,000 affordable housing units available to them. It did not discuss the type of units but it would appear that many were public housing or affordable through Section 8 vouchers (ACS asked the rent the householder paid). Between 2012 and 2014 the median rent (as reported by ACS) increased from \$974 to \$1084, a 11.3% jump, total renters jumped by almost 10%, yet the study estimated that the number of renters earning less than 25,000 remained the same and the number of affordable units decreased by only 7,000. With a further two years of rent increases I would expect the gap to have widened more.	As noted in the Housing Market Study: "The 2014 increase in rental shortages shows up for renters earning \$20,000 to \$25,000. 2014 pricing increases this gap by about 6,800 units, putting the cumulative gap at nearly 47,700 versus 40,924 using the 2012 rent distribution."

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
267	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	It would help to have included the numbers of Public Housing units, Housing Choice (section 8) vouchers, Project based Section 8, and Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units, as well as the affordable units provided through other HUD, State, City or non-profit financing, or City incentive programs. Where agreements state that units only have to be affordable for a limited period (sometimes as little as 5 years), it would help to show when these units revert to market rents. There is a danger of double counting when within a ten year plan one project is affordable for only the first five years and then five years later another project gives a five year affordability guarantee.	Information has been added to the plan about attrition of both market rate affordable and subsidized housing.
268	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	Since the "gap" measured by the 2014 study was based on actual households surveyed by the ACS, it does not include "suppressed demand". We know that there are a lot of households who have been forced to move outside the City to find affordable rent, or have had to double up, move back in with parents, or resort to living in a motel. To simply ignore these households understates Austin's real need for housing. In addition between 2012 and 2014 ACS recorded an additional 1000 households living (presumably illegally) in Mobile Homes, Cars, RVs etc. The study should not ignore these people: they still would like to have housing within the City, and would if more housing were available.	Comment noted. The affordable housing goal has been amended to 60,000 affordable units over ten years. This is responsive to the anticipated population growth of the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which is higher than that of Austin City Limits. The assumption being that more people may choose to live in Austin if there are more housing options for a variety of income levels, in all parts of town.
269	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	This study also largely ignored the potential loss of market affordable housing. New apartments are never likely to be affordable for families earning under \$60,000 a year. Instead they have to rely on older apartments ("Class C and Class D"), which command a lower rent because of their age and run-down condition. However many of these are being demolished, or have been substantially renovated, and the remainder are in such high demand that now the average rent for a Class C apartment is equal to Class B apartments! Once these Class C apartments are lost, you have to wait 20 years or so for more to "trickle down" and fall to an affordable rent. It would help to show a distribution of apartment units by age.	Comment noted. Information has been added to the plan acknowledging the loss of market rate affordable housing.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
270	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	While there are many commercial sources tracking the number and performance of apartment complexes with more than 50 units, there is little data on smaller complexes, which are often locally owned, and mostly of Class C. Any plan to keep affordable housing, will need to collect data on these units and look at possibilities to keep them affordable. HousingWorks seem to have taken the lead in this area.	We continue to seek out quality data sources for this information.
271	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	<p>It would be helpful to note the trends that have given rise to the current situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • national demographic changes, such as aging boomers, later marriage and child birth, divorce rates, all of which reduce household sizes and need extra housing for a given population; • No public housing construction, limited LIHTC and Section 8 funding, which place a heavy burden on growing Cities; • 2004-2007 mortgage boom led to conversion of many apartments into condominiums; • the 2008 crash, and subsequent financial uncertainty, which caused a big drop in multifamily construction; • New apartment construction being almost entirely of Class A luxury apartments; • tighter mortgage requirements, causing more households to rent, and a change in preferences away from home ownership; • Changing housing preferences (as described by Arthur C Nelson) - fewer households with children, increasing numbers of "empty nest: retirees, and shift in preference from large houses to living within walkable communities. This is leading to new demand for very different kinds of housing, while existing zoning codes were designed to support the type of housing demanded in the 1970s and 1980s.[While you do mention this at top of page 8, you could illustrate it better by using outputs from the Balanced Housing Model.] • In Austin, continuing growth in well-paid high tech jobs, mainly younger college graduates; • Migration to Austin from areas with expensive housing, causing many new home buyers to have lots of cash and a willingness to pay high prices; • Investors buying up Austin housing, both multi-family and single family. The ACS (although subject to a sampling margin of error) shows that the number of single family rented units increased from about 20,000 in 2010 to about 30,000 in 2014, a 50% increase in four years! 	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
272	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	<p>The growth in high tech jobs has led to both indirect and induced job growth (the "employment multiplier" effect). This is the main reason why Austin and the State have been wooing potential employers. Enrico Moretti has famously predicted that each high tech job in companies like Apple will generate five additional jobs (he claims that 13,000 Apple jobs in Cupertino added another 70,000 jobs through indirect and induced employment). However such multiplier estimates are very variable and will depend on the availability of housing for all these "generated: workers. First the business will itself need goods and services that result in more local employment, including construction, cleaning contractors, office suppliers, maintenance etc. secondly both the direct employees and the indirect (supplier) employees will spend money in the local community. The question though is how much will be spent in ways that generate more jobs? This can vary greatly: to generate five additional jobs really requires a lot of things to come together. First how many indirect jobs (company suppliers contractors etc.) will be generated locally? The growth in the internet economy makes it less important that these jobs be local. For example office supplies, or printing needs can be ordered over the internet and then the only local job generated is for a UPS deliveryman. In practice there is likely to be only 0.5 indirect local jobs for each employee. Next we have to work out how much of that 1.5 workers spending ends up delivering local jobs. Well right off the bat there are federal taxes, only a tiny fraction of which are spent locally. Goods purchased, such as a new car or electronics will largely be global, with only a tiny percentage going to local employees of the retailer. Of course housing is the major expense for most people but as every homeowner knows, most of the mortgage payment goes to interest, pocketed by some big national bank. For renters the situation is similar: almost all Austin apartment complexes have been bought by outside investors, so the 30% or so of their income that goes to rent is almost all leaving the local economy, and much of it used to pay interest charges. The proportion used to pay property management and maintenance staff or to hire landscape contractors and trash haulers is tiny. Only services, especially when provided by local businesses, keep most of the money within the community. For example the cost of food is less than 25% of the price of a restaurant meal, the rest (plus tip) goes into the local economy. In addition property taxes and local sales taxes will go to provide employment in local</p>	Comment noted.
273	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	<p>Of course this all depends on the workers providing these services living locally. Increasingly more and more retail and service workers cannot afford to live in Austin! So by not providing sufficient housing for all those who work in Austin the City is losing out on property taxes and, at least to some extent, sales taxes, as well as the further induced employment that their spending causes. In this context it is interesting that I have been told (but have not been able to find the source) current multifamily uses only 3% of the land within City limits, while 19% is vacant.</p>	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
275	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	Fannie Mae (Multifamily Market Comment November 2015) has said "The multifamily market cannot just build its way out of the current affordable rental housing shortage. Most of the units built are Class A luxury units, as high land and construction costs make it hard for developers to keep rents affordable. Even though many local and municipal inclusionary housing requirements (outside Texas) can earmark up to 30% of units for lower income tenants, it is unlikely that these requirements will produce enough supply to meet the ever increasing demand for affordable units	Comment noted.
276	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	The Section "What is the Need" should include demographic projections relevant to the time period of the plan. Using projections for 2040 makes comparison of needs and goals impossible. If the objective is to produce a 10 year plan projections of demand at both 5 and 10 years ahead would give us a way to measure progress towards goals. I would therefore suggest using 2015 as a base year and produce forecasts for 2020 and 2025 using the Balanced Housing Model and current City demographers predictions.	Comment noted. Information has been added to the plan to address population growth and corresponding housing demand over the next ten years.
277	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	The report appears as if there were a few pages missing, jumping from the discussion of needs to an apparently arbitrary set of 10 year goals. Clearly you need to show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expected need for owner occupied housing units in 10 years time • expected need for rental units by type in 10 years time • existing and expected distribution of affordable units by zip code • what it will take to increase these to levels needed. 	Comment noted. Information has been added to the plan to address population growth, corresponding housing demand, and distribution of affordable units by geographic area (i.e. City Council Districts) over the next ten years. An Implementation Plan for Proposed Strategies has been added to the appendices to reflect steps needed to realize objectives of the plan.
278	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	Without that information, the goal of 75,000 housing units in 10 years, affordable at 80% MFI, appears puzzlingly low. You have already shown a shortage in 2014 of 48,000 affordable units for those earning under \$25,000 and another 10,000 units affordable to those earning \$35,000. Since then rents have continued to outstrip wages, The 2015 RECA Housing White Paper summarizes that 50% of renters are cost burdened and notes the loss of 7000 affordable units between 2012 and 2014. The situation is now far worse than in 2014. Add to this the City demographer's forecast that between 2015 and 2025 the City population will grow by 180,000 (implying about 90,000 more households) many of whom will be employed in low paying jobs. And even this does not count those who work within the City and would like to live here, but at present cannot afford to.	Both the affordable and market-rate housing goals have been revised and increased.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
279	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	We also need to mention the homeless, having looked at as much data as I can, and surveyed some sample areas myself, I can tell you that only a tiny portion of the homeless appear in the ECHO Point in Time Counts. My best estimate of their number is that the City of Austin has 7,500 homeless (using the ECHO definition) plus about the same number again who lack a suitable home and are forced to "double-up", stay in motels etc.	Strategies focused on providing Permanent Supportive Housing units, increased funding for homelessness services, and housing for people at or below 30% MFI are included in the plan with a focus on the city's residents experiencing homelessness. The plan calls for these strategies to receive more funding to provide more units and supports, acknowledging the fact that more units are and will be required to address the need.
280	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	Your list of funding mechanisms for 35,000 affordable units over 10 years, includes SMART programs with a 1 to 5 year affordability period. So most of these units will no longer be affordable at the end of the ten year plan! Also the affordability period on many existing projects will have expired, yet there is no estimate of the number of affordable units lost, which will need replacing.	Comment Noted. The existing S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program was established in 2007, and calls for a 1-5 year affordability period. It has been removed from the "Funding Mechanisms and Tools" stacked bar chart. Alternatively, the "Other Tools" category has been expanded to include a restructured S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program with extended affordability periods. An estimate of the number of affordable units with expiring affordability periods has also been added.
281	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	There is never going to be enough Federal funding, State funding, or Housing Bond issues, to meet more than a tiny fraction of affordable housing need. What funding there is needs to be concentrated mainly on the elderly and disabled, who are in the extremely low income group, including Housing First and other PSH projects. Therefore we need to look at incentives to encourage market rate affordable housing options. The report needs to state that at present the main issues preventing the market from creating affordable units are obstacles created by the City, in the form of outdated zoning codes and building regulations.	Comment noted.
282	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	I believe that the average wage earner deserves to have a place to live that he can afford, without needing a government subsidy. This means that he may have to compromise: studies have shown that many would prefer a small home within short commuting distance of work, to a large house many miles away. Yet zoning rules have so far restricted choice.	Comment noted. Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
283	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	For example we have seen in close-in areas such as 78704, which are largely zoned SF3, developers are tearing down older single family homes to build a pair of 3000 sq ft (per side) modern condo units (taking advantage of the duplex provision for a 7000 square foot lot. These sell at around \$600,000 each! The 78704 area has excellent walkability, access to bus services and would be a great place for people without a car to live. Yet the zoning laws, which allow two 3000 sq ft units, prevent the developer from building a smaller structure as a fourplex with four 1200 sq ft units.	Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
284	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	Since land costs are so high in Austin, the best way to make units more affordable, and in doing so increase the number of units per acre, is to either use smaller lots, or increase the number of units per lot.	The "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin" section discusses strategies to help address the issues associated with rising land costs. Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
285	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	The City is preventing people from living in the homes they can afford. There is huge interest in "Tiny Homes", which are generally built on a trailer, and classified as an RV, to avoid Building Code minimum sizes. These are often less than 200 square feet in size but are still popular. I would prefer something somewhat larger, such as a "Park model" mobile home, which are around 320 to 400 square feet. Many people are living illegally in an RV or trailer, despite City codes making it illegal to occupy one as a permanent home. The few RV parks allowed within the City have always had long waiting lists, and their numbers are decreasing as sites are sold for redevelopment. Similarly the City has banned mobile homes, except those with grandfathered status, although these are a popular housing option for low income households in much of the country. A new mobile home starts at about \$30,000 (excluding land and site preparation costs).	Tiny house recommendations have been included in Plan in the "Create new and affordable housing choices for all Austinites..." Section
286	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	Housing cooperatives are another popular choice for reducing housing expenses. Individual units may be small but they share communal facilities. Thus they go one step beyond a condo association.	Comment noted. Cohousing has been included as part of a strategy in the plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
287	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	The recent permitting of ADUs, is a step in the right direction. Many older neighborhoods, like Travis Heights, or Hyde Park have long had many illegal garage apartments, that have been a popular home for generations of students and musicians. However I have to wonder why the rules only allow detached ADUs, and still prohibit attached dwellings or the subdivision of a house into two separate apartments?	The "Relax Regulations on both Internal and External ADUs" section discusses recommendations for both types of ADUs. Specific questions dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
288	8/11/2016	Paul Mullen	Email	While the report lists a wide range of possible solutions it puts few numbers on them, and they are presented in a haphazard order. At present this is very confusing. It would be better if they were separated into approaches that need significant funding (grant or bond), and those that rely on non-cash incentives. They should also be grouped by objectives such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to allow young people to buy a home; • measures to help elderly home owners; • measures to provide very low income rental housing; • New funding approaches to help non-subsidized non-profit affordable housing developments • Incentives to encourage affordable housing at various MFI levels; • Ways to provide affordable units for single person households. 	A section on implementation and prioritization of strategies has been added to the plan.
289	8/10/2016	Mark Hey	Email	I am a beneficiary of the city's efforts to provide people with affordable housing. I bought my present residence in Dec. of 1995 through a First Time Homebuyer of Low to Moderate Income joint Neighborhood Housing Sevices/HUD program for \$72,000 with a forgiveable note of \$7,000 when I paid off my house (which I did early) after repaying \$7,000 to the city for its downpayment assistance. I filed a 2016 income tax return declaring a gross income of less than \$40,000, and it is definitely a struggle to continue enjoying the joys of home owernship (2 of 3 children are still on the premises) along with the responsibilities, given the continuous rise in city fees and garbage/water/electric and other utility rates (such as the Texas Gas Service rates which the city rubber stamps each time they--TGS--appeal for an increse).	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
290	8/10/2016	Mark Hey	Email	Nowhere in the housing plan is there a strategy for reducing the costs of home ownership for current or future home owners which emanate from city budgetary considerations, just recommendations for the city to assume a greater role in promoting affordability with no price tag for implementing/fulfilling the various proposals/programs, etc. For example, just completing the city's sidewalk and bike lane master plan would require spending billions of dollars (don't know the exact amount, but it IS above a billion just for sidewalks). Seeing how the now defunct Lone Star Rail District has expended \$30 million since 2003 with nothing to show for it, I cannot find convincing evidence of the payoff from a recent housing bond (seems it was in the range of \$12 or \$15 million approved by voters) or the \$10 million contributed by the predecessor council to the current 10-1 format after voters DIDN'T approve the prior affordable housing bond, with another \$68 million projected over the next 10 years for the Housing Trust Fund.	Comment noted.
291	8/10/2016	Mark Hey	Email	The last stats I recall explaining the success of affordable residential units being provided through NHS or other City of Austin programs was less than 200 units created (either in 2014 or 2015), which clearly is a paltry number given the projected need of over 75,000 affordable housing units over the next 10 years. An example of a completely counterintuitive recommendation is a relocation plan for those in trailer parks when the property is converted to other uses. For people who desire to reside in mobile or modular homes, the proper response is to find a new location where they can take their trailer, which means the city needs to proactively promote trailer parks. How often does the city approve plats for trailer parks? Seems the last time one was recommended by Mobile Loaves and Fishes, there was significant push back because people don't want "trailer trash" in their "back yard." We claim to want a diverse community, but most of the housing options being contemplated feature fairly indistinguishable sandwiched structures or high rise canyons of cookie cutter loft-style apartments, but where is a neighborhood which incorporates elements of tiny houses, cargo container conversions that can be double stacked even, all manner of "green" construction such as cordwood, rammed earth, haybale, adobe, or other different products (prefab multi-story or single-unit products which can be erected quickly and cheaply).	The Plan recommends the use of different housing types (designed and integrated into the neighborhood) throughout the City to allow for more affordable options for residents.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
292	8/10/2016	Mark Hey	Email	I believe a more viable model of private and public sector partnership is the Mayor's recent initiative dealing with the homeless vets here in Austin. I think there were upwards of 300 placements arranged for these generally problematic cases. I am fairly jaded about "Great Society" type programs which offer "urban renewal" and future utopias, but then come to some inglorious end like the filmed implosion of derelict housing projects for the evening news at a loss of huge sums of taxpayer funds while only perpetuating more failure of inner city communities/low income neighborhoods, etc.	Call out boxes have been added throughout the plan that highlight the successful use of certain strategies, such as the Mayor's initiative to end veteran homelessness.
293	8/10/2016	Mark Hey	Email	Lastly, funding affordable housing by waiving fees due Austin Water and diverting them to NHS initiatives (as represented by the Pilot Knob fiasco) is unconsonable because it transfers resources which potentially "needy" homeowners rely on to continue residing in their dwelling to other people that will reap a reward at their expense. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is no way to run a city or a business or school or church or a non-profit.	Comment noted.
294	8/10/2016	Wade Powell	Email	I believe we need zoning categories favorable to diverse housing options such as cooperatives. Also, I believe Austin's housing stock would benefit from a regulatory and subsidy environment encouraging the establishment of co-ops.	Comment noted. Please see the Housing Cooperative section in the Plan under "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin"
295	8/10/2016	Gina Andre	Email	I am writing to you today in support of allowing THOWs tiny houses on wheels to be occupied as residences within the City of Austin. With so many people moving here every day, housing prices and land values have soared beyond the reach of many long-time residents of Austin. The growing popularity of tiny homes and learning to live with less stuff is partly a reaction to this market phenomenon. It is also a more sustainable approach to housing in term of the land area needed and resources used. As you formulate the new Austin Strategic Housing Plan, please consider allowing THOWs to be occupied as accessory dwelling units.	Tiny house recommendations have been included in Plan in the "Create new and affordable housing choices for all Austinites..." Section
296	8/10/2016	Philip Wiley	Email	Thank you for leading this effort! I applaud the effort and most of the conclusions / recommendations. Like other opinion pieces, it is missing the mark on a critical point - people are being taxed out of their homes. Property value does not equal ability to pay for long time property owners in a rapidly escalating market - which is why so many are being taxed out of their homes. The property tax tool as a funding mechanism should be significantly reduced for COA, if we want to stop increased economic segregation.	Comment noted.
297	6/23/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	Include in toolbox better coordination with regional entities.	Regional context has been added to the plan

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
298	6/24/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	There should be specific language on supporting public schools. Maybe it should be its own section in the Plan?	Planning for schools is overseen by several independent school districts in Austin (including Austin ISD). The Housing Plan does not seek to specifically address school issues; however, by striving to achieve the goal of providing different types of housing for all Austinites in all parts of town, schools could benefit from the ability of families to live across the city.
299	6/25/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	PSH needs to be more tied into Housing First Goals, the current goal in the Plan is very expensive	Comment noted.
300	6/26/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	Non-voucher holders need to be addressed	Acknowledgement of people without rental subsidies added to plan.
301	6/27/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	Creation of more integrated development	Comment noted.
302	6/28/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	Tie goals to current development costs	Comment noted. The affordable housing goal has been amended to 60,000 affordable units over ten years. The methodology now reflects a higher per unit subsidy of \$38,000 based on 2013 Affordable Housing Bond Program data.
303	6/29/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	More active language to set crisis feeling in first part	The introduction section has been revised to include more context regarding the affordability crisis.
304	6/30/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	City wide goal should include family-friendly goal	Comment noted. The family-friendly goal included in the plan pertains to units funded by the City, where the number of bedrooms per unit can best be required and monitored.
305	7/1/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	Coordinate City, developers, and finance on regulatory barriers	Comment noted.
306	7/2/2016	Austing Housing Coaliton	Meeting Summary	Flip the _% goal so that _% of units in corridors and centers are affordable	The overall housing goals have been revised.
307	7/18/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	How does the plan address immediate homeowner help?	See updated section on strategies for homeownership for people between 80% - 120% MFI.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
308	7/19/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	Homestead exemption needs to be increased	City Council voted to increase the homestead property tax exemption to 8% in the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 budget. Laws governing how property taxes are levied are set at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information, or to comment, on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.
309	7/20/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	Is there a faster process to implementation? A 5 year timeline is more appropriate	Sections on implementation and prioritization of goals and strategies have been added to the plan.
310	7/21/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	Make Plan shorter term. Act faster	Sections on implementation and prioritization of goals and strategies have been added to the plan.
311	7/22/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	Medium-income families are affected by the wage not increasing	See section "What is the Need?" for discussion of impact of stagnant wages on middle and low income families.
312	7/23/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	Taxes are too high. The homestead exemption should be 10-15 years, primarily help low income households, and be a flat rate	Laws governing how property taxes and exemptions are levied and set are made at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information, or to comment, on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
313	7/24/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	East Austin is in more need of Homestead exemptions than any other part of the	Laws governing how property taxes and exemptions are levied and set are made at the state level. The Texas Constitution does not allow different tax rates to be set for different areas of a city, but rather requires that taxation must be equal and uniform. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information, or to comment, on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.
314	7/25/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	The plan should make sure there is housing for the disabled	A new section on increasing housing for residents with disabilities has been added to the plan.
315	7/26/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	Rent Control is needed	See section "Pursue Legislation to Allow Rent Control"
316	7/27/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	Shorter timeline for the plan	A section on implementation and prioritization of strategies has been added to the plan.
317	7/28/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	metro rail should be more accessible	Comment noted. More information on future plans for Capital Metro systems and opportunities to provide input on these plans can be found at http://connections2025.org/ .
318	7/29/2016	Neighbors United for Progress Meeting	Meeting Summary	East-west bus routes are deeply needed	Comment noted. More information on future plans for Capital Metro systems and opportunities to provide input on these plans can be found at http://connections2025.org/ .
319	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Toughen code requirements for developers	The Housing Plan discusses code requirements in a broad way under the "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Town." Specific comments regarding code requirements should be submitted to the CodeNEXT process.
320	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Prevent folks from being price out	See section "Prevent Households from being Priced Out of Austin"

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
321	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	need “balanced” approach	Comment noted.
322	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	What about preservation? –older/affordable units are being replaced by luxury	See section "Prevent Households from being Priced Out of Austin" for discussion of preservation strategies.
323	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Need more clarity on relationship between housing and transportation	For a discussion of how transportation is tied to housing affordability, please see the following Imagine Austin blog post (http://www.austintexas.gov/blog/imagine-affordable-housing) and the Center for Neighborhood Technology's H+T Index (http://htaindex.cnt.org/).
324	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Cost of Regulations passed on the cost of housing. –city permitting efficiency is n	The Housing Plan discusses code regulations in a broad way under the "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Town." Specific comments regarding code requirements should be submitted to the CodeNEXT process.
325	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Incentivize inclusion of cultural/creative spaces	Comment noted. For more information regarding assessment and preservation of cultural spaces, see the Economic Development Department's Cultural Asset Mapping project: https://austintexas.gov/department/cultural-asset-mapping-project .
326	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Factor in land cost, regulations.	The cost estimates provided in the plan are limited to construction costs due to the wide variation in the cost of land.
327	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Would rather see affordable housing instead of commercial	Comment noted.
328	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Important to leverage public land that is available	See section "Maximize Public Property to Build or Include Affordable Housing." Information has been added to the plan that discusses the need for the City Council to set policy regarding prioritizing city-owned land for affordable housing.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
329	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Look beyond just vacant public land...can we make better use of property the City uses for services/storage?	See section "Maximize Public Property to Build or Include Affordable Housing." Information has been added to the plan that discusses the need for the City Council to set policy regarding prioritizing city-owned land for affordable housing.
330	7/22/2016	Community Meeting at Asian-American Resource Center	Meeting Summary	Accessibility needs to be highlighted more in the Plan	A new section on increasing housing for residents with disabilities has been added to the plan.
331	8/10/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	The Plan's scope should be broadened to the whole region	A new section on regional context has been added to the plan.
332	8/11/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	There is great concern about occupancy limits	See section "Add Flexibility to Occupancy Limits" in plan
333	8/12/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	The City should foster a greater sense of community in future housing developments, specifically adding community facilities such as pools, parks, and common space for neighbors to gather around	Specific comments regarding code requirements or open space should be submitted to the CodeNEXT process.
334	8/13/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	Break up the proposed housing unit goals into smaller MFI levels	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.
335	8/14/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	There should be a goal for affordable, adaptable units	See section on "Austin Community 10-year Affordable Housing Goals and Targets" in the plan, which lists goals for both adaptable and accessible units

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
336	8/15/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	There needs to be more language about accessibility in the Plan	A new section on increasing housing for residents with disabilities has been added to the plan.
337	8/16/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	the city should focus its efforts on keeping the affordable parts of Austin from gentrifying and displacing current residents	Discussion of gentrification has been added to the plan introduction. See section "Prevent Households from Being Priced Out of Austin" for strategies dealing with preventing displacement.
338	8/17/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	There should be a goal regarding schools	Planning for schools is overseen by several independent school districts in Austin (including Austin ISD). The Housing Plan does not seek to specifically address school issues; however, by striving to achieve the goal of providing different types of housing for all Austinites in all parts of town, schools could benefit from the ability of families to live across the city.
339	8/18/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	Shared equity ownership models should be explored/highlighted in the Plan	See section "Preserve and Create Ownership Options for Households at 80%-120% MFI," which includes strategies like shared equity and community land trusts.
340	8/19/2016	Community Meeting at Austin Community College- South Austin Campus	Meeting Summary	Tiny houses on wheels should be mentioned in the Plan	Tiny house recommendations have been included in Plan in the "Create new and affordable housing choices for all Austinites..." Section
341	8/13/2016	P. Sybesma	Letter	I recommend that you do a short introduction on how fast Austin has grown in land area and population from 1980 to present and how the population income percentages and tax rates have changed.	Comment noted. Additional information regarding past efforts and regional need has been added to the plan.
342	8/13/2016	P. Sybesma	Letter	For the charts, I recommend that either you have a title for each chart and label the horizontal and vertical axis (i.e. put in the "\$" sign).	The charts have been revised.
343	8/13/2016	P. Sybesma	Letter	We do not support changes that would make stealth dorms easier in residential neighborhoods (p17), nor cutting the existing residential lot sizes (p22), and existing Subdivision Plat Notes and deed restrictions need to be acknowledged (p20).	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
344	8/13/2016	P. Sybesma	Letter	Various markups in document; p. 3, 5-15, 17-26	Comments noted.
345	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	There needs to be a clear distinction between the overall goal and the affordable housing goal, and the plan's attention should be focused on achieving the goal for affordable housing units.	<p>The graphics breaking down market-rate versus income-restricted/affordable units have been updated to better reflect the distinction.</p> <p>The experiences of other cities have shown that affordability crises such as ours cannot be solved by subsidized units alone. When there is a lack of housing units relative to demand for those units, prices for all types of housing rise. Increasing the supply of market-rate AND subsidized units will help get the level of supply closer to demand and prevent prices from rising as quickly. Therefore, the Housing Plan incorporates goals and strategies to increase not just the supply of subsidized units, but the supply of housing units in general.</p>
346	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	With respect to the affordable housing goal, it would be helpful to frame the strategies in the Core Values previously adopted by the City. These three values —deeper affordability, longer affordability, and geographic dispersion — offer a compelling platform rooted in broadly held common goals	The five focus areas listed in the plan (Prevent Households from Being Priced out of Austin; Foster Equitable Communities; Invest in Housing for those Most in Need; Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin; and Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs) have been designed to replace the three core values. The core values are still reflected in these new focus areas, which are broader and reflect current issues.
347	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	There should be a clearly articulated, achievable, yet ambitious affordable housing goal. The current goal of 75,000 units (35,000 of which are affordable) is not sufficiently ambitious. The plan should rely on the city's historical production of housing units, combined with population projections, to establish a more realistic overall goal.	The goals have been revised and information on methodology updated.
348	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	The 35,000 affordable unit goal should similarly be adjusted upward. The 2014 Housing Market Study showed a current gap of 48,000 units (for households earning approximately 30% MFI or less). Accordingly, the affordable housing goal over the next 10 years should be at least 48,000 units.	The goals have been revised.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
349	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	The Austin Housing Plan details the funding mechanisms to achieve the affordable housing production. Certain estimates will need to be adjusted upward to accommodate the more ambitious affordable housing goals. For example, the estimated yield from the Housing Trust Fund is currently 2,165 units. This is based on projections from December 2015. Subsequent to that time, the list of properties contributing to the Housing Trust Fund was expanded to include both city- and state-owned property. This addition should have a positive impact on the Housing Trust Fund and, thus, the potential units created.	Comment noted. Appropriating funds to the Housing Trust Fund requires annual action by City Council.
350	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	The “other tools” category is currently set at 13,973 units over a 10-year period. There is enormous opportunity within this category, and it is necessary to provide more detailed breakdowns. The Homestead Preservation Districts have just been operationalized, and their potential yield is unknown.	Comment noted. The "funding mechanisms and tools" bar chart has been updated to better delineate between "current tools" and tools that require policy direction.
351	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	Perhaps most importantly, the expanded density bonus program under CodeNEXT holds massive potential. With density bonus programs within the Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors, onsite affordability can grow with all targeted development. Because of the timing of CodeNEXT (draft code is due in January 2017, with council adoption later in the year), it is crucial for decision-makers to both understand and leverage this potential for increasing affordability.	Comment noted. The Density Bonus programs will be reconfigured through the CodeNEXT process and will be released in January 2017.
352	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	Several programs being counted toward goals have short affordability periods. Yet it is our understanding that the shorter terms of programs such as CDBG actually are contracted for longer time frames, and should be shown as such in Figure 7. We recommend counting only those programs with affordability terms of at least ten years.	Modification made in plan that addresses this comment, including a change to the stack, rolling SMART Housing into other tools, and specifying that we will explore extending the affordability period for SMART Housing.
353	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	The plan proposes to provide choice in where to live to more families with children, a class protected under the Fair Housing Act, with a goal that 25% of production supported by NHCD have two or more bedrooms. We support this; however, we note the number of two-bedroom units in homeownership programs sold to people without children. To better reach families with children, we recommend the City establish a preference for families with children.	The goals have been revised.
354	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	The plan references CodeNEXT’s proposal to focus growth and offer density bonuses in centers and corridors. In fact, page 11 of the Austin Housing Plan offers a target for growth in residential units along the centers and corridors. It would be ideal to have a realistic and defensible target. Imagine Austin’s preferred growth scenario should be used as a basis for those projections.	The goals have been revised and information on methodology updated.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
355	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	While sustainable growth within centers and corridors is critical to the implementation of the Imagine Austin vision, greenfield development also offers enormous opportunity for affordability. It will be crucial for CodeNEXT to include a diversity of housing choice, as well as a mix of uses and transportation choices, within the greenfield areas. One option to consider is a greenfield density bonus program that would facilitate affordability throughout the City of Austin.	Comment noted.
356	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	Gentrification is rapidly limiting the choice of low-income families of color to live in certain neighborhoods. While the draft plan focused on producing new units, the City operates programs which can preserve homes in gentrifying neighborhoods. The plan mentions using these programs to preserve the ability of homeowners to stay in their neighborhoods. We recommend also including goals for preservation of single-family homes.	Comment noted. Text that addresses gentrification has been added, as well as a goal for home repair.
357	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	We recommend that the City study how to enhance density bonus programs with attention to affirmative marketing, non-discrimination by source of income, achieving units for families with children, including a right of first refusal patterned after Montgomery County Maryland's Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit program, and compliance monitoring.	Comment noted. The Density Bonus programs will be reconfigured through the CodeNEXT process. Draft Code will be released in January 2017 for public comment.
358	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	In order to make the plan actionable and achievable, it will be critical to add concrete timelines for all of the proposed changes in programs and policies. Seattle's housing plan establishes 15 "action steps" and provides a detailed three-year timeline. The Austin Housing Plan should include a similar timeline for short-term (1-3 years), mid-term (3-5 years), and long-term (5-10 years) action items. This will help policy-makers understand the urgency of certain actions and the overall context for success.	A section on implementation and prioritization of strategies has been added to the plan.
359	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	As we add residential units to the current inventory of affordable housing, it is crucial to ensure that NHCD has sufficient capacity and resources to actively provide monitoring and compliance. Public confidence in the affordable housing program is vital to its success and longevity. To adequately addresses NHCD's compliance and monitoring needs, we recommend looking at best practices from other jurisdictions' compliance and monitoring programs and how that crucial work is funded	Information has been added to the plan that describes the need for additional funding for monitoring and a real-time database of housing.
360	8/31/2016	Housing Works	Letter	Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment on the draft Austin Housing Plan. It is a vital document that is integral to long-term sustainability. With some improvements and enhancements, the Austin Housing Plan will help to guide our community toward affordability for all.	Comment noted.
361		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Provide options for those who own their own home currently to earn income from it by renting an accessory dwelling unit.	See "Relax Regulations on both Internal and External ADUs" in the plan.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
362		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Support for community land trust model to create new opportunities for affordable/attainable homeownership (8 meetings)	Comment noted. Community land trust model is discussed in section "Expand the use of Community Land Trusts"
363		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	There is a perception that new condos for young, single people are pushing out families with children	Comment noted. The plan includes a goal for affordable units for families to help address the lack of multi-bedroom affordable units available.
364		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	People need to have the ability to pass on their homes to their children. Currently, people are not able to transfer their wealth to family members because of property taxes and other expenses.	Laws governing how property taxes are levied are set at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.
365		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Some families are moving by choice to areas with better schools or for more land; others are leaving against their will because they cannot afford housing in Austin.	Comment noted.
366		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Starting to see effects of higher home prices/potential gentrification areas outside the urban core. People are moving here from other areas of town because they have nowhere else to go.	Comment noted.
367		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Find ways to preserve those sacred spaces that get lost during gentrification. And have rent controls. You don't move and the rent is frozen protecting the tenants.	See section "Pursue Legislation to Allow Rent Control." More information has also been added to the plan regarding preservation.
368		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	See that the integrity of houses and neighborhood stay the same.	Comment noted.
369		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	This (the 78744) is the last affordable area in Austin including Del Valle. Cap everything.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
370		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	People do not want to be (put in) in a box. (after explanation of the Community Land Trust).	Comment noted.
371		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Adjust the code/protection. This is a return to a sharecropper situation. People who acquire wealth and loss of wealth and they are homeless.	Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
372		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Address hidden homelessness in the Austin community and have shelters away from neighborhoods. We have vulnerable populations who are poor. And you have multiple families living in one place or out in the outskirts/rural areas of the city. Affordable Housing could address the issues of homelessness. Not a separate issue.	Comment noted. Increasing the supply of homes affordable to households making less than 30% MFI would provide more units for people who are experiencing, or are at risk of, homelessness to move into, lessening the time they spend in places not meant for human habitation.
373		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	There is overcrowding in the Austin public schools. Quality education needs to be provided in the city as people are moving outside of Austin to get a better education for their children.	Planning for schools is overseen by several independent school districts in Austin (including Austin ISD). The Housing Plan does not seek to specifically address school issues; however, by striving to achieve the goal of providing different types of housing for all Austinites in all parts of town, schools could benefit from the ability of families to live across the city.
374		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Wages have not caught up for people to afford to live in Austin. There is a wage gap in Austin and the cost of living. This needs to change.	Comment noted.
375		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Stop the floodgate of old landowners being forced out.	Comment noted. See section "Prevent Households from being Priced Out of Austin" for strategies proposed to deal with this issue.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
376		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Low quality public schools are an equity issue that affects housing choice.	Planning for schools is overseen by several independent school districts in Austin (including Austin ISD). The Housing Plan does not seek to specifically address school issues; however, by striving to achieve the goal of providing different types of housing for all Austinites in all parts of town, schools could benefit from the ability of families to live across the city.
377		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Need for education of elderly property owners to complete elderly tax exemptions.	<p>Laws governing how property taxes are levied are set at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p> <p>Information on how to qualify for and obtain property tax exemptions can be found on your local taxing entity's website (Travis County: traviscad.org; Williamson County: wcad.org; Hays County: hayscad.com)</p>
378		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Support tenant relocation efforts.	The section on Tenant Relocation Assistance has been updated to reflect the fact that the ordinance was approved by City Council on September 1, 2016.
379		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	There needs to be a review of the Zoning Codes. Let the newcomers incur the additional costs and not those who are long term Austin residents.	See section "Ensure that New Development Covers the Cost of Growth."
380		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Put a cap on the amount of rent for rental properties to allow for affordability.	See section "Pursue Legislation to Allow Rent Control."
381		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Need to support students and young professionals.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
382		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Council Member Delia Garza - Texas won't allow rent control. It's time to figure in the missing middle people.	The Housing Plan includes recommendations to pursue legislation to allow rent control, and to incentivize development of missing middle housing.
383		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Employer-assisted housing can be a good strategy to allow employees to live closer to work; good for employers as well.	See section "Challenge the Private Sector to Participate in a Fund for Affordable Housing and/or Workforce Housing."
384		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Support for utilizing public land for affordable housing	See section "Maximize Public Property to Build or Include Affordable Housing."
385		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Duplexes should be capped (MFI) at \$850.00 - \$1,400 for a (3 bdrm/2 bath). At Logan Mill, the average is \$1,250 a month.	Comment noted.
386		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	New Houses – let there be a standard tax for all. Do not believe in land grabs and landlocks the same.	Comment noted.
387		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	There is support for affordable housing in all areas of town – this area (Colony Park) is already saturated.	Comment noted. Goals have been revised to reflect that 10% of housing by <i>Council District</i> should be affordable.
388		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Bring back Rent to Own Programs to allow for home ownership in Austin.	Comment noted.
389		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	How will often will the % goals for the zip codes be reviewed and adjusted? They will need to be re-evaluated on a regular basis as the housing costs will change.	Goals have been revised to reflect that 10% of housing by Council District should be affordable. They will be monitored and evaluated as needed to reflect the changing market and income conditions.
390		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Lack of flexible transit options; need for additional transit routes (Colony Park, Dove Springs, Montopolis, etc.) areas.	The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority develops routes and plans for transit in the Austin area. Find more information about its latest long range planning effort here: http://connections2025.org/ .
391		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Need for more connectivity and sidewalks. Let the developers incur the costs for sidewalk development.	The Public Works Department develops strategies for increasing walkability and sidewalk infrastructure in Austin. Find more information about the latest Sidewalk Master Plan and pedestrian program here: https://austintexas.gov/departments/pedestrian-program .

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
392		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Transportation costs are a major component of household budgets.	Comment noted. See section "Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs."
393		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Bike Share program near work	The Austin Transportation Department develops strategies for increasing bikeability and bicycle infrastructure in Austin. Find more information about the latest Austin Bicycle Master Plan here: https://austintexas.gov/page/austin-bicycle-master-plan .
394		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Promote biking among Blacks (African-American Austinites). Go into the elementary/middle schools.	The Austin Transportation Department develops strategies for increasing bikeability and bicycle infrastructure in Austin. Find more information about the latest Austin Bicycle Master Plan here: https://austintexas.gov/page/austin-bicycle-master-plan .
395		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Promotion/advertising campaign for bike programs for youth	The Austin Transportation Department develops strategies for increasing bikeability and bicycle infrastructure in Austin. Find more information about the latest Austin Bicycle Master Plan here: https://austintexas.gov/page/austin-bicycle-master-plan .
396		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Offer other pushes (promotions) for the transit companies.	The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority develops routes and plans for transit in the Austin area. Find more information about its latest long range planning effort here: http://connections2025.org/ .
397		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	The Rail was built to benefit Southeast Travis County. Do/Go South of Riverside. Bus 127 – there are only two options of Capital Metro for Eastern Addison Park. People need more options.	The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority develops routes and plans for transit in the Austin area. Find more information about its latest long range planning effort here: http://connections2025.org/ .
398		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Code Enforcement needs to happen with slum lords of parking (possibly apartments).	The Austin Code Department is responsible for enforcing city codes to maintain quality of life. To contact the Code Department, visit their website (http://www.austintexas.gov/departments/code) or call 311.
399		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	The City must support innovation and new models in affordable housing; especially market-based approaches that can be achieved with less subsidy than traditional models.	The plan provides funding mechanisms, potential regulatory changes, and other creative approaches the City of Austin should utilize to achieve housing goals.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
400		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Need to drastically reduce site planning time for pre-approved models of affordable housing	Specific questions dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
401		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Need for continued public engagement and education around this issue to have engaged citizens.	Future public hearings and presentations on the Housing Plan will be posted on the plan webpage: http://www.austintexas.gov/housingplan .
402		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	How will this plan be different from past plans that just seem to sit on the shelf and were not implemented?	Our goal is to increase housing choices available to all Austinites. The Austin Housing Plan will include numerical goals, timelines, and strategies to maintain and create affordable housing for a range of incomes throughout the city, as envisioned in Imagine Austin. The plan helps align resources, ensures a unified strategic direction, and helps facilitate community partnerships to achieve this shared vision. The plan will provide potential funding mechanisms, regulatory changes, and other creative approaches the City of Austin should utilize to achieve housing goals.
403		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	There needs to be a review of the Zoning Codes. Let the newcomers incur the additional costs and not those who are long term Austin residents.	Specific questions dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
404		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	Regulations can help create opportunities. Jonathan T. explained that the Mueller Development was an opportunity/experiment of mixed development which included Affordable Housing.	Comment noted.

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
405		Focused Outreach Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Meeting Summary	The City needs to bring back the Rent-to-Own program. People were able to pay their rent and pay on a house. Two situations – one young lady thought everything was in order but could not find the paperwork that her father paid for and had to move out of the house. The other situation is that the daughter had all the documentation from her father and the paperwork was in order and she given the house – free title and it was her when he died. That program would help a lot of people with home ownership	Comment noted.
406	8/17/2016	City of Austin Economic Prosperity Commission	Letter	Incentivize construction of missing middle housing to increase supply in housing stock which is already in high demand.	See sections "Implement Density Bonus Program for Missing Middle Housing"; "Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots"; "Relax Regulations on both Internal and External Accessory Dwelling Units"; "Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions" in plan that discuss this goal
407	8/17/2016	City of Austin Economic Prosperity Commission	Letter	Adjusting lot size minimum and maximums to open the market for the construction of missing middle housing, including small to medium sized homes.	Specific questions dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
408	8/17/2016	City of Austin Economic Prosperity Commission	Letter	Support creative solutions suited to our market needs which mitigate the high cost of land; including housing cooperatives, community land trusts, limited equity models, and micro-units.	These strategies and others are discussed in the following sections: "Prevent Households from Being Priced Out of Austin"; "Foster Equitable Communities"; "Invest in Housing for Those Most in Need"; "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin"
409	8/17/2016	City of Austin Economic Prosperity Commission	Letter	Support creative financing solutions such as social impact bonds or Pay For Success models.	See section "Utilize Social Impact Bonds/Pay for Success Models for Services for People Experiencing Homelessness"

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
410	8/17/2016	City of Austin Economic Prosperity Commission	Letter	Working with design professionals to develop a catalog of pre-approved, missing middle product types that can receive expedited approval. Further, challenge design professionals and the city to adopt basic uniform specs so that citizens can design and submit their own projects - which would be added to the catalog - and also receive expedited approval.	Specific questions dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
411	8/17/2016	City of Austin Economic Prosperity Commission	Letter	Add flexibility to occupancy limits.	See section "Add Flexibility to Occupancy Limits" in plan

FEEDBACK LOG FROM RECEIVED COMMENTS

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Yes, and they will benefit many people. However, they fail to take into account the considerable migrant, refugee, and asylum-seeking populations that are present here in Austin.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Yes. I also feel that once this plan is developed and implemented, there should definitely be more accountability that the rules are actually enforced	NHCD staff is currently working on an Affordable Housing Inventory tool that will better track and monitor affordable units being built in the city.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I believe they're on the right track	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Overall the intentions are well meaning	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Goals are right but concerns about the Community Land Trust because provision do not take into consideration cultural aspects of home ownership and leaves questions that it may mimic historical instances of African Americans being able to stay in house but never own any inequity. This may exist because land in Austin appreciates. So are we playing numbers game with the trust concept?	The CLT paragraph has been expanded to include other forms of shared equity ownership that may offer households a greater percentage of the equity in the home.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I need more information because I don't believe that one will ever own land. The city does not do something for nothing	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I think a break out of mfi's to be served with these housing goals is appropriate as well as housing types to be developed (multifamily, townhouse, single family, ADU, etc.)	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan. The plan recommends the use of missing middle housing types including bungalow courts, side by side duplexes, stacked duplexes, triplex, fourplex, live/work and small multiplexes to meet future housing demand.

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Call out accessible, affordable, integrated housing for people with Disabilities (HST tied to services)	A section on elaborating on the housing needs of persons with disabilities entitled "Expand the Supply of Housing for People with Disabilities" has been added to the plan.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	No. Need to talk about housing for minimum wage earners. 80% mfi earners don't need help like low income earners. Should base numbers on poverty figures.	Residents in Austin at a range of income levels are in need of more affordable housing. The Housing Plan provides policy tools that can help the whole spectrum of homeowners and renters at 120% MFI and below
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	In districts where there is a higher percentage of lower cost housing, 10% goal implies displacement	The goal is to have atleast 10% units in each Council District be affordable to 30% MFI. The goal would not try to decrease the amount of units already affordable in districts
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	for the most part needs to be faster time line (5 years)	Please see the Implementation Matrix of the plan. The proposed strategies are designated with short, medium, and long term timelines.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	It's a start for right now	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Los objetivos son buenos pero seria mejor que no sea de largo plaso.	Comment Noted

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Seem to be reasonable, maybe include a higher % of accessibility	A section on elaborating on the housing needs of persons with disabilities entitled "Expand the Supply of Housing for People with Disabilities" has been added to the plan. The goal of "25% of all affordable units will to be accessible" is ambitious compared to current standards
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Relax Parking requirements for rehabbing and also sidewalk fees	Please see the proposed strategies of the plan titled "Comprehensive Parking Reform" and "Align Sidewalk Master Plan with Imagine Austin."
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	yes with the addition of community preservation and potential prioritization of gentrifying neighborhoods	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Yes I believe people who cant afford to live where they have been for years, should be offered affordable housing, even if they are well below the median.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	15 responses said Yes	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	3 responses said No	Comment Noted

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Absolutely not! Why do we need an additional 40,000 market rate housing units. They should all be affordable units. All!	The experiences of other cities have shown that affordability crises such as ours cannot be solved by subsidized units alone. When there is a lack of housing units relative to demand for those units, prices for all types of housing rise. Increasing the supply of market-rate AND subsidized units will help get the level of supply closer to demand and prevent prices from rising as quickly. The plan advocates for strategies that would incentivize additional market-rate development or preservation, including strategies dealing with development regulations and property taxes.
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Partly- too much focus on lottery-style subsidized housing, not enough on making multi-family housing easier and deeper to build	Specific questions dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/code-next-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.
Written Comments from Library Outreach	As long as there are NO taxpayer subsidies	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Not only do we need a lot more affordable housing fast, we need minimum wage that is not poverty level in order to stop corporations from placing their greed as a burden on the community.	See section "What is the Need?" for discussion of impact of stagnant wages on middle and low income families.

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Yes. Housing does need to be dispersed throughout the city	Comment Noted
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Stuart Dupuy: Respectfully, I believe this whole discussion is based upon a flawed assumption, which is that Austin needs to have affordable housing in expensive real estate areas of the City. I think the approach should instead be on raising income levels of those people who are in poverty, as opposed to artificially modifying housing prices. Whenever government tinkers in areas like this, outcomes are negative.	As a recipient of HUD funding, the City of Austin has an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing by creating the opportunity for geographic dispersion of housing units throughout the city for Austinites at all income levels. For more information please review http://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/NHCD/Reports_Publications/1Analysis_Impediments_for_web.pdf
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Barbara Aubrey: The plan appears to be addressed to the needs of low income property owners and renters however the changes benefit investors who are now competing with first time buyers and increased sales in this price is increasing the list price. I see nothing here that is limiting low income homes to be owner occupied. The concept of creating apartments in existing structures is a boon for investors, difficult for individual owners without extra assistance to obtain a loan. I would also suggest a series of housing grants for various occupations. Example a musician or other needed service person could apply for a 2 or 3 year grant to partially offset the higher cost of housing. A very small increase in sales tax can be used in how much these services and how much being known as the musical capital is really valued in Austin.	Comment Noted

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Gary T: I agree with Stuart's comments above. I don't see anything positive coming from this. The city should focus on encouraging people to get better educations and to add earning value to themselves through skills training. Where has this been tried before and what was the outcome? I recall growing up in the DFW area that "government" created affordable housing through "projects" and the outcome almost always seemed to be that the "projects" became slum areas. I realize that nothing of the kind is proposed here but I'm afraid the tinkering by government into housing will have far fewer benefits socially than focusing on skills development.</p>	<p>As a recipeint of HUD funding, the City of Austin has an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing by creating the opportunity for geographic dispersion of housng units throughout the city for Austinites at all income levels. For more infomation please review http://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/NHCD/Reports_Publications/1Analysis_Impediments_for_web.pdf</p>
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Response: LaTisha Anderson:So you assume because your considered low income you have no education. This is what is wrong with this city now. As long as the upper income can afford its what matters right? EVERYONE should be allowed to live in Austin not just the privileged.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Tim Altanero: I am a teacher. My salary is fixed and hardly increases year-to-year but I'm subjected to a 10% (max) property tax increase year after year. I can't remember a year when my taxes were not increased 10% PLUS the various other tax increases. My first question, of course, will be, how much more do you want to tax me until I can't afford to live in the city anymore? Who pays for "affordable" housing? I think it's me given the enormous tax increases (10%+ per year) I experience year after year. What about me? I'm your local teacher - for now - but if you price me out by taxing me on my home-which I've owned for more than 10 years - to the extent that I can't live here anymore, what does that say about "affordable" housing? If your teachers, police, social workers, first responders, etc, get taxed out, it's time to consider what "affordable housing" really means. I would like to think that it means keeping us in our current housing but what I'm seeing here doesn't seem to support that. How about just capping the tax at some point? 34% of my income goes to paying property tax. When I bought this place, it was 15%. All I see is tax me out. Tax, tax, tax. Rising at least 10% per year. And my salary rises maybe 2% Is this what we envision for our future?</p>	<p>Laws governing how property taxes and exemptions are levied and set are made at the state level. The Texas Constitution does not allow different tax rates to be set for different areas of a city, but rather requires that taxation must be equal and uniform. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information, or to comment, on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p>
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Response: Karen T:Well said Tim.	Comment Noted

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Garret Nick: I feel like your property taxes should freeze when you homestead so that you can actually budget and have a chance to stay there versus being slowly priced out by the relentless 10% annual jump. also, developers like "david weekly" are part of the problem by bringing the suburban mindset to the urban core. they regularly tear down smaller more affordable homes and build million dollar homes in their place. no ADUs or duplexes... just big fat houses that all look the same. The "suburban mindset" to me is when builders are buying up homes with cash before individuals/families have a chance and then tearing down what would be a perfectly livable home in order to build the biggest possible home the law allows and then immediately turn around and sell it. you have removed a more affordable \$500,000-800,000 home and replaced it with a \$1,200,000-1,500,000 behemoth that used up all the square footage of the lot. there is no longer the ability to build an ADU that would provide an affordable option and increase housing. you have exacerbated the housing problem so that a family of 2, 3 or maybe 4 can live in a 3,000 sqft single family home. the incentive to build anything else there was obviously not enough for David Weekly to consider the options. instead we get a row of identical houses that are churned out of the developer money machine. it is development like this that drives up the cost of housing in the urban core. the regulations should punish people for going this route and reward those who build a duplex/adu/condos/garageapt especially if they incorporate other components that address other city-wide concerns like flooding. whatever the algorithm is that developers use to determine what makes them the most ROI still results in the same tired old suburban looking junk. zero innovation.</p>	Comment Noted

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Tim Maddox: I agree with Tim as well. Reducing the tax burden in all forms (property, utilities, etc.) is very important to make Austin more affordable. The City can do this by reducing its spending significantly. The amount of superfluous spending is embarrassing. The City should make trade-offs. If you want to spend more on housing subsidies, then reduce the City payroll or some other offset. When the first motion is to increase taxes, the result is to further exacerbate the affordability problem.</p> <p>Also, if there were better road infrastructure, commuting would be a more viable option. The chronic lack of investment in roads has made the affordability problem worse.</p> <p>One final point, \$15/hour = \$30K/year only working 40 hours/week. Not clear to me why we are considering \$15K/year as an income level to solve for when more work or making yourself more valuable to your employer could get you to a much higher pay level. Austin's unemployment rate is 2.9%, so there is plenty of work to be had.</p>	<p>Laws governing how property taxes and exemptions are levied and set are made at the state level. The Texas Constitution does not allow different tax rates to be set for different areas of a city, but rather requires that taxation must be equal and uniform. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information, or to comment, on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p>

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Stuart Dupuy: Absolutely. The City can focus on the root cause of our "problem", which is that businesses and families want to be located in Austin. As a result of this problem, we have had low unemployment, leading to higher wages. We have also had pressure on housing prices in desirable areas of Austin. I do not agree that artificially driving housing prices down will be effective, and I fear that it will slow down the strong Austin economy, creating additional poverty for those on the lowest end of the wage scale. Tim I feel your pain, but you do realize that your taxes have increased because the value of your house has increased, tax free. You can sell your house if you want, and buy a much larger house in Dripping Springs or Kyle, or you can continue to pay property taxes because your house is now more valuable. That's not necessarily a bad thing.</p>	<p>Information has been added to Executive Summary that reflects of the attractive nature of Austin you spoke of.</p>
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Steven Zettner: Hello. I strongly support the plan's goal of balanced age and income in Austin, but fear the citywide target of just 25% multi-bedroom housing will do nothing to achieve the Imagine Austin goal of "a city for all ages." Rather, it will help to cement the emerging long-term housing bias against families in the urban core. Children represent about 24% of the US population. Areas like Downtown Austin have about 3% children in the population. It's not just that Downtown is so expensive. Only 40% of housing in Downtown has more than one bedroom. Downtown's housing mix is permanently biased against families, and that affects everything else important to families - services, culture, support networks. Because singles and couples also use multi-bedroom housing, to have balanced housing you need more multi-bedroom housing than just for family households. Nationally, communities with balanced age demographics have at least 70% multi-bedroom housing. The housing plan's target of just 25% multi-bedroom housing is grossly insufficient to get anywhere near balanced age demographics in the urban core. I could be wrong, but I don't see that the housing plan distinguishes between urban and suburban areas. So for urban areas the outcome may be even less than 25% affordable multi-bedroom housing. Unlike with market-built housing, the City actually has some control over the nature of affordable housing. The City should set a much more aggressive target for affordable housing units in the urban core that are multi-bedroom.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Maria Tase: Q:To what extent do you think the draft Housing Plan's goals are the right goals? They are not at all the right goals. The approach of CoA is flawed and based on artificial social engineering ideas. The role of the CoA is not to social engineer Austin and regulate the real estate market but to think economically and collect high taxes from high priced and highly desirable areas around downtown and use this money wisely to improve life conditions for all austinites. Enable economical development by investing in the right infrastructure that is roads to allow for an easier commute, focus the affordable housing efforts to more affordable areas further from downtown. This will improve the quality of life for everybody, including the low income families. I think that low income families with children would prefer to live in suburbs rather than cramped in small apartments downtown if the commutes would be easier</p>	Comment Noted

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>George George: Creating affordable housing is a noble but complicated goal. I feel for those that have owned a home in places that have seen dramatic growth. I know several that bought a one story in the 1970s for \$50 or \$60k and now cant afford the property taxes on the lot alone being valued at \$250-\$300k. Still, this is what happens in a relative "boom town" like Austin. As was mentioned some of those people sold and moved a little further out and were able to buy a new house and even pocket the difference. To be honest if our home keeps going up in value we might do the same. I also question imposing rent controls in this environment. I own a small condo near campus I rent out very reasonably and the cost of that rental unit goes up every single year with tax and utility increases so freezing the rent would basically eliminate the very small margin I make on it and I would not want to put anything else towards improving it (and I would probably sell it - maybe to someone that would live there instead of renting to people that might need a cheap rental unit - thus eliminating another rental unit downtown). As to the whole idea of creating new affordable housing in Austin one of my biggest concerns is the push for increasing population density within the city. Why do we need to do this? Every single North South corridor is extremely dense as it is and there are new apartments and condos being erected everywhere. The city hasn't come to grasp with how to handle Lamar and Burnet - isn't the double buses that just add to the traffic jams. As Maria mentioned the city should concentrate on projects and promoting multi-family housing including affordable units in areas that are near existing and developing retail centers and are also well served by light rail or effective bus transport. trying to cram any more people within metropolitan Austin is a bad idea regardless of the noble reasons behind it.</p>	Comment Noted

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Anthony Dill: I grew up here in Austin and so did my parents and grandparents. I am certain that I am one of a very few who can claim this unlike the vast majority now days that are from elsewhere originally. First, I want to say that I have also lived outside of Texas in some wonderful places with a high quality of life that didn't have such a horrible tax structure. The tax structure here in Austin (Central Texas in general) is strangling the affordability of the area. As the taxes go up so does the rent, house payment and cost of overall living here - property taxes are the number one reason why the affordability of Austin is what it is. Second, why does a property owner want to put money into fixing up and beautifying the property they own if it is going to go up in value even more and to be taxed more – NO incentive to keep things nice? Parts of Europe pay more taxes when they don't take care of the property. In the central Austin area there are property owners with Duplexes sitting on very large lots that they can't split up or add additional units because of current zoning. The city needs to address higher density allowances for property along the key coordinators here in Austin. Closer to the main roads the higher density should be allowed. Incentives to help keep older residential buildings in service and to remodel or update them should be made available. Also, I think basements should be encouraged for additional living space used for rentals here in the city. It works great in Northern Cities in urban areas. The City of Austin penalizes the use of basements in square footage calculations when building a home</p>	<p>Laws governing how property taxes and exemptions are levied and set are made at the state level. The Texas Constitution does not allow different tax rates to be set for different areas of a city, but rather requires that taxation must be equal and uniform. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information, or to comment, on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p>

Question 1: Are the Housing Plan's goals the right goals?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	<p>Anne Miller: As a middle-class, dual-income family with a teeny tiny house in Central Austin, we have seen exorbitant increases in our property values and taxes. When I hear about affordable housing, I have to ask what is being done to help the middle class whose incomes aren't being increased at the same rate as our tax increases. I am especially concerned about how affordable our property taxes will be once we retire and try to live on a fixed income. Please focus on helping the current homeowners and renters by cutting subsidies and spending, and reducing tax rates. I don't understand why we are giving handouts to companies to move here when the roads are already packed with traffic. With all of the building and increases to the tax base, why haven't our property tax rates been lowered? Please provide affordable housing to the existing residents by curbing spending and lowering tax rates.</p>	<p>Laws governing how property taxes and exemptions are levied and set are made at the state level. The Texas Constitution does not allow different tax rates to be set for different areas of a city, but rather requires that taxation must be equal and uniform. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information, or to comment, on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p>

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	The percentage of new housing units which should be within Imagine Austin centers and corridors should be 75% Access to public transportation should be directly tied to affordable housing. Small business should be incentivized to create new housing for groups such as RST whose clients cannot apply for government funding, large corporations are not an option and the disappearance of smaller businesses who cannot compete leaves many refugees and migrants homeless	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I am not quite sure if 10% in each zip code is quite enough. Maybe 20. I think it will be crucial that our children are equally educated regardless of the area they live in.	The 10% goal was derived as a recommendation from the 2014 Housing Market Study. The revised goals are now based on City Council District, rather than zip code. For information on how each Council District is doing on affordability, please see HousingWorks Austin's 2015 City Council District Analyses at: http://housingworksAustin.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2015-City-Council-District-Analyses.pdf .

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Workforce Housing and Tax discussion. How to maintain the house when taxes go up.	The plan includes a strategy to "Target a Preservation Property Tax Exemption to Communities at Risk of Displacement." More broadly speaking, laws governing how property taxes are levied are set at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	More market solutions and micro units	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Maybe...what happens to the people who have no income don't receive disability living with friends or relatives but seeking a place of their own. How would they qualify?	The section in the plan titled "Support the Creation of Deeply Affordable Units Serving People at 20% MFI and Below" has been updated to recognize the needs of residents without rental subsidies
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Expand mfi from 80% to 120% mfi to 200%	Goals have been broken down by specific MFI level and incorporated into plan.

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	1) Consider young singles that are straddled with student loans and need affordable apartments or ones with lower income as well as family housing-very hard to visualize enough land available for all Austinites in all parts of town. 2) Consider monetary support/subsidy for ones in need. Available quality schools and quality supporting entities in the low income/affordable housing neighborhood such as quality resources such as library, stores (food, others) etc. as well as religious institutions are concerning because current land owners may not be willing to sell land to trust and trust land may be in areas not easily accessible.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I own my house, a new house, and have been raised in my taxes even though I am 67 years old. Everything the city does it is all about money. Doesn't really think of the minority.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I think presented related housing development costs (basic costs/sq. ft.) in relation to these goals will assist in public budget planning for affordable housing and can assist non-profit developers with fundraising from non-governmental sources	The cost estimates provided in the plan are limited to construction costs due to the wide variation in the cost of land.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	What is the number of old "Section 8" assistance and waiting lists in last few years?	In 2015-2016, HACA administered several voucher programs including 6,093 Housing Choice Vouchers. As of August 23, 2016 there was an excess of over 8,000 people on the waitlist
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I wouldn't say so	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Key policies and programs don't convey idea of workforce housing- as higher end population grows, service population grows.	Please see sections "Challenge the Private Sector to Participate in a Fund for Affordable Housing and/or Workforce Housing." and "Use Incentives to Support the Production of Living Wage Job"

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Include residents with disabilities, transportation and neighborhood grocery stores and daycares for working parents. Not everyone has a car and a lot of low income residents get food stamps.	Please see the section entitled "Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs"
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	un comentano seria que hagan el processo mas rapido y que trabajen mas con East Austin porque nostotros no sabiamos sobre esto.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	More specific number in terms of affordability. Does the median income of residents match the numbers?	A chart which breaks down the Median Family Incomes for the Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) has been added. In order to comply with HUD regulations, the Housing Plan will use the MSA methodology to calculate MFI levels
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	More Affordable housing	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Maybe cover existing programs and tools that are currently being used- like alley flat initiative.	Call out boxes have been added throughout the plan that highlight the successful use of certain strategies, such as the Mayor's initiative to end veteran homelessness.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Like to see incentives for co-housing communities and tiny house communities	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	I wonder about the potential for technology to help...Not sure how, but could be a competition or hackathon to get creative tech solutions from the savvy. Maybe even making permits/code easier? Or an easy to use app for finding if your eligible for certain programs?	Although an app is not yet developed to determine City program eligibility, websites such as auntbertha.com offer a more user-friendly interface to locate non-profit and city services for residents.

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Accountability and communication- how will the city demonstrate achievement? Some sort of scorecard (like Boston's city score). Increased 20% MFI units for individuals on social security.	A section on implementation and prioritization of strategies has been added to the plan.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Tiny houses on wheels (THOW) Park/pay rent in another's backyard. Tiny houses on wheels communities. Allow more than 1 party to purchase land and have multiple tiny houses (on wheels or not)	Tiny house recommendations have been included in Plan in the "Create new and affordable housing choices for all Austinites..." Section
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	In the Draft, focus on areas where displacement is happening fastest. Area such as east Austin and soon to be south east (dove springs). Stop Displacement and stop displacement before it happens.	Several strategies discussed in the "Prevent Residents from Being Priced out of Austin" can be applied to gentrifying areas. Additional strategies dealing with preservation of currently affordable housing have been added to the plan.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Maybe setting a better return on the carrots, (more than 10% of units per project)	Recalibration of density bonus programs is being undertaken. Community benefits and requirements will be assessed through this process and could result in changes to existing density bonus programs or recommendations for new programs or benefits
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	2 responses said Yes	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	7 responses said No	Comment Noted

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Reduce taxes- property taxes- so that Homeowners can keep their houses. Eliminate excessive permit requirements and fees to make new homes less expensive	<p>Laws governing how property taxes are levied are set at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p> <p>Information on how to qualify for and obtain property tax exemptions can be found on your local taxing entity's website (Travis County: traviscad.org; Williamson County: wcad.org; Hays County: hayscad.com)</p>
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Reality! Austin needs to adopt/create Rent Caps ordinances and rent control like other major cities	<p>Comment Noted: The City utilizes funding tools to develop affordable housing that are currently available to it. State law limits the ability to provide affordable housing through other means, such as rent control or an income tax. The plan does mention some strategies which would require legislative changes, and also details many regulatory changes (that are within the city's control) that could also promote the development of affordable housing.</p>

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Quit encouraging people to move here.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Need much more focus on increasing public transit options, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian/sidewalk facilities. Need more focus on eliminating parking requirements on significantly relaxing restrictions on 4-plexes, 8--plexes etc.	Please see the section entitled "Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs"
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Current home owners who are being displaced due to rising land in many cases inflated, property taxes	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Low income housing is a great idea but how about the middle income families/single households? I make \$55,000 per year and will never be able to afford a house in Austin. You have priced us out too!	The proposed homeownership goal in the Draft Plan includes middle income households: "At least 25% of ownership housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 120%MFI or (\$93,360 or less for a 4-person household in 2016"
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Concerns over property value here not relevant	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Good for now	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Earth ships- YouTube it	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Including affordable units in centrally located high rises? -Maybe missed it; I think that developers can now opt out by paying into the Affordable Housing fund. It sounds like they all opt out. If I am correct, I think it should be mandatory to include affordable units- even some 2 bath/2 bedroom units	Recalibration of density bonus programs is being undertaken. Community benefits and requirements will be assessed through this process and could result in changes to existing density bonus programs or recommendations for new programs or benefits

Question 2: Do you have any strategies or approaches to affordable housing not presented in the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Yes there needs to be basic assumptions of too many people for the area	Comment Noted
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	LaTisha Anderson: The "where". Every nook is filled so have areas around Austin been identified? How will this be sold to voters? What will be the key selling points? How will this impact communities in those areas? Will this further harm the dwellings of the African American Community?	Please see the section in the Plan entitled "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin"
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	David Orr: I would have liked to have seen micro-units specifically mentioned as a solution to finding housing for young people, elderly, and any adults without kids. Easing parking requirements and occupancy restrictions is mentioned, and that would help make micro-units possible. But I think the report could do more to make the point that inexpensive micro-units are highly desirable among young people, and would help to solve much of the housing crisis with a solution that is beneficial for everyone without passing on any additional cost to anyone else.	Comment Noted. Micro-units have been specified as a non-traditional housing product recommendation under "Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin" section of the Plan.
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Maria Tase: what's missing? proper infrastructure for adequate transportation to allow for easy commutes. We should not even start talking about affordable housing until transportation/commute issue is worked on. And I mean worked on now not the talk that CoA likes to do as of how we will move 20 years from now. Worked on as in implement easy solutions such as make 183 and 360 reduced access and so on to ease traffic and allow people easy commutes. Once that is in place affordable housing areas can be identified further away from downtown	Comment Noted

Question 3: Do you have any additional ideas or concerns after learning about the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	How does this plan affect incoming residents, especially those making less than \$20,000 per year or those who have no proof of income at all?	Proof of income is a requirement of income restricted housing units. Please see the section "Support the Creation of Deeply Affordable Units Serving People at 20% MFI and Below."
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	as a whole I was very impressed with the plan because I felt it included everyone	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	this plan needs to be presented to the Mueller Planning Commissioner	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	1) Concern is that the city wasn't proactive early enough and now there is such a rapid influx of investors that are more in control of housing than the city government. 2) Address concern of individuals being forced out of existing property because of particular property being deemed unlivable or sold to investors if rental property. Support for homeowner relocation.	Please see the "Implement Tenant Relocation Assistance Program" section
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	they were addressed in the discussion	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Lower taxes for poor people, lower utility bills especially since city of Austin doubles rates in the summer.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Housing is not what I consider "affordable" My housing (apartment, rent) is 48% of my income including the "tax credit" program. I pay \$853 for a 1 bed - 1ba. When I lived in Colorado springs I paid \$715 for basically the same apartment. That include \$40 per month for washer/dryer rental. Without the "tax credit" program, my rent would be approximately \$950/ month. Median income in Austin is the basis for this "tax credit" calculation. It is upwards of \$40-\$50 K/yr. which is more than twice my income (\$21,600)	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Bolding/highlighting statements such as "lower income households are also renting more expensive housing units as they are unable to compete for the small pool of rental units that are affordable to them."	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	This is a serious problem but I am glad it is being addressed	Comment Noted

Question 3: Do you have any additional ideas or concerns after learning about the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	More incentive for lower income long term homeowner's (10-15 years)	Please see updated section on strategies for homeownership for people between 80% - 120% MFI.
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	We need to change CodeNEXT and zoning is a big issue	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Una preocupacion seria el aumento del costo de caso o de apartamento	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Focusing on residents already in place also.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Where is the option for more affordable housing	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Complex subject- any way to clarify or simplify stats, regulations, goals, and direction would be great. Encourage creativity (within reason) like an international communities site	NHCD Staff will continue to conduct outreach with the Austin community on components of affordable housing through more creative and simple educational formats
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Please use plain language-you are assuming this group is familiar with city programs and terminology	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Would love to get a larger sense of the underlying internal valves driving decisions and acknowledgement of the biases; also curious about how one can build in evolution and change into the programs. (sunset clauses, what happens in 50 years, etc.)	The Housing Plan will be amended as necessary to respond to evolving market conditions

Question 3: Do you have any additional ideas or concerns after learning about the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	General concern with using MFI when Austin's is so inflated (and since so many Austinites that are low income are uninsured so have extra costs) Interested in mixed affordability/mental-health unit projects like Broadway Housing Communities in New York.	Goals for 10-year housing production of both affordable and market rate housing were established by examining data on past housing production and population growth in both Austin and the Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), consultation with the City's Demographer, and examination of a range of potential scenarios with regard to the national and local economy over the next 10 years
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	Reach out to the South Congress combined neighborhood Plan contact team and other contact teams to education on the need for affordable housing, along with people against development are unaware of what needs/carrots are available.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Meetings in Districts 1, 2, 3	7 responses said No	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Draft Housing Plans with meetings personnel cost and associated expense are unnecessary cost and expense to taxpayers and create another bureaucracy	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	My concern is this draft and approach to true affordable housing is a hoax and just so unrealistic to the realities of people who make less than \$25 K per year. If the cost is going to build affordable housing just build it! Now~ stop messing around and playing peoples lives.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Need to charge much more for single family house permits. Stop building so many wide roads in suburbs. Eliminate neighborhood associations from process	Specific questions or recommendations dealing with code requirements should be directed to the CodeNEXT process. The CodeNEXT process has had and will continue to schedule public input opportunities as work on the draft code continues. Those opportunities are listed at the following website: http://www.austintexas.gov/departments/codenext-community-engagement . The draft code is anticipated to be released in early 2017 for additional public review and comment.

Question 3: Do you have any additional ideas or concerns after learning about the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Library Outreach	They key to any housing/property plan is to keep property taxes down. Nothing works when city council raises property taxes. Any new developments should pay their way into city services and taxes!	<p>Laws governing how property taxes are levied are set at the state level. For an Austin resident living in Travis County in 2016, 20% of his/her property tax bill is comprised of City of Austin property taxes. The other taxing jurisdictions that make up the rest of the property tax expenses are the (Austin Independent) School District, Austin Community College, Central Health, and Travis County. For more information on the laws governing how property taxes are assessed and the exemptions that are allowed, visit the Texas Comptroller's website (www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/property-tax/) or contact your state representative's office.</p> <p>Information on how to qualify for and obtain property tax exemptions can be found on your local taxing entity's website (Travis County: traviscad.org; Williamson County: wcad.org; Hays County: hayscad.com)</p>
Written Comments from Library Outreach	As a current homeowner who now is underemployed and often must choose between groceries and/or healthcare due to constant rising property taxes. I soon may be force to sell and relocate outside Travis because of the inability to meet my mortgage responsibilities	Information on how to qualify for and obtain property tax exemptions can be found on your local taxing entity's website (Travis County: traviscad.org ; Williamson County: wcad.org ; Hays County: hayscad.com)
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Glad to see (finally) something that may be positive for our communities of color	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Affordable disability and location are great	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	I want to attend any classes or help plans.	Comment Noted

Question 3: Do you have any additional ideas or concerns after learning about the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Single -housing individuals should be important to all	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	Earthships would provide viable low cost sustainable housing.	Comment Noted
Written Comments from Library Outreach	3 of the ideas have been fought by neighborhood groups- small houses on small lots, more residents/house+ADUs, layers land and car to the concerns of the neighborhood groups and provide language to control the results they are worried about. I think you are right on in seeing this issue as a companion to transportation issues! I know a lot of complaints neighborhoods have involved all the extra cars, extra people bring. But currently we all need cars.	Comment Noted
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Stuart Dupuy: If government truly cares about creating affordable housing, why not partner with the state and develop government-owned Camp Mabry or the TX DOT campuses on MoPac or at I35 and 71 and build low income high rise apartments? I shudder when I think of the unintended consequences that are certain to result from the City of Austin trying to tinker with the housing market. The basic economics of Austin and its booming economy are going to continue to put upward pressure on real estate. These same economics are also going to help assuage poverty. We cannot have one without the other.	Please see the section on "maximizing public property to build or include affordable housing"
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	LaTisa Anderson: My concern is when you talk about Austin as a whole you'll be met with a huge push back. I hope the city isn't considering Low income high rise apartments. You will then have a city that resembles NYC. Don't overthink this. The need is for apartments to fill the gap. When I say fill the gap this is what I mean: Look at areas hardest hit (east- say Airport blvd to Decker Ln, South-riverside out to Slaughter Ln, so on and so forth) Data shows those families/ individuals are being priced out head these areas or further. Is it possible to create apartments such as those that were remolded called Oak Creek Village (located off Oltorf by HEB)? These are/were(not sure how its changed since the remodel) Income based apartments and they look very upscale	See sections "Implement Density Bonus Program for Missing Middle Housing"; "Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots"; "Relax Regulations on both Internal and External Accessory Dwelling Units"; "Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions" in plan that discuss this goal

Question 3: Do you have any additional ideas or concerns after learning about the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Karen T: This plan doesn't take into account the way Austin has grown over the past 50 years nor has it realized that we are basically out of land. It's true it is not exactly affordable but it is not affordable for those of us who worked here and are now retired either, just like the young. When I got out of school, I had 4 roommates, all working. We saved our money and slowly made our way in life. Now we spend thousands and thousands of dollars complaining about how much it costs when one of the reasons it costs so much is spending so much on examining the fact that it is unaffordable. Our tax dollars paid for this study, as if everyone has a right to everything. The only way to solve the problem is jobs, an individual commitment to making a living for the individual and their own family and a City that will be the best as using our tax dollars wisely. Everybody needs a budget. And the idea that West Austin is not diverse? That is where the growth occurred 30 years ago and these are the citizens that contributed to the City's growth. People don't realize that this City wouldn't be so vibrant if it didn't have its older citizens to thank. So dont give West Austin grief.	Comment Noted
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Stuart Dupuy: Certainly. In Austin we are blessed with a booming economy, which is creating higher paying jobs for most Austinites. Unfortunately, the boom is also increasing real estate prices in certain areas of the City. Rather than focus on artificially keeping real estate prices low, I would encourage the City to see how it can continue to have the Austin economy lift wages, which will allow people on the lowest end of the wage scale to earn more money to be able to afford to live in greater Austin. Think "a rising tide lifts all boats" instead of trying to artificially keep the tide down.	As a receipt of HUD funding, the City of Austin has an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing by creating the opportunity for geographic dispersion of housing units throughout the city for Austinites at all income levels. For more information please review http://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/NHCD/Reports_Publications/1Analysis_Impediments_for_web.pdf

Question 3: Do you have any additional ideas or concerns after learning about the Plan?

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Response
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Margaret Christen: The Sutton Group has proposed a massive development along Red River from Cesar Chavez to the Mexican Cultural Center. The proposal calls for a total of 8 buildings ranging from a 8 story office building to 54 story hotel, 48 story hotel/condo, and as well as a 58 story luxury apartment building. The 58 story luxury apartment building will replace approximately 40 plus affordable condos (The Villas on Town Lake). The owners of the condos have an intent to sell with the Sutton Group. If this proposed development goes through it will basically encircle the lake on the Northwest Bank of the River. I believe they are prepared to implement all of the Waller Conservancy proposed ideas in return for being allowed to develop this land. How does this vision coincide with trying to maintain affordable housing and keep open spaces? There is currently a restrictive covenant on this land limiting residential to 30 units per acre (proposed development site of a 58 story residential tower) that is slated for a September hearing to remove. The developer says that without the removal of this covenant it can build anything it wants that is nonresidential because it is zoned as CBD. Did anyone consider this scenario when they designated all of the Rainey St area as CBD? What can be done to reconsider the blanket CBD designation for this area? This proposed developments will eliminate some somewhat affordable housing with non affordable housing and create a high density in a landlocked area. This will add to traffic nightmares in the Rainey St, emergency egress issues as well as becoming a wall between Rainey St and the Northwest shore of the lake.	Comment Noted. This concern has been passed on to the Planning and Zoning Department
SpeakUP! Austin Comment	Maria Tase: other ideas: fundamentally change the approach, stop trying to regulate everything: x% of this income and y% of this age should live here or there and on and on..., this approach never worked and never will. Nothing ever gets done but we are wasting tax \$ \$ for endless surveys, forums, discussions, visions of an Austin 20 years from now. Look at the actual data and identify 2 or 3 issues that are affecting most austinities NOW and work on those issues. Your number one priority should be to improve and increase the infrastructure to address the traffic problems in Austin. Allow free market to drive development, it will benefit everybody. Change your mindset, use some principles of economic thinking....	Comment Noted



The Austin Apartment Association (AAA) was founded in 1964 and is composed of more than 1,000 diverse businesses that own, manage and service more than 200,000 rental homes in the Greater Austin Area. AAA members are committed to providing quality housing and wholesome living environments for all Texans and we support the City of Austin's effort to craft a Strategic Housing Plan in order to align resources, unify strategic directions and facilitate community partnerships.

The city's draft Strategic Housing Plan (SHP) released for public comments on June 6, 2016 contains an impressive number of funding mechanism, regulatory changes and creative approaches that can be used to help reach the stated goal of producing 75,000 housing units in 10 years; with 35,000 of them being affordable units (80% MFI and below) and 40,000 being market rate units. Despite the many factors and forces that affect the rental housing industry we view the city's goal to be attainable given proper stewardship, and as partners in housing we will do our part to help facilitate success for the betterment of Austin.

Property tax increases, utility rates and related property ownership costs along with construction costs and regulatory expenses all underpin the rise in rents. As the SHP acknowledges, implementing housing programs and creative concepts cannot resolve all of the city's affordability issues. Deft actions and focused efforts will be needed to meet the demand for affordable housing amid a dynamic housing market.

The AAA finds many of the program and approaches outlined in the SHP document to be time-tested and fully appropriate. These strategies have worked well in a wide variety of housing markets and are worth full staff efforts and/or cost benefit analysis including:

- ✓ Preservation tax exemptions to communities at risk.
- ✓ Strategic investments in economic development, transit and education.
- ✓ Land banking.
- ✓ Homestead Preservation Districts and TIFs.
- ✓ General Obligation Bonds for affordable housing.
- ✓ Utilization of the National Housing Trust Fund.
- ✓ Maximum participation in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program.
- ✓ Revisions and expansions of existing density bonus programs.
- ✓ Small lot development and relaxed regulations on both internal and external accessory dwelling units in conjunction with overall increased housing diversity in new subdivisions.
- ✓ Multifamily property tax exemption program.
- ✓ Incentives for transit oriented development.
- ✓ Prioritized infrastructure investments in activity centers and along activity corridors.

Additional affordable housing strategies and approaches not mentioned in the SHP but we believe are worth staff consideration and analysis are:

- ✓ Shared equity ownership - a housing ownership funding mechanism for ensuring that the initial subsidy given buyers to reduce the purchase price of a home creates a lasting asset that can help one generation of homebuyers after another.
- ✓ Creative funding program to facilitate small community developments having 20 units or less and/or are too small to participate in the LIHTC program.
- ✓ Timely and coordinated code amendments that increase acceptance of innovative construction materials, techniques and housing concepts.

The AAA finds that strategies mentioned in this document that rely on changes to state law are not bona fide housing strategies and should not be included in a strategic housing plan. The SHP should focus on the tools and planning programs at hand, and staff efforts should be directed toward their fair and efficient implementation. Given the Texas Legislature's stated priorities and past history on property rights and related issues, hinging attainment of the city's affordability goals on legislative pursuits would be an unfortunate diversion of city time and resources.

In recent years numerous housing policy discussions, programs and initiatives have occurred or have been implemented. The AAA suggests that any housing strategy and/or concept listed in the SHP that that is currently operating in some form or fashion be clearly identified in the document. Having a listing of current programs and strategies underway will make the Strategic Housing Plan a more useful and dynamic document for directing future actions, conducting public housing policy discussions and determining funding needs in the effort to reach Austin's housing goals.

Respectfully submitted August 9, 2016.

By: Paul Cauduro
Director of Government Relations
Austin Apartment Association
8730 Burnet Road, #475
Austin, Texas 78757



www.austinaptassoc.com

Austin Board of REALTORS® Comments on City of Austin Strategic Housing Plan

ATTN: City of Austin Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Dept
DATE: 10 August 2016

The Austin Board of REALTORS® is pleased that the City of Austin is taking a proactive measure in adopting a policy-driven Housing Plan for Austin. The Housing Plan represents an important stride by acknowledging that market-rate housing that is affordable to Austin's workforce is critical to the mission of NHCD and the long-term economic success of the city as a whole. The recognition of the market-dependent aspects of a successful housing policy allows the City to take part in a conversation about how local policy aids or hinders affordability and how housing fits amidst other key priorities.

ABoR's primary comment on the Strategic Housing Plan is that, while there are valuable recommendations on density bonus programs along corridors and for missing middle housing, more attention should be given to specific policy recommendations for creating market-rate units affordable to households in the middle range of Austin's income scale — in particular, the 27% of Austinites identified in the report who fall roughly between 80% and 120% MFI. These recommendations should include policies for both income-restricted and market units to lay the path for the well-rounded housing market described by the Plan's goals.

Further, ABoR believes there are several opportunities for additional detail or clarification that will ensure this plan is not only sound in its approach to Austin's housing challenges, but also thorough and actionable in its guidance to those who will be tasked with implementing it, ensuring the good intentions it sets forth translate to informed and achievable goals that drive the true progress our market so urgently needs.

In summary, we reiterate our general support of the Housing Plan in setting priorities and offer the following comments for consideration.

Clarify Strategy Tied to Housing Demand. Embracing a specific count of 75,000 units to satisfy demand over the course of the next 10 years is helpful for setting general priorities. There is, however, insufficient detail and explanation for these targets in the Plan. While the Plan breaks down the source of potential affordable units (Figure 7), there does not appear to be a similar breakdown for market-rate units.

The policy recommendations in the Housing Plan should be additive toward reaching the goals set forth in the plan, but it is impossible to know this without specific projections, or even projected ranges. To the extent possible, policy recommendations should be tied with projected outcomes.

To this end, the Plan should address how many market units are needed at different MFI levels and should, as applicable, identify specific strategies for generating market units at those

different levels. For instance, the recommendation to relax restrictions on internal and external accessory dwelling units should be tied with a projection of the potential production capacity that would stem from implementing this recommendation.

In the same vein, a significant portion of the affordable unit strategy vaguely falls under “Other Tools.” To be of greater value, the Plan should be amended to include more details about how these units break down in order to create a clear policy pathway to the goal established in the report.

Assess Strategies for 80-120% MFI. The laundry list of suggestions compiled by staff from stakeholder meetings does not provide adequate direction to policymakers concerned with the “missing middle” and how Austin can increase its total supply of geographically dispersed market-rate workforce housing. ABoR agrees it is important to have strategies for both income-restricted and non-income-restricted housing. These strategies, however, should be linked to a greater goal and assessed by their potential positive impact on housing production where it is needed most.

In general, ABoR is supportive of measures that reduce regulatory barriers to affordability and allow for a greater variety of housing types across the city. Adding navigability to create more missing middle and small lot housing, as well as adding options to subdivide existing larger lots and buildings into smaller spaces, has the potential to improve affordability while retaining residential neighborhood character.

Flesh Out Potential for Public Land. The Plan makes a recommendation regarding maximizing the use of public property, but it is not specific about how the City can amend its policies regarding public land to carry this out. Given long-standing questions in the community about how City land can be used to create workforce housing, more specific direction is needed in terms of how public land can be catalogued, assessed, reviewed for use, and developed to create more housing that meets defined priorities.

To accomplish this, the City should ensure all its land is catalogued where it can be easily accessed by stakeholders and a policy is in place to periodically review the use of all City land in light of the highest and best use.

In particular, the concept of co-locating housing with other public facilities is promising and this should be fleshed out and made into a separate recommendation, enabling more focused and timely progress on innovative, impactful strategies like these that leverage resources the City already owns.

Identify Departmental Nexus to Promote Coordination. A well-documented and ongoing challenge in the City of Austin is a lack of departmental coordination stemming from spotty inter-departmental communication and a lack of formalized shared objectives. The Housing Plan can help work against this by specifically identifying when a policy recommendation involves another City Department and ensuring that the affected department is aware of the recommendation and buys into the policy for its part before it is taken up at Council.

For instance, the policy recommendation that calls for relaxing regulations on housing cooperatives will require review and buy-in from the Neighborhood Planning Department regarding zoning issues, the Code Department regarding building code and occupancy, and the Transportation Department regarding amending parking standards. By identifying these

situations in advance and starting the communication process at this planning stage, implementation is likely to be more successful.

Spell Out Fair Housing Recommendations. The Plan recommends implementing the “City of Austin’s Fair Housing Action Plan” recommendations in their entirety. There are, however, dozens of recommendations in the Action Plan of varying degrees of priority, leading to the possibility of confusion in how to implement them, or worse, ignoring them altogether due to lack of specificity. We believe it would be more effective for NHCD to include top priority recommendations separately in the Housing Plan, taking care to cite their source in the Fair Housing Action Plan, making expectations clear to all involved.

Insufficient Linkage to CodeNEXT. The Plan is in a key position to demonstrate the relevance of CodeNEXT to affordability issues, yet there are only four instances of CodeNEXT appearing in the document—unusual given that many of the policy recommendations rely on it as a vehicle for implementation. There should be more specific and direct treatment of the question of how these recommendations intersect with CodeNEXT and how that initiative will or will not provide an avenue for implementing these recommendations. In addition, NHCD should provide backup documentation to document and support these recommendations when a draft code is released.

Jettison Policy Recommendations without Specific Deliverables. Some of the policy recommendations in the Plan are objectives confused with principles, such as calling for ensuring that “new development covers the cost of growth”. It is not clear what this priority signifies in this context, and it should therefore be condensed into a specific policy recommendation or stricken from the Plan. This will help provide the clarity and accountability necessary to ensure this plan is a useful tool to the many departments and stakeholders who must work to implement it.

Goals should be more transparently tied to demographic forecasts. The Housing Plan sets a goal of 75,000 units over the course of ten years, but it does not clarify how this goal is tied to demographic projections. It is critical we make that connection between housing production and projected demographic trends to ensure our community does not confuse true housing relief with merely keeping pace with increased demand driven by a growing population, enabling all those involved to bring appropriate urgency to address the need.

ADAPT highly commends NHCD for the plan's focus on the need for housing for those with incomes at 30 percent and below MFI. This is where the need is so very dire and it is terrific to see the City finally recognizing and at least attempting to address this problem. Although other Austinites (or would-be-Austinites) with lower incomes also are having problems with finding affordable housing, those in this lowest income bracket have the least number of options.

In the list of other issues impacting affordability, jobs and wages is another impact. However, we must remember that the jobs that pay lowest will still need to be done and someone will have to do them; Those individuals will have to live somewhere. So **just getting everyone training and education and better jobs doesn't solve the city's problem.**

One thing that kept disturbing us when reading this report was the couching of the **affordability crisis** as on the horizon, as opposed to the present and even a bit in the past. Of course, we can't change the past and must deal with present reality. But this crisis is not coming at us, it is **here now and getting worse, the plan should openly admit that.**

Affordability Definitions:

With the housing affordability problem as out of control as it already is, is it realistic to aim for housing that is 30% of a family's income? Even though this is a good goal, it might be better to say that 30% is our goal but 50% may be a more realistic short-term goal. When rents are over people's entire monthly incomes, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We know this is a HUD rule, but maybe you can advocate with them.

Community and Stakeholder Engagement:

While ADAPT favors income integration and opportunity, with our current city-wide affordable housing desert, **developing housing where it is connected to transportation and services is more important than spending huge chunks of scarce funding to develop in more upscale neighborhoods.** If such development can be done for fairly equal funding to developing in less prosperous areas (by using public lands, etc.) these projects should get strong city support.

As for lowering property values of current residents by developing affordable housing, if those moving into these affordable housing units are willing to risk their family's dignity and stomach the crap by living near snobs and bigots, the snobs and bigots shouldn't complain about these brave pioneers who come to live among them.

It is really good to know that overall, citizens appear to understand the need for affordable housing. It's exhausting feeling you are resented.

What is the Need?

In the discussion of the need on p.6 and elsewhere it is very **important to include** the fact that a considerable amount of **affordable housing is being converted into unaffordable housing** at a steady rate. This has displaced many, many low income people and forces most further and further away. It

reduces the number of options for very low income people, including people with disabilities, uprooting their lives.

Also ADAPT is concerned that a realistic picture of the **services housing should be near** be included in this plan. While some people with disabilities definitely care about being near good schools, this is not an issue for many and I would assume that goes for many seniors as well. **Grocery stores, drug stores, general Target, Walmart, type places and laundry – places that address daily, weekly living needs are the high priority.** Many of the mixed use places in Austin have stores downstairs but they are tattoo parlors, expensive hair care, and boutiques; places that are fine to have but are used only infrequently. We love tattoos in ADAPT but getting them is hardly a weekly affair. We can travel farther for these kinds of things. Maybe “amenities” might better describe what we mean?

Job Growth:

Attendants and other direct care workers, janitors, and many others who do the work that makes life livable for our families earn less (often closer to \$16,000) and these folks **should not be left out** of the picture in this plan. Their work saves our community and the state lots of money and frees up family members as well.

Future Housing Demand:

It is really good to see such good information/data on households at 30% MFI and below. ADAPT believes however that **breaking it down even further to 15% or at least 20%** and below would help focus on the most deeply affected population in Austin. Most of ADAPT’s members are in this category and disability benefits remain abysmally low. Without deep subsidies there is really no way these individuals could make it in Austin.

The description of the squeeze on the middle cost housing is terrific.

In looking at the demand and future demand **we are constantly disappointed with how little attention the city demographer pays to people with disabilities, there is almost never any data** in this regard included. Where it is included, it focuses on diagnosis as opposed to need for housing, transportation, etc. This is something the city could pay a lot better attention to and probably get much better information than a volunteer consumer group can get. In addition, **this plan should take into account the people who are institutionalized in Austin in nursing homes or other such facilities who want out but are held back by lack of housing options.** They are neither counted as homeless, nor as members of the community (the Census explicitly says it does not include these populations) so they belong in a kind of limbo from which it is very difficult to escape, since they are invisible to planners, the general public and pretty much everyone else. **Austin should include them in its planning, especially housing planning since housing is one of the main barriers to getting out of a nursing home** and getting services and living in the community. CMS has data on these numbers for people in nursing homes, in a study called the Minimum Data Set. Question Q 1A asks about people who would rather be living in the

community. **TDHCA's 811 program provides funds for just this population and the city should get some of those funds.**

ADAPT believes the **city Housing Plan should not include any support for, promotion of, or acceptance of townhomes as housing options**, or housing options that receive any city support. Townhomes deliberately discriminate against people with mobility impairments and the builders have succeeded in exempting them from any access requirements. Austin should not support deliberate discrimination.

On page 10 you list low wage workers and you should **include attendants and other direct care workers**. The city does little to assist this critical category of workers who help people with disabilities and seniors to live in the community, and in so doing, help families live more free and less burdened lives as someone else is doing the personal care of their loved ones. Attendants and other direct care workers are paid less than fast food workers, often considered the poster children for people who don't earn enough to live on.

Equity and Inclusion:

In the equity and inclusion section **you again use the future tense to describe people being displaced when past and present are probably more appropriate**. A commitment to fairness and equity for the future seems a bit like closing the barn door after the cows are gone. This commitment should extend to those who have already been driven out but would like to return. We agree with conclusions here regarding the negative impacts described in this section. Do we really want to be one of those communities which doesn't want those who help make the city the way it is (via the services they provide to the community) to live here?

Goals and Targets:

Page 11 brings up many issues for us. Throughout the document you talk about the percents of MFI that are impacted. In some places you very positively include dollar equivalents for those percents, making the information a LOT more accessible, and that's great. But it's always in terms of a 4 member family, whereas you say in several places that future families in Austin will be smaller than that. Perhaps a better way to do this is to **include the chart with the percentages and amounts for a single person, a couple, as well as the four person family**.

Here you talk about housing **by zip code**, in other places by **City Council district**; it seems like the plan should be **consistent on which geographic area it is using**. In addition, especially if you go by the smaller zip code areas (smaller than Council districts) it is **important to look at how this works with closeness to transit etc**.

ADAPT strongly objects to your Housing for all targets. **In your Housing for All Target it seems terribly low to say only 20 people with incomes at 20% or below and since this same plan says there is a shortage of 48,000 units for people 30% and below MFI**. 20 people is not even a drop in the bucket. Adding to this is your call for 50 PSH units per year. **There are a lot more people with incomes at 20% and below MFI than there are people wanting or even eligible for PSH, yet you target more than twice**

as many units for PSH as for 20% and below income folks. In addition, individuals eligible for PSH are also, in all likelihood, at 20% and below MFI, and could potentially monopolize those 20 slots as well. **PSH units however are not available to everyone at 20% and below.**

We like your call for access and adaptable design in your targets. However, your call for 50% of the units to be adaptable may or may not meet Fair Housing, which requires ALL new units in buildings with 4 or more units be adaptable if they are on the ground floor or reachable by elevator. **ADAPT would like some statement about compliance with Fair Housing and Section 504 be included here, for example “All units and project which use City of Austin funding must comply with Fair Housing, Section 504 and the City’s Visitability requirements.”**

Linking housing and transportation is very important to the disability community and the low income community. While a quarter mile is a noble goal, **ADAPT believes you should raise requirement that 25% of housing be within ¼ mile of transportation to 100% be within ¾ mile, 50% within a ½ mile and perhaps have a stair step means of giving the most points to projects within ¼ mile and a smaller amount of points to projects that are within a half mile.**

Another factor is that for **ADA paratransit you must live within ¾ mile of a transit line, so all projects built outside this distance will not have Metro Access service** for people with disabilities and seniors who need that type of transit. Perhaps **you should better align this kind of requirement with the transit requirements.** Also how will you deal with the **fact that transit corridors move?** Last but not least, what is your definition of high frequency?

Funding Mechanisms and Tools:

It is great to include the information you have on the next page, but **many of the affordability periods are WAY too short.** 40 years should be the minimums for all these programs; and SMART Housing’s 1 to 5 year requirements are a joke. Even the 10 to 20 year periods are too short. These timeframes will pass in the blink of an eye and **by the time this plan is completed many of the projects started when the plan was adopted will no longer need to be affordable.**

Prevent Households From Being Priced Out

In your prevention of displacing low-income homeowners, **do not let funds for accessibility be used for other kinds of home improvement like repairs and weatherization.** These funds should be separate **or the access funds will be drained for other work.** Local agencies have lobbied hard at the state level to allow this kind of **bleeding dry the access funds** and it should not be permitted locally. Just because someone needs access improvements should not prevent them from getting repairs or weatherization. Cost savings on doing these projects at the same time should not mean access funds pay for it all.

Your **focus on preserving and creating ownership options for households at 80% to 120% discriminates against lower income families.** The Home of Your Own program has successfully made people on disability benefit levels of income homeowners and the city continues to belittle this program. The city

should not knock these kinds of programs out of the picture, but instead seek to expand and/or partner with them.

At the top of page 14 it seems you are targeting all these options to households at 80 – 120% MFI but **many of these strategies could be used to help create/support rental housing for people with lower incomes and perhaps even homeownership for people below 80% MFI. Why extend these options to people above MFI (120%) and restrict lower income households?** ADAPT believes this is wrong. This is especially true for the sale of public land. Expanding SMART housing to higher incomes will not lead to some kind of trickle down, but will further limit the assistance available to the lowest incomes and the same is true for density bonus programs.

“Missing middle housing” must still meet Fair Housing requirements, visitability ordinance and for live/work housing the ADA as well. This is **also true for the flexible housing** listed a few bullet points below. While you can have accessible or adaptable versions of the housing described in missing middle and flexible housing, this **needs to be carefully monitored. The city should make this need for compliance abundantly clear throughout the plan.** In addition, ADAPT strongly believes **this plan should not promote housing that discriminates (like townhomes).**

ADAPT strongly supports simplifying the permitting process and increasing its user-friendliness for everyone, not just affordable housing. This will benefit the entire community.

It might be good to tone down the jargon in the ideas listed on page 14. For example, what are “form based code districts”?

Another idea for maintaining affordability would be to **increase tax, levy a fee, for developers who convert affordable multifamily housing into market rate or higher income housing.**

Also in some cities, they have a **flipping tax**, where homes that are simply flipped are taxed at a different (higher) rate at time of resale.

In Austin’s expansion of community land trusts you should **allow for scattered site CLTs** so that all the units in a project do not need to be in the same location.

Tenant relocation assistance is vital and should **address the additional difficulties people with disabilities often face in finding new housing that is accessible to them.** Some of these include the greater difficulty of finding available accessible housing in the right price range, greater costs of moving since many will need to pay for assistance, lack of assistance from service providers in moving, difficulty in finding affordable and accessible housing near needed amenities, and similar problems.

ADAPT strongly supports the city in any efforts to protect renters from discrimination based on source of income. What the state did was a travesty and extremely hypocritical considering their constant drone for local (state control vs. federal control) control. One method for ending such discrimination **we do NOT support is any form of financial reward for taking vouchers**, as that is basically rewarding discrimination, and will tend to make the problem worse. We recommend the City **push the Austin**

Apartment Association to create a voluntary program in conjunction with the city and the Austin Tenants Council to promote acceptance of vouchers. If their members are as big hearted as they claim they should want such a program, but just in case they are not quite as big hearted, they should work with these other entities.

The city should also **explore** ways to provide a **working-with-landlords to accept section 8** (like the one referred to below in the PSH section), **possibly support developing an agency or agencies to assist landlords with the scary section 8 paperwork.** **Working with** on such efforts could help spread any costs and use of other resources. Collaborate with **HACA and Travis County Housing Authority and an independent committee of landlords and the Austin Tenant's Council, to make accepting Section 8 and other vouchers more attractive and user friendly for landlords, while not infringing on tenant's rights.**

The city should **repeal its code requirement on occupancy limits that sets those limit is at 4 unrelated people.** This is anti-lower income people and will negatively impact them. The city should however realize group homes for persons with disabilities are not a positive option, though the reasonable accommodation language here is appropriate.

Why is this plan completely silent on board and care homes? These are among the most abusive housing situations for low income people with disabilities but they are unaddressed here. **This is wrong!!!** The plan should include quantitative and qualitative information (like how many are there? How many people live in them? What are the experiences these people have living there? What are ways to address the abuses?

ADAPT supports the City's' efforts to **pursue inclusionary zoning** and encourages the city in this regard.

Preservation of housing that is affordable is a logical tool, however ADAPT wants the city to recognize that **preserving housing usually means preserving inaccessibility.**

Invest in Housing for the Most in Need:

ADAPT enthusiastically supports the city pursuing GO Bonds for affordable housing. Future campaigns for such bonds should be carefully designed to better describe the intent (than happened the last time) but this is a very important tool to help create more affordable housing in Austin.

ADAPT has long called for the city to **challenge private sector players to participate in funding affordable housing.** **UT** should be high on the list to be tapped! ACC and AISD might provide some teacher housing. However, don't let rich employers experiment with low income housing they know little to nothing about, just get them to fund it. **Low income people should not become the lab rats for social experimentation just because they need housing.**

ADAPT strongly supports the use of public property to include affordable housing. The **Austin State Supported Living Center** should be shut down and turned into an area for affordable housing. The **Austin State Hospital** could co-locate its current services with affordable housing; they have already

done so with market rate housing. There are many other locations around town that can be tapped. When the Health and Human Services Commission redoes their buildings at 51st and Guadalupe (the Winters Building Complex) they should include housing for workers and for clients of their services. We also think **the colocation idea is very interesting.**

While **social impact bonds** are a creative and interesting idea, they **have no place in this housing plan. Services should not be linked to housing.**

The **National Housing Trust Fund is vital and the city should most definitely utilize** these funds, however your talk about better targeting the dollars **should not be a code message for using these funds for homeless people only.** Many people with disabilities and seniors need this housing, not to mention other low income persons, and they do not want or need services tied to their housing. Since TDHCA manages these funds, the City should monitor how TDHCA is planning to use them and advocate for mission-driven non-profits to be able to provide housing to people at 15% and below MFI.

The City should also monitor, promote and partner with TDHCA in their Section 811 program. This is another source of funding for accessible, affordable, integrated housing.

Low income housing tax credits have created a lot of affordable housing and are **a good tool. However, they do not achieve affordability for the lowest income populations** and this needs to be better recognized because they leave out a lot of people. In addition, the **city should not allow duplication of vouchers and subsidized units** where the houser is receiving double benefits and the actual number of people being served is less.

ADAPT very strongly supports the creation of deeply affordable units serving people at 20% MFI and below. Services should not be tied to these units, nor should eligibility for these units be tied to a diagnosis or receiving services.

PSH should be provided in integrated settings like the working-with-landlords approach noted at the bottom of this paragraph. It should be recognized that while services may be voluntary in these programs, the way it works here, eligibility is tied to services since certain service providers approve people for this type of housing for their clients, so you must be getting services through these agencies to get PSH. **Housing first is a positive development** in this type of housing. **However, ADAPT is very concerned that this kind of housing is allotted a much greater percentage of available funding for extremely low income housing, greater than the percentage of population eligible to be served.**

The city should begin an Affordable, Accessible, Integrated Housing initiative to promote this kind of housing, without services attached or even part of the eligibility process. This kind of housing has a long, proud and effective history and successfully serves thousands of people with disabilities and seniors.

Create New and Affordable Housing Choices:

Affordable housing goals that **distribute affordable housing throughout the city** are laudable. However, this **needs to be balanced with the goal of creating as much truly affordable housing as possible**. In addition, 10% by zip code doesn't make sense since there are more than 10 zip codes in Austin. Perhaps what is meant is council districts and if so this should be clarified.

ADAPT has long called for the lengthening of the affordability period for SMART housing. 1 to 5 years is just a travesty and basically does little to nothing to create affordable housing.

Consistency in density bonus programs is good but your **emphasis here for more bedrooms doesn't align with your prediction of smaller family sizes** in the future.

Any **density bonus for missing middle housing must ensure compliance with** Fair Housing, Visitability and other **accessibility requirements and should not promote inaccessible types of housing**, like townhomes. This is **also true for smaller houses**.

Some kind of **emphasis should be given to ADUs that are accessible, or at least visitable**. **Multifamily tax exemption programs are terrific** and can also assist people with disabilities. They could also **help in creating developments in more costly areas of town**.

Reduce Transportation Costs:

Helping reduce transit costs is important. As discussed earlier it might be a **good idea to make your development requirements more in line with the requirements for transit under the ADA**. **ADAPT would be happy to help with this and we can probably get help from Capitol Metro too**.

ADAPT has fought for over 25 years to increase funding for sidewalks and we strongly support this recommendation. However, the Sidewalk Master Plan is something we have also worked with the city to develop for many, many years and **current Sidewalk Master Plan priorities in it are there for a reason**. (Sometimes people must travel from less busy areas to busier ones to get to the transit routes.) We are hesitant to call for amendments less than a month after the current plan has been adopted. The Sidewalk Master Plan is based on actual experience from years of trying to deal with our current patchwork of sidewalks, streets and paths, as opposed to something based on theoretical plans.

Other

It is exciting to see housing that appears to be Visitable highlighted in illustration in this plan. Sad that so many of the graphics in here have steps.

Thank you for the opportunity to be a part of the development of this plan.

ADAPT has advocated for a better model of housing for people with disabilities since the 1980s.

The model ADAPT supports is called Accessible, Affordable Integrated Housing. It is a decades old, proven and best practices model for housing people with and without disabilities. It creates housing units that a broad spectrum of people can use, and can supplement in whatever way is needed and/or wanted. If someone needs certain access features, they can be added. If they need supports to live in that housing, they can get those supports.

We will take the components of this model in reverse order here:

INTEGRATION

History shows that society views people with disabilities as everything from "unfit," to "dangerous," to a "detriment to normal society." These views directly led to the establishment of our nation's very long history of government imposed segregation of people with disabilities. Housing options in this system of imposed segregation are large warehouse-like state operated institutions and smaller institutions, such as group homes. People with disabilities are considered "sick" and in need of treatment to be cured, hence nursing homes and the like. Though attitudes are changing somewhat, these views have not been erased, and unfortunately continue in much of our housing policy today. "Housing" options for people with disabilities often resemble medical centers or containment facilities, rather than what most people would call a home.

Integrated housing is housing that mixes people with and without disabilities. It does not segregate by disability or disability type or diagnosis. **ADAPT is not against services**, in fact many of us have been to jail in the fight for adequate services. However, we believe **services should be separate from housing**. The vast majority of our members use services and live in housing that is not connected to these services, and in fact thousands of Austinites with disabilities use this model and have done so for decades.

A huge part of this today is **housing that is not tied to services**, either by one provider providing both housing and services OR by qualifying for housing based on need of services or having to go through a service provider. In other words, your **eligibility for housing should not depend on services**. Your landlord should not run your life and your service provider should not either. If you lose your services you should not therefore lose your housing, and vice versa. Supportive housing (permanent supportive housing, whatever name you give it) is not the only model and it shouldn't even be the primary model because it serves only a tiny fraction of those who need housing and services.

Nursing Homes and other institutions are not housing, and should not be considered as such. Austin should include **people who live in nursing homes and other institutions as part of our population**, even though they are not counted in the Census (Austin's demographics on disability are PATHETIC! City demographer doesn't even really try.)

When we segment who we are going to house (veterans, homeless, seniors, etc.) we make housing harder. We should be creating universal housing and beef up the supports and services – through service dollars and programs, not scarce housing funds -- so that we make sure the people we want housed can be housed and live their own lives as they see fit.

AFFORDABILITY

People with disabilities frequently live on very-low, fixed incomes. Only about 30% of people with disabilities are employed; the majority work at low wage jobs. People with significant disabilities have even fewer opportunities for employment. People trapped in institutions receive a monthly "allowance" of approximately \$60, making it impossible to save enough for a security deposit or to buy the most basic necessities to move into the community, like furniture, curtains, bedding or cookware.

Many **people with disabilities living in the community have incomes well below 15% of Austin Area Median Income (AMI). People with disabilities are unable to afford much of the housing that is considered "affordable" by non-disabled standards.** This can target people whose incomes are 80%, sometimes even 120% AMI; how is someone at 15% or below supposed to access that? Tax credits are not the panacea; this housing too is beyond the payment ability of many people with significant disabilities.

Housing vouchers serve perhaps 10% of those who need this level of housing assistance and many, many places that are affordable with a voucher will not take them. **Discrimination based on source of income is a huge problem for our members. Austin needs to find alternative ways to address this, not just let the Apartment Association win.**

We need more truly affordable housing for people with disabilities; housing that is not tied to services or "type" of person (veteran, senior, homeless, etc.).

ACCESSIBILITY

Housing that is not accessible to the people living in it is substandard housing.

In the 1990s ADAPT was working on getting people who wanted out, out of nursing homes, but the biggest barrier was a lack of housing for people to move into. We wondered why? Our research found over 60% of the housing in Austin that was supposed to be accessible was not, the city had not bothered to enforce federal accessibility requirements. ADAPT filed a complaint against the city and HUD ruled in our favor with a VCA – Voluntary Compliance Agreement. But by the time all this was done many of these housing units had changed hands and the original contracts were unenforceable. Probably **thousands of accessible units were lost to our community.** Though we have made some headway in this arena (better awareness and enforcement of the requirements, the Visitability Ordinance, SMART housing access requirements), **this deficit has never truly been made up.**

Passage of housing codes that are similar to Fair Housing and Section 504 access requirements have helped create more housing that is accessible, but compliance is far from perfect. The Architectural Barrier Removal Program has helped some, but the program needs to be streamlined as qualifying is too complex. Yet strong enforcement of accessibility requirements is still critical. The Austin Tenant's Council has found the greatest percent of their discrimination complaints are discrimination based on disability.

ACCESSIBLE, AFFORDABLE, INTEGRATED HOUSING

This is housing built to accommodate people with varying abilities, as is already required by law. It is affordable to people at the lowest income levels. It integrates people with and without disabilities, treating us as what we are: people.

WHAT WE WANT

ADAPT wants to see YOU Mayor Adler and the City of Austin embrace and support Accessible, Affordable, Integrated Housing. We want your help to achieve these goals:

Right now, the vast majority of emphasis in Austin's housing efforts is toward Supportive and similar type housing programs. We want Accessible, Affordable Integrated to receive Austin housing funding commensurate with the percent of the population that will use this kind of housing, or at minimum equal to supportive housing funding. Beef up supports in your services budget, by all means, but housing should be for all and separate from housing.

We want equal weight in grant and loan program scoring and in all similar ways that housing is considered, evaluated and supported.

Austin has vouchers for veterans, for homeless people, for people with AIDS; you need vouchers for people who are coming out of nursing homes and institutions. In addition, Austin should make use of the state's 811 program.

Austin needs to focus on housing for people at and below 20% MFI. This housing should be near main arterial transportation and nearer to the center of town, rather than farther out.

Austin needs to recognize nursing homes and other institutions are not housing, and give equal priority to assisting people who want out of these human warehouses, as they give homeless people. (In ADAPT's view they *are* homeless.)

Austin needs to adopt a housing integration policy like the state's housing integration policy.

Austin needs to pursue alternate ways to ensure people with housing vouchers can find places that accept these vouchers.

Austin needs to increase accessibility targets for housing, and not support housing that is not accessible like townhomes and tiny houses.

Austin needs to extend affordability requirements for housing it funds, and work to continue the agreements it currently has with housing that is currently affordable and accessible.

Austin needs better demographics on disability available to the public and to city staff.

Improve ABR Program so it is easier to qualify and use by both homeowners and renters.

You need to meet with ADAPT on a quarterly basis to discuss these and related disability issues.

August 10, 2016

The Honorable Mayor Adler
Honorable City Council members
City of Austin Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Office

Re: Austin Strategic Housing Plan

Dear Mayor and City of Austin Council Members,
AIA Austin is a member-driven professional association of local architects who practice in a variety of fields including residential, commercial, institutional, and interior architecture, as well as urban design. As design professionals we are uniquely interested in the performance and quality of the built environment, the fabric of our city. The lack of affordable and reasonably priced housing options within Austin affects us, our colleagues, our employees, and our clients.

We encourage the adoption of the Austin Strategic Housing Plan as it outlines a variety of policies which would begin to address many of our current challenges in offering housing choices at attainable prices/rental rates.

The City has long had policies such as VMU Bonuses and the SMART Housing Policy which incentivize affordable housing in larger, developer-driven housing developments.

The Austin Strategic Housing Plan goes further, encouraging flexibility at the individual homeowner level which will benefit a large number of existing Austinites.

Small Infill Projects are of great importance. Many of the opportunities for providing additional homes exist within the backyards of individual residents. These residents could greatly benefit from having an additional dwelling on their property, either in the form of rental income which makes their household more affordable, or by bringing young adult children or aging parents closer. This type of one-off “infill” should be encouraged.

1. Limit new regulation. Additional requirements only increase the barrier to entry for residential remodel and new construction. All new initiatives, no matter how worthy a cause, should be carefully scrutinized for the unintended consequences that may result in additional fees, permitting time, and construction cost. Whenever possible, programs should work as an optional incentive with some added benefit to the project rather than an across-the-board requirement which might exclude participation all together.
2. Prioritize remodel/addition and ADU permits. Updating an existing home in most cases results in less perceived change of scale and character from the average passing neighbor. The city should expedite permits which fall in these categories.
3. Incentivize protecting existing trees. Existing trees (regardless of regulatory classification) define the character of many Austin neighborhoods and provide important shade, heat reduction, and in many cases visual separation between homes. Critical root zones can impose significant challenges when combined with set-backs and other restrictions. The City should offer slight bonuses of FAR and/or Impervious Cover allowances to effectively incentivize the preservation of existing trees.

Utility costs are a major factor of household affordability. The City should review existing programs which encourage weatherization as well as efficient household appliances, fixtures, and mechanical systems. Consider how to actively seek participation from both renters and landlords.

Transportation options can open more residential opportunities. We applaud the plan for addressing the invaluable role the pedestrian and transit network plays in the housing equation. However, in order to be effective for daily life, transit must work as a round-trip system. This means pedestrians must be able to safely cross the street near each end of their trip. Crosswalks are a critical component if we hope to leverage transportation options relative to housing needs. This is especially true on core transit corridors and other busy streets where long blocks, multiple lanes, and speeding cars prohibit safe crossing.

Missing Middle Housing typologies offer a transitional scale while providing diversity of home types that accommodate the housing needs of various age groups, family sizes, and incomes. Missing Middle Housing can provide options for context-sensitive urban infill.

Subdivision requirements could allow for better utilization of available land. Currently, new single-family subdivisions (regardless of land area or relative location) are required to dedicate a 50' wide right-of-way for streets and require a 25' front yard set-back on each side effectively resulting in a 100' wide swath of unbuildable land. Multiplied across the 50' minimum lot width this equates to 5,000sf of under-utilized land for each pair of homes on a double loaded street. At this time, the best option for avoiding such significant losses is to apply for an up-zoning to SF-6, a time consuming and expensive task hardly appealing to seasoned developers let alone smaller organizations attempting to construct a more modest project. The city should look for opportunities to either loosen the subdivision standards or expedite up-zoning on urban parcels available for subdividing in order to maximize the efficient use of these parcels in providing additional homes.

Small Residential Developments require city assistance to facilitate Affordable Housing Bonuses. The City should consider the options available that would allow for a City-run trust similar to the one utilized at Mueller, which would assist smaller for-sale condo developments in managing the 99 year term for affordable units sold at a loss in exchange for density bonuses.

AIA Austin appreciates the efforts of City staff in preparing the Austin Housing Plan. Austin's struggle to provide plenty of affordable and reasonably priced homes directly or indirectly affects all of us who live, work, and play in Austin. We support this plan and look forward to its implementation.



Jim Susman
2016 President
AIA Austin

To whom it may concern:

This letter is to provide our formal feedback regarding the draft housing plan, both that which is posted on the city website as well as items discussed in a public presentation given to AURA on November 9th, 2016. We appreciate the time spent with our group, and we appreciate the opportunity to provide our feedback.

AURA stands for an Austin for Everyone, and nowhere is this more important than in building a city that provides enough housing for all residents who want to live here. Currently there are many invisible walls built around some neighborhoods and we feel strongly that these walls must come down.

We applaud the city's efforts to create a housing plan that will address the needs for both market rate and affordable units. This is key to addressing housing for all levels of income. While we advocate for more density overall, we recognize that simple supply can never meet the need for "deeply affordable" units. Likewise, we recognize that subsidizing all units for up to 80% MFI is an enormous cost that cannot be borne by the city, either politically or fiscally.

In reviewing the housing plan, we found there were some areas that needed more clarity as well as more bold options. For example, the draft plan provided an extensive list of options that could be explored, but without realistic estimates for the cost, the value, and the actual ability to accomplish, it leaves the reader untethered. We need more clarity around each proposed tool, what its costs are, what its benefits are, and how achievable it is. This could be provided as a matrix where the X-axis is ease/cost of implementation and the Y-axis is number of units/public benefit. When this matrix is divided into quadrants, it will become very clear which of the tools provides the most good for the least cost (sometimes free, such as allowing smaller houses and smaller lots) and should be implemented immediately. It will also identify areas where less funding should be allocated based on the limited pool of dollars we have to affect the most number of households.

There were items suggested that have little chance of achievability, and we need to recognize that. In particular, suggestions to work with the Texas state legislature to allow rent control are basically non-starters in our current political climate, and we need to be realistic that this will likely not happen (at least not in the next 10 years).

Other areas where we found issue are the overall definitions of affordability. As is clear from speaking with AHCD staff, everyone knows that transportation costs in the Austin area are higher than the national average, costing households upwards of \$11,983 per year due the increased miles driven (see data [here](#)). This is a huge burden on families and contributes to the struggle many face. "Affordable" needs to recognize that building housing near Decker lake may be "cheap" but the transportation costs will be astronomical, erasing the benefit to living in an affordable unit. Housing advocates generally recommend that no more than 45% of a household's income be spent on housing and transportation.

An area of great concern to us is the desire to put a number on the percent of new housing that will be on Imagine Austin corridors and centers. In particular, the number we heard was 75%. This is unacceptable, as we feel that ADUs, townhouses, duplexes, fourplexes, and other “missing middle” housing types should be allowed everywhere, not just in transition zones $\frac{1}{4}$ mile from a corridor or activity center. We recommend removal of this target completely. If it must exist, it should be 50% or below, or should say within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of centers and corridors.

We also recommend that the housing plan include options for pre-approved plans for missing middle housing types, such as duplexes, ADUs, and fourplexes. This decreases the soft costs for small investors and homeowners looking to maximize their property. Many cannot afford to hire an architect or wade through the complex development approval process. Simplifying this will decrease costs.

Thank you very much for your hard work in service to the city and we look forward to the final housing plan.

Regards

AURA

Members

Accessible Housing Austin!
Austin Community Design & Development Center
Austin Habitat for Humanity
Blackland Community Development Corporation
Caritas of Austin
Chestnut Neighborhood Revitalization Corporation
College Houses
Ending Community Homelessness Coalition (ECHO)
Foundation Communities
Frameworks Community Development Corporation
Guadalupe Neighborhood Development Corporation
HousingWorks Austin
Jeremiah Program
LifeWorks
Meals on Wheels Central Texas
National Church Residences
Neighbors United for Progress
Triple Bottom Line Foundation (ICAST)

August 9, 2016

To Council Members and City Staff;

RE: Austin Housing Coalition position on Draft City of Austin Housing Plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

First and foremost, we extend our deep appreciation to the City of Austin, and specifically Neighborhood Housing & Community Development, for creating the draft of a formalized and well-considered affordable Housing Plan. This effort aligns with key recommendations we provided in our 2011 CHDO Roundtable Position Paper (see attached).

Nevertheless, it is our resolute position, as the consortium of affordable housing providers in the City of Austin, that the Housing Plan needs considerable work to achieve its full potential as a robust, goal-setting framework with clearly defined strategies to successfully address Austin's burgeoning housing affordability crisis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

IDENTIFYING THE NEED + SETTING THE GOALS

On pg. 6, the 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Study is rightly referenced as one measure of need – a housing shortage of 48,000 units at or below 30% MFI. However, there is an additional massive and growing shortage of housing for families 30-120% MFI. These numbers are generally current. In ten years, these needs will only increase.

- 1) INCREASE AFFORDABLE UNIT GOAL:** AHC's (Austin Housing Coalition) position is that the Housing Plan's Goals & Targets (pg. 11) are not sufficiently ambitious. The goals should directly aim at current conditions plus projected 10-year increases. The Housing Plan's 35,000-unit goal (80% MFI and below) is dramatically low and fails to account for almost certain significant loss of unsubsidized affordable units.
- We recommend NHCD work with the City Demographer, or other departments, to identify a rigorous methodology for developing a comprehensive affordable unit goal. We would not be surprised if the result doubled or tripled the currently identified goal.
- 2) GOALS BY INCOME LEVEL:** The Housing Plan needs defined sub-goals targeted by income level. The deeper analysis of need, as described above, must inform these goals.
- 3) HOME OWNER SUPPORT:** The Housing Plan needs well-defined goals for affordable home ownership units and home repair (also by income level).
- 4) ACTIONABLE STRATEGIES:** The Housing Plan needs to identify an overall, integrated strategy for success that goes beyond the diagram on pg. 12. The City needs a complete roadmap with actionable strategies with a timeline organized by 1-year goals, 2-3 year goals, 3-5 year goals, etc.
- 5) 20% MFI UNITS:** There is a deep need for units at or below 20% MFI for renters without access to housing vouchers. We commend the included Target to address this need, but it should be considerably higher.
- 6) AFFORDABLE, ACCESSIBLE, INTEGRATED:** AHC supports the model of affordable, accessible, integrated housing for people with disabilities. 100% of all new-construction affordable housing units should be adaptable.

- 7) **INCLUDE PUBLIC HOUSING:** Neither the City of Austin's nor Travis County's public housing authorities' goals are included in the Housing Plan. HACA and HATC are key players and they need to be included.
- 8) **REGIONAL PLANNING:** Though the City of Austin cannot set regional goals alone, the Housing Plan needs to stress the importance of regional affordable housing planning efforts.
- 9) **REMOVE MARKET UNIT TARGET:** Since NHCD has no agency in the production of market units, we believe it is neither necessary nor useful for NHCD to specify a market-unit goal.

KEY POLICIES + PROGRAMS

Starting on pg. 13, the Housing Plan describes a laudable list of potential policies. However, the language used and description of said policies does not rise to the necessary level of clearly defined strategies with timelines and prioritized action steps structured to achieve success.

- 10) **PRIORITIZE MOST IMPACTFUL:** The policies and programs need to be re-organized to prioritize and highlight those with the most potential impact.

Example: "Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program" (pg. 20) has enormous potential impact on affordable unit production by market rate developers (if the program is revised quickly and well). This program should be prioritized in the Housing Plan accordingly.

- 11) **WHAT AND BY WHEN:** Each program or policy needs to be written with actionable language with explicit guidance to City Council on what steps need to be taken and by when.

Example: Under "Prevent Displacement of Low-Income Homeowners" (pg. 13), the City cannot merely "explore". Instead, actionable steps need to be clearly identified.

MONITORING + WELCOME CENTER

- 12) **CENTRALIZED MONITORING STRUCTURE:** To achieve the affordability goals, a large percentage of projected units will have to be developed by market rate developers (S.M.A.R.T. Housing, density bonus programs, etc.) Currently, there is no centralized structure for the City, for developers or for potential income-qualified tenants to track units, know where they are located or identify vacancies. With the dramatic increases in such units required, NHCD needs the budget and staff to implement such a centralized structure for everyone's sake.

- 13) **WELCOME CENTER:** If we are going to have any hope for success, market rate developers must be welcomed with direct support and assistance in building affordable units under S.M.A.R.T. Housing or density bonus programs. With a thoughtful, customer service-oriented approach, a Welcome Center could transform what currently occurs as another hurdle put up by the City into a catalyst for market rate participation. This Welcome Center needs to be one of the first priorities in the Housing Plan.

VISIONARY LEADER

With the current vacancy of the NHCD Directorship, City Council and the City Manager have the opportunity to hire a visionary leader that can guide NHCD and invigorate the implementation of the Housing Plan over the next 10 years. Please carefully review the Director's job description with an eye to leadership with a powerful voice for advocacy and implementation.


However, please do not postpone the adoption of the Housing Plan until a new Director is hired. We need an updated Housing Plan now.

CONCLUSION

As NHCD suggests (pg. 10), without sufficient and dispersed housing for Austinites at a range of incomes, Austin *will* become a city accessible only to the affluent and privileged with paradigmatic consequences for Austin's quality of life, transportation network, job retention, fair housing legalities, and environmental condition.

Finally, the Austin Housing Plan needs to be just that, a Plan with explicit strategies and a correlated implementation timeline. Please give NHCD staff the support they need to revise the plan to become the most actionably ambitious Housing Plan in the country.

Sincerely,



Sunshine Mathon
Austin Housing Coalition, Chair





A Time for Solutions

We are proposing a three-pronged approach:

Identify the Goals

- Design a portfolio of all the housing types Austin wants to develop between now and 2021.¹⁰
- Set long-term (ten year) targets, with shorter term objectives.
- Correlate the goals to the needs, using a consistent methodology across the spectrum, for example: 40% of current needs over next ten years .
- On a quarterly basis, produce clear and concise reports on housing needs and numbers of housing units, using MFI levels as a consistent methodology for data collection and analysis.
- Annually review gaps between goals and needs against the ten-year targets.
- Based on review, annually adjust scoring of applications to prioritize funding in areas where needs remain and development capacity exists.
- Per the CHDO Roundtable’s 2009 recommendation, build in a transparent, predictable and consistent system for evaluating whether funds should be transferred from one “bucket” to another and for doing so if needed.
- Recognize the wide variety of people and households who need permanent supportive housing.

Make Plans Driven By The Goals

- Align Action Plan and Consolidated Plan with Housing Authority of City of Austin and Travis County Housing Authority master plans to create the 2021 Portfolio.
- Integrate these goals with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Integrate these goals with the GO affordable housing bond election.

Create the Means

- ✓ Aggressively promote additional GO bond funding for affordable housing.
- ✓ Implement a viable land-banking strategy¹¹.
- ✓ Innovate and replicate best practices across the continuum, including a community land trust.
- ✓ Creatively develop new funding sources both for supportive services and for housing.
- ✓ Expand S.M.A.R.T. housing resources.

As a community, Austin should embrace planning policies and principles that encourage “all types of homes in all parts of town.” Our resources should be guided by our core values of geographic dispersion, long term affordability, and deeper affordability.

As detailed in this report, the CHDO Roundtable recommends a collaborative, flexible, and predictable approach for meeting Austin’s growing housing needs along the entire Housing Continuum.

NOTES

1. Comprehensive Housing Market Study, 2009
2. Austin Business Journal, January 6, 2011
3. Austin Business Journal, February 14, 2011
4. ATCIC/HMIS 2011 Annual Homeless Assessment Report
5. Comprehensive Housing Market Study, 2009
6. 2010 Corporation for Supportive Housing Permanent Supportive Housing Program and Financial Model for Austin/Travis County, Texas
7. ATCIC/HMIS 2011 Annual Homeless Assessment Report
8. Comprehensive Housing Market Study, 2009
9. Austin Housing Repair Coalition’s Housing Repair Needs Assessment, February 22, 2011.
10. The 2009 Comprehensive Housing Market Study recommended that the City of Austin set affordable housing five, ten and twelve-year targets through 2020 (Section VII, p. 5).
11. The 2009 Comprehensive Housing Market Study recommended that the City of Austin “explore partnerships with school districts, utility companies, and other public landowners” to establish a land-banking program (Section VII, p.8)



Meeting Austin’s Affordable Housing Needs Across the Spectrum

Austin is facing unprecedented challenges in addressing the housing needs of its lower income citizens. Funding for housing and supportive services has experienced steady reduction in past years and is now poised to suffer the most severe cuts in decades.

For this reason, the city’s current NHCD Action Plan and the proposed upcoming General Obligation Bond election provide critical opportunities to thoughtfully prepare for badly needed funding and to design a meaningful, goal-driven allocation process that can be sustained over the next ten years.

As members of the Austin CHDO Roundtable, we are intimately familiar with the barriers our clients face in obtaining safe, decent and affordable housing; whether that be a chronically homeless woman living on the streets or a single father struggling to feed and house his children on minimum wage. Our organizations work to house people with disabilities, the homeless, youth aging out of foster care, extremely low-income families, the elderly, people in dilapidated homes, and low-income, first-time homebuyers. We have come together to collectively assess our own housing production capacity, to present consolidated data on needs, and to propose coordinated strategies for meeting the affordable housing needs of people across the entire affordable housing spectrum.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this paper is to present and recommend a balanced approach to address the housing needs of Austinites with low incomes—a population that represents half of the city’s population¹. Our five central recommendations are:

1. Recognize the housing needs of **all** lower-income Austinites and reaffirm a commitment to addressing them.
2. Revise the Annual and Consolidated Plan process to use current, consistent data and analysis across the housing continuum, filling in existing gaps.
3. Set specific goals across the entire spectrum of affordable housing needs for numbers of units over one, five and ten-year periods, while maintaining flexibility and a predictable process to revise priorities on an annual basis.
4. Creatively seek new sources of revenue for affordable housing and supportive services.
5. Increase the priority of funding CHDOs and nonprofits in order to achieve the core values of **deeper affordability, longer-term affordability and geographic dispersion.**



In the summer of 2010, the Austin CHDO Roundtable membership polled its membership on each CHDO’s opportunities to develop housing and aggregated the data for these opportunities (this includes some projects that were just allocated funding in December). We found that, given the resources, our membership was positioned at the time to develop 1249 units, comprised of 999 units of new rental and ownership housing and 250 home repairs.

What does this tell us?

First, it is important to recognize that this snapshot, if taken in a different year, might look quite different, thereby creating a need for a long-term strategy. Second, projecting that this represents opportunities over a two to three year span, it demonstrates that CHDOs can deliver approximately 500 units of new or preserved housing per year to the community. Finally, and most importantly, this snapshot proves that CHDOs are able to do the hardest work of meeting Austin’s affordable housing needs by addressing the core values of **geographic dispersion, deep affordability** and **long-term affordability**.

By Income Level	no. units	% units (rounded)
30% MFI and under	368	30%
30-50% MFI	541	43%
50-60% MFI	214	17%
60-80%	126	10%
Total	1249	100%
By Geographic Distribution		
East of IH-35	904	72%
West of IH-35	345	28%
Total	1249	100%
By Affordability Period		
0-40 years	255	20%
41-99 years	744	60%
Unspecified (housing repair program)	250	20%
Total	1249	100%

Austin’s Affordable Housing Needs ... All of Them 458 of 535

A number of reports focusing on Austin and Travis County have identified needs spanning across income levels and types of affordable housing. These numbers represent people ranging from the severely disabled to the working poor who are struggling to keep their homes, pay their utilities, and keep their family members fed.

A quick glance at the headlines reveals that the gaps between available housing and those who need it are on the brink of widening: the rental market is tightening², foreclosures are up³, and major layoffs are about to take place at the state, in local school districts, and at non-profits, potentially sending more households into economic distress.

Type of housing	Estimated gap (housing units)
Emergency shelter	1004 beds ⁴
Affordable rental housing for below 30% MFI (includes supportive and transitional housing)	39,000 households ⁵ , of which:
	1,891 units of permanent supportive housing for currently homeless individuals and families with one or more chronic and disabling conditions ⁶
	Data is needed for permanent supportive housing for households not currently counted as homeless (e.g., adults with brain injuries, elderly, etc.)
Affordable rental housing for between 30% and 80% MFI	4,488 units of deeply affordable housing with transitional support services OR transitional housing for single adults and families with children. ⁷
	Data is need for households in the 30-50%, 50-60%, and 60-80% MFI ranges.
Homeownership	13,600 homes affordable to buyers earning between \$35,000 and \$75,000 per year ⁸ .
Home repair	13,286 homes ⁹



As a reference, the CHDO Roundtable members found that, given the resources, they would be positioned to develop the array of housing units shown in the chart at right.

The membership of the Austin CHDO Roundtable view these as a call to action for community leaders to seek solutions for people across the entire spectrum of housing needs.

By Types of Units	no. units	% units (rounded)
Supportive housing for people needing services in order to stay housed (e.g. chronically homeless & people with severe disabilities)	203	16%
Transitional housing	2	0.2%
Affordable rental <ul style="list-style-type: none">for households at or below 60% MFIfor households 60-80% MFI	506	41%
	15	1%
Homeownership for households between 30% and 80% MFI	273	22%
Home repair for households at or below 50% MFI	250	20%
Total	1249	100%

The housing plan contains many sections, which strongly reflect Austin's needs and values. The following relates to sections which could be more complete, clear, or attuned to Austin needs.

1. Core values: In 2007 Council adopted core values for affordable housing programs. These values guided the City's recent audit of the Neighborhood Housing Department (NHCD). However, the draft plan does not mention these values, which are:
 - a. Deeper Affordability Targets: It is desirable to reach deeper levels of affordability, i.e., to serve lower-income households.
 - b. Long-term Affordability: We value housing units that will remain affordable over the long term; and,
 - c. Geographic Dispersion: Affordable housing should be dispersed throughout the city.

Recommendation: Use the core values to frame the plan as detailed below.

- a. Deeper Affordability
The plan reports 48,000 households with income below \$25,000 need affordable housing now, or in U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) terms, extremely low-income families or families with income below 30% of Median Family Income (MFI). Yet the Funding Mechanisms on p. 12 show a goal to house 30,000 families with income up to 80% MFI, which the plan projects will be added to current needs over the next 10 years.

Recommendation: Set goals to meet the housing needs of all low-income families by funding source and by 0-30, 30-50, 50-80% MFI groups.

Housing mismatch data misrepresents need

The plan states: "there is not sufficient product for people with both very low and very high incomes. These households are being forced to compete for limited housing supply in the middle."

People with \$100,000 incomes are not "forced to compete" for low cost homes. They choose to spend less. Nothing says that creating units in their "affordable" price range will cause them to leave their current homes for more costly ones. Publishing mismatch data distorts our focus on housing the most vulnerable Austinites as the Concordia PUD developer did when he used similar City data to justify 135% and 150% MFI rents over commonly accepted affordable rents.

Severe cost burden statistics from HUD are much more relevant:

- 74% of households under 30% MFI;
- 36% of households from 30 to 50% MFI;
- 9% from 50 to 80% MFI;
- 4% from 80 to 100% MFI; and
- less than 1% above 120% MFI pay over half their income for housing.

Recommendation: Replace text about forced competition and Figure 3 with a new figure and an explanation of the burden of paying over half of one's income for housing and how severe cost burden disproportionately affects the lowest income households. Remove references to incomes of \$100,000 and \$150,000.

b. Long-term affordability

The affordability periods in Figure 7 on p. 12 are shorter than the horizon of the draft plan and possibly shorter than the affordability periods actually in use. For example, the plan projects that SMART Housing will create 4,210 affordable units in the next ten years. However, these units will be affordable for only one to five years. The City audit faulted NHCD for counting these short affordability periods toward long-term goals. Also, the draft plan states that federal funds have shorter minimum affordability periods. However, a longer period could be set.

Recommendation: Revise all City housing programs to meet 40 to 99 year standards and count only programs with 40 year or longer affordability periods.

c. Geographic dispersion

The draft plan clearly describes the importance of housing choice and the consequences to the city of denying choice. The plan repeats that the City will complete the action steps in its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing and notes that 10% of housing in each zip code should be affordable to people below 30% MFI, but does not elaborate on how this goal will be met. The plan sets a goal that 25% of housing created under the plan will have two bedrooms so as to promote choice for families, but does not address how it will end a pattern of City-supported 2-bedroom units serving households without children.

The draft plan refers to CodeNext as increasing housing choice in activity centers and corridors. A line on p. 11 would set a unit goal for centers and corridors but the goal is blank. The plan refers to a density bonus and suggests "missing middle" housing might be affordable, but with no details. Without details the public should not support the CodeNext sections. Furthermore, all future affordable housing cannot be segregated to activity centers or corridors.

Gentrification is rapidly limiting the choice of families to remain in certain neighborhoods. On p. 13, the plan recognizes the value of programs such as GO Repairs, weatherization, or Architecture Barrier Removal in helping families to remain in their homes in gentrifying neighborhoods, but sets no goals.

Recommendations:

- Set a preference for renting or selling family friendly housing stock created with city support or incentives to families with children.
- Include goals to help residents stay in their gentrifying neighborhoods.

- Provide details on CodeNext so that the public can comment on whether missing middle housing and incentives will meet affordable housing goals.
- Take the City's entitlement incentives (e.g., density bonus) to the next level: Require incentive units to accept rent vouchers; Grant nonprofits a first right of refusal to purchase for sale incentive units for rent to families below 30% MFI; Mirror the bedroom mix of market rate units in incentive units; and Monitor how incentive program units serve members of protected classes.
- Establish a greenfield affordable housing density bonus to meet demand for single family housing outside of activity centers and corridors.

2. Comprehensive planning, monitoring and evaluation of City housing plan

The draft plan provides no description or schedule for evaluation.

- a. Comprehensive process: For years, the City planned its affordable housing programs in one process in which Council passed the housing budget, including local budget items in July, in time to meet a HUD deadline. With a change of city manager, the local housing budget process was divorced from the federal budget process and transparency of the local planning process suffered.

Recommendation: Adopt a single budget action plan annually with a combined local / federal evaluation process in conjunction with the current federal process.

- b. Incentive units: With increasing production of affordable units through incentive programs, the city auditor has noted the lack of resources to monitor compliance with incentive requirements. One aspect of monitoring, which the City included in the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, is to monitor incentive units for compliance with fair housing, specifically to assure that members of protected classes under the Fair Housing Act have a chance to rent or buy incentive units.

Recommendation: Conduct a best practices study to determine how other jurisdictions affirmatively market and monitor incentive units.

3. Correspondence of data: Some data does not correspond with other data.

- p. 8 references overlapping income groups, \$0 - \$25,000 then \$20,000 - \$39,000.
- p.8: references 121% MFI instead of 120% MFI.
- p. 12: Should Strike Fund units be counted on acquisition or when they go into an affordable program? Should units with affordability under 40 years count?
- p.18: "GO Bonds...provided rental assistance" How does that square with City policy to use bonds only for activities with a longer life than the bond term?
- p.18: How does the goal for adaptability surpass visitability requirements?
- The appendix states that an average cost of \$31,500 was used to project units. But p. 3 uses a different per unit cost to close the gap.

HOUSING STRATEGY AND DENSITY BONUSES

Stuart Harry Hersh [REDACTED]

The 6/6/16 Austin Strategic Housing Plan draft is not a path to housing affordability for Austin, but is a good description of what others are doing elsewhere.

Page 11 of the draft sets a 40,000 market rate housing unit goal. This seems unnecessary since market rate housing is created by builders and bankers. The 7/19/16 City of Austin Multi Family Report reminds us that “there are now over 40,000 upstream units headed toward what has got to be a maturing market”. Why would market rate housing be a strategic goal for City staff given what is already in the pipeline?

What is the 160 home repair goal with \$3,000,000 in 2016-2017 funding recommended by the Austin Home Repair Coalition and the Austin Housing Coalition not in the City staff draft budget when we supposedly embrace homeownership and safe housing for the poorest among us, particularly in neighborhoods facing gentrification pressures?

Where are the goals in the draft 2016-2017 budget that move us toward the 35,000 affordability housing unit production highlighted in the Strategic Housing Plan? What are the affordability sub-goals for Mueller, the University Neighborhood Overlay, Colony Park, city owned land and other sites where S.M.A.R.T. Housing production is expected? I hope we can discuss this at a future Committee and Council meeting. 8/1/16

DENSITY BONUS

The Density Bonus Report contains much information about what other cities do to achieve housing affordability that exist in a different legislative context than Texas. Here are the questions that should have been asked and answered:

1. Why was the University Neighborhood Overlay able to achieve on-site affordability and fee-in-lieu payments or 50% Median Family Income rental housing units when other density bonus initiatives failed to do so?
2. Why were none of the 50 Rainey Street affordable housing units required to be affordable for more than one day, and no applications filed in Rainey since the 5% of dwelling unit square footage standard replaced the 5% of housing unit standard in Rainey?
3. How do the density bonuses roll up to 35,000 affordable housing unit production goal describe in the Austin Strategic Housing Plan? Where can this information be found in the 2016-2015 draft City budget?
4. Is there a plan to replace housing in Austin for homeowners who participated in Flood Plain buyouts in Onion and Williamson creeks respectively?
5. Why aren't rental housing goals at 50% Median Family Income rather than 60% Median Family Income given the two most recent housing market studies?

If you are interested I am prepared to offer some preliminary answers.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY PERFORMANCE GOALS AND TERMS

Stuart Harry Hersh [REDACTED]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME (MFI) Published annually for Austin area based on family size

MODERATE INCOME = 80-120% MFI

LOW INCOME=50-80% MFI

VERY LOW INCOME=30-50% MFI

EXTREMELY LOW INCOME=Below 30% MFI

REASONABLY PRICED=Spends no more than maximum rent/mortgage based on income level and housing type/bedroom type published annually for the Austin area

PORTFOLIO OF HOUSING AFFORDABILITY= Each property required to continue to meet level of housing affordability

REHABILITATION = Any work undertaken in an existing building (INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE = IEBC)

REPAIR=patching or restoration or replacement of damaged materials, elements, equipment or fixtures for the purpose of maintaining such components in good or sound condition with respect to existing loads or performance requirements. Work on non-damaged components shall be considered part of the repair. (IEBC)

ALTERATION LEVEL 1 = Removal and replacement or the covering of existing materials, elements, equipment or fixtures that serve the same purpose (IEBC)

ALTERATION 2 = includes the reconfiguration of space, the addition or elimination of any door or window, the reconfiguration or extension of any system, or the installation of any additional equipment (IEBC)

ALTERATION LEVEL 3 = Where the work area exceeds 50% of the aggregate area of the building (IEBC)

**COMMISSION ON SENIORS RECOMMENDATION 20161109-03A**

Date: November 9, 2016

Subject: Recommendations on the Draft Austin Housing Plan

Motioned By: Vice Chair Varteressian

Seconded By: Commissioner Gray

Recommendation

The Commission on Seniors recommends 1) incorporating the goals and strategies of the Age Friendly Austin Action Plan into the Draft Austin Housing Plan and 2) including a strategy and sufficient funding to expand and publicize home repair, maintenance and modification assistance for seniors, consistent with the third goal in the Housing Domain of the Age Friendly Austin Action Plan.

Description of Recommendation to Council

The recently adopted Age Friendly Austin Action Plan includes the following goals and strategies related to affordable housing for seniors:

Goal: Expand and promote the development of diverse housing options that are affordable for seniors of different income levels.

Strategies:

1. Encourage the development of new and innovative models of affordable housing (multigenerational, co-housing/cooperative housing).
2. Increase and prioritize funding for affordable housing for seniors (housing bonds, housing trust fund).
3. Expedite the City's permitting process and promote flexible zoning.
4. Increase outreach and community awareness about diverse housing options.
5. Increase access to rent and utility assistance programs to keep seniors in their homes.

Goal: Support and expand affordable housing options for seniors.

Strategies:

1. Fund improvements and renovations of public housing for low-income seniors.
2. Replicate successful models of mixed income senior housing communities and encourage redevelopment.
3. Address the impact of increasing property taxes.

Goal: Expand assistance for affordable home repair, maintenance and modification for seniors of all income levels.

Strategies:

1. Expand support for the Austin Housing Repair Coalition.
2. Increase home access for seniors through design modification that improves safety and "visitability."
3. Improve access to energy efficiency and weatherization programs.
4. Expand the Village concept to engage volunteers and neighbors to help with simple, preventative maintenance.

Rationale:

The greater Austin area is experiencing rapid growth in the population of residents age 55 and older. Affordable and accessible housing is a primary concern for Austin residents as they age. Austin currently lacks affordable housing options for those seniors who wish to age in place in their own homes, as well as those who would like the option of living in a housing community designed for seniors.

Vote


For: Briesemeister, Varteressian, Bordie, Cagle, Cohen, Garcia-Pittman, Gray, Kareithi, Lugo, DeMaria Nicola, Van Sickle.

Against: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Lauck, McDowell, Pruett

Attest: Janee Briesemeister, Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Janee Briesemeister", written over a horizontal line.

Dear Code Advisory Group,

Thank you for discussing the issue of Cooperative Zoning Use at length at your recent meeting on July 11th. I was very excited to see support for the concept and I wanted to address some questions raised.

First, there was some uncertainty as to where group cooperative houses are allowed. Currently the City of Austin considers Co-ops to fall under the Group Residential use. This is a high intensity use that is allowed by right in MF-4 and above and with a Conditional Use Permit in MF-3. Please note that Group Residential is a different use than Group Home and Group Home is allowed in a different set of zoning districts.

The Sustainable Economies Law Center cites three zoning challenges for developing shared housing such as Cooperatives. They are restriction on the number of units on a parcel, restrictions on the relationships of number of occupants per unit, and mandatory parking limits. Allowing the GR use exclusively in high density zoning districts forces local groups to compete against large real estate investment groups and trusts that typically develop MF-3 and above. Additionally, by not extending the GR use to lower-density zoning districts, thus removing the restriction on the number of occupants per unit, co-ops are prevented from locating in these districts, though they would in no way disrupt the character of these communities. It should not be a surprise that currently the majority of co-ops are located in the UNO district, where there are many properties zoned for high density, and where lower parking requirements facilitate cooperative housing.

In order to extend the impact that cooperatives can have in Austin I strongly advocate for a separate Group Co-op use category that allows for more people per unit and reduced parking minimums to be allowed in multi-family and single family districts.

There are a few cities I would recommend Austin look to for best practices in the area of cooperative housing:

- Madison, Wisconsin has a co-op use similar to what I recommend. Their code defines the Housing Cooperative use as ““A residential occupancy where one-hundred percent (100%) of the ownership is held by a Cooperative Corporation organized under Wis. Stat. ch. 185, for the purpose of residential living where the residents share common areas and cooking, dining, and maintenance duties. All residents shall be members of the Cooperative Corporation.” They are allowed in Suburban, urban, and mixed use zoning districts. While this definition largely serves the needs of cooperative housing in Austin, I do have one concern regarding adopting this language. In Austin there is precedent for a co-op to take up a whole floor of a midrise building, and under the Madison definition I am unsure if a Cooperative could operate in a condo regime with other non-cooperative tenants/owners in a large building.
- In Buffalo, New York members of a cooperative are considered to be “related person’s” as they share kitchens, bathrooms, cooking, cleaning, meals, household expenses and management duties of a single household and cooperative corporation. Similarly, Minneapolis is considering a code amendment that allows for co-ops to abide by safety occupancy limits as opposed to unrelated person’s limit.

I hope that the Affordability Working Group includes these examples and recommendations in their final product which will be delivered to staff, consultants, and council.

Sincerely,
Ryan Nill



City of Austin
Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

ECHO BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CORKY HILLIARD, CHAIR
Hilliard Resources

RICK COFER, CO-CHAIR
Travis County District Attorney

RICK MENDOZA, TREASURER
R. Mendoza & Co.

ED MCHORSE, SECRETARY
Graves Dougherty Hearon & Moody

ANN DENTON, MEMBERSHIP
COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc.

DR. DONALD CHRISTIAN
Concordia University

MARSHALL JONES
Bon Vivant Consulting

ALAN ISAACSON

TIM LEAGUE
Alamo Drafthouse Cinema

MARK LITTLEFIELD
Littlefield Consulting

PERRY LORENZ
Constructive Ventures

JUDY MAGGIO
Maggio Media

LAURA MORRISON

BETTY STAEHR

DR. CALVIN STREETER
UT School of Social Work

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Ann Howard

To Whom It May Concern-

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Austin Strategic Housing Plan. As the City's lead agency to end homelessness, our comments focus on the need to develop Housing First Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH).

On Page 11, the Plan states, "Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Targets: Support the production of 50 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units each year, with half of those being Housing First." This goal originates from City Resolution No. 20141002043 passed October 2, 2014 that sets, "a community target of 400 PSH units, with a minimum of 200 dedicated to 'Housing First' PSH, to be delivered through coordinated, community-wide efforts in the next four years. While the goal does not put the burden on the City alone to fund the 400 units, it is a goal set by the Austin City Council and thus implies leadership and ownership of the goal. As such, the production of just 50 units each year as stated in the Draft Plan is too low. **ECHO suggests that the target be "production of 100 units each year," and that the resolution be referenced in the plan (as other resolutions are throughout the plan.)**

On Page 18, the Plan addresses several tools to "Invest in Those in Most Need":

- Pay for Success
- Housing Trust Fund
- Low Income Housing Tax Credits

ECHO requests that NHCD recognize that each of these can be used to develop Housing First PSH. Until enough Housing First PSH exists in Austin, these tools and others should be aligned to ensure production of PSH. NHCD will need to examine their current policies and practices using such tools to understand what modifications need to be made to yield more Housing First PSH.

On Page 20, the Plan addresses different uses of a density bonus, but nowhere does it mention that the Downtown Density Bonus is currently dedicated (City Resolution No. 20130627-105) to low barrier, Housing First Permanent Supportive Housing. ECHO is concerned that as time goes by waiting for the funds to materialize from using the Downtown Density Bonus, policy tweaks might lose sight of this badly needed dedication.

ECHO and stakeholders have worked with staff, council members and mayors to develop the resolution and to identify tools like affordable housing bonds, Pay for Success, trust funds, tax credits and density bonuses that could amount enough funds to develop the needed number of PSH units. We need this plan to further encourage actual use of all these tools to implement the goal.

Sincerely,

Corky Hilliard E-416

Corky Hilliard

December 5, 2016 DRAFT

Feedback for the City of Austin Office of Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Concerning the Austin Strategic Housing Plan

WHEREAS the City of Austin office of Neighborhood Housing and Community Development ("NHCD") released a draft Austin Strategic Plan on June 6, 2016;

WHEREAS the NHCD has requested comments from the Austin community regarding the draft plan;


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the City of Austin Economic Prosperity Commission recommends the NHCD do the following:

1. Incentivize construction of missing middle housing to increase supply in housing stock which is already in high demand.
2. Adjusting lot size minimum and maximums to open the market for the construction of missing middle housing, including small to medium sized homes.
3. Support creative solutions suited to our market needs which mitigate the high cost of land; including housing cooperatives, community land trusts, limited equity models, and micro-units.
4. Support creative financing solutions such as social impact bonds or Pay For Success models.
5. Working with design professionals to develop a catalog of pre-approved, missing middle product types that can receive expedited approval. Further, challenge design professionals and the city to adopt basic uniform specs so that citizens can design and submit their own projects - which would be added to the catalog - and also receive expedited approval.
6. Add flexibility to occupancy limits.

ADOPTED 8/17/16

VOTE: FOR - 9 AGAINST - 0 ABSTAINED - 0 ABSENT - 1 (Segura)

Attested by: _____


John King, Chairman



HousingWorks

AUSTIN

Board of Directors**Emily Chenevert**

Austin Board of REALTORS

Ashton CumberbatchSeton Family of Hospitals &
Austin Bridge Builders Alliance**Catharine Echols**

Liveable City

Frances Ferguson

NeighborWorks America

Michael GerberHousing Authority of the City of
Austin**John Limon**Guadalupe Neighborhood
Development Corporation**Terry Mitchell**MOMARK Development
Capital Metro Board of
Directors**Cile Montgomery**

Inventive

Laura MorrisonFormer City Council Member
Community Leader**Karen Paup**Texas Low Income
Housing Information Service**Chris Peterson**

Rivendale Homes Texas

Mark RogersGuadalupe Neighborhood
Development Corporation**Cookie G. Ruiz, C.F.R.E.**

Ballet Austin

Kathy TylerMotivation Education and
Training, Inc.

August 31, 2016

Rosie Truelove
Interim Director, NHCD

Dear Ms. Truelove:

The City of Austin's department of Neighborhood Housing and Community Development (NHCD) has taken an important step toward increasing our community's affordability by releasing the draft Austin Housing Plan. While the Austin Housing Plan clearly establishes the community's housing needs and provides details on important programs and policies, there are some crucial components that should be added to enhance the plan.

Affordable Housing Goals:

There needs to be a clear distinction between the *overall* goal and the *affordable housing* goal, and the plan's attention should be focused on achieving the goal for *affordable* housing units.

With respect to the affordable housing goal, it would be helpful to frame the strategies in the Core Values previously adopted by the City. These three values —deeper affordability, longer affordability, and geographic dispersion — offer a compelling platform rooted in broadly held common goals.

There should be a clearly articulated, achievable, *yet ambitious* affordable housing goal. The current goal of 75,000 units (35,000 of which are affordable) is not sufficiently ambitious. The plan should rely on the city's historical production of housing units, combined with population projections, to establish a more realistic overall goal. The 35,000 affordable unit goal should similarly be adjusted upward. The 2014 Housing Market Study showed a current gap of 48,000 units (for households earning approximately 30% MFI or less). Accordingly, the affordable housing goal over the next 10 years should be *at least* 48,000 units.

Strategies and Resources:

The Austin Housing Plan details the funding mechanisms to achieve the affordable housing production. Certain estimates will need to be adjusted upward to accommodate the more ambitious affordable housing goals. For example, the estimated yield from the Housing Trust Fund is currently 2,165 units. This is based on projections from December 2015. Subsequent to that time, the list of properties contributing to the Housing Trust Fund was expanded to include both city- and state-owned property. This addition should have a positive impact on the Housing Trust Fund and, thus, the potential units created.

The “other tools” category is currently set at 13,973 units over a 10-year period. There is enormous opportunity within this category, and it is necessary to provide more detailed breakdowns. The Homestead Preservation Districts have just been operationalized, and their potential yield is unknown.

Perhaps most importantly, the expanded density bonus program under CodeNEXT holds massive potential. With density bonus programs within the Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors, onsite affordability can grow with all targeted development. Because of the timing of CodeNEXT (draft code is due in January 2017, with council adoption later in the year), it is crucial for decision-makers to both understand and leverage this potential for increasing affordability.

Several programs being counted toward goals have short affordability periods. Yet it is our understanding that the shorter terms of programs such as CDBG actually are contracted for longer time frames, and should be shown as such in Figure 7. We recommend counting only those programs with affordability terms of at least ten years.

The plan proposes to provide choice in where to live to more families with children, a class protected under the Fair Housing Act, with a goal that 25% of production supported by NHCD have two or more bedrooms. We support this; however, we note the number of two-bedroom units in homeownership programs sold to people without children. To better reach families with children, we recommend the City establish a preference for families with children.

The plan references CodeNEXT’s proposal to focus growth and offer density bonuses in centers and corridors. In fact, page 11 of the Austin Housing Plan offers a target for growth in residential units along the centers and corridors. It would be ideal to have a realistic and defensible target. *Imagine Austin*’s preferred growth scenario should be used as a basis for those projections.

While sustainable growth within centers and corridors is critical to the implementation of the *Imagine Austin* vision, greenfield development also offers enormous opportunity for affordability. It will be crucial for CodeNEXT to include a diversity of housing choice, as well as a mix of uses and transportation choices, within the greenfield areas. One option to consider is a greenfield density bonus program that would facilitate affordability throughout the City of Austin.

Gentrification is rapidly limiting the choice of low-income families of color to live in certain neighborhoods. While the draft plan focused on producing new units, the City operates programs which can preserve homes in gentrifying neighborhoods. The plan mentions using these programs to preserve the ability of homeowners to stay in their neighborhoods. We recommend also including goals for preservation of single-family homes.

We recommend that the City study how to enhance density bonus programs with attention to affirmative marketing, non-discrimination by source of income, achieving units for families with children, including a right of first refusal patterned after Montgomery County Maryland’s Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit program, and compliance monitoring.

Implementation and Monitoring:

In order to make the plan actionable and achievable, it will be critical to add concrete timelines for all of the proposed changes in programs and policies. Seattle's housing plan establishes 15 "action steps" and provides a detailed three-year timeline. The Austin Housing Plan should include a similar timeline for short-term (1-3 years), mid-term (3-5 years), and long-term (5-10 years) action items. This will help policy-makers understand the urgency of certain actions and the overall context for success.

As we add residential units to the current inventory of affordable housing, it is crucial to ensure that NHCD has sufficient capacity and resources to actively provide monitoring and compliance. Public confidence in the affordable housing program is vital to its success and longevity. To adequately address NHCD's compliance and monitoring needs, we recommend looking at best practices from other jurisdictions' compliance and monitoring programs and how that crucial work is funded.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment on the draft Austin Housing Plan. It is a vital document that is integral to long-term sustainability. With some improvements and enhancements, the Austin Housing Plan will help to guide our community toward affordability for all.

Sincerely,

Mandy De Mayo

Mandy De Mayo
Executive Director
HousingWorks Austin

cc: Bert Lumbreras, Assistant City Manager



Letitia Brown, Acting Director
 City of Austin
 Department of Neighborhood Housing and Community Development
 1000 E. 11th Street
 Austin, Texas 78702

Dear Ms. Brown,

I am writing to express my appreciation to the department and its staff for drafting the Austin Strategic Housing Plan. A comprehensive strategic plan for addressing the entire spectrum of affordable housing needs for low-income Austinites is long overdue; in fact the Austin Housing Coalition, formerly the CHDO Roundtable, called for it in our 2011 white paper. I recognize the enormous time and effort put forward by NHCD staff.

Please accept the following comments on the plan:

Housing Needs:

1. This section should address the fact that the entire Central Texas region, not just the city of Austin, is seeing a dramatic increase in population and housing needs. How much of that is Austin's responsibility to provide? How much should other counties and municipalities participate? Of course, there is nothing that the department or city can do to force other cities in the region to live up to their responsibilities to provide affordable housing, but calling attention to this might be the beginning of a critically necessary regional conversation about housing.
2. The needs of *people with disabilities* should be highlighted. For example, we have estimated that out of the 48,000 gap, 7,440 are households with persons with disabilities, of which 1,844 have mobility impairments.
3. The plan should recognize the importance of *the affordable, accessible, integrated housing model* for people with disabilities (please see attached white paper by ADAPT of Texas). It should recognize that disability-related services (e.g. medical and mental health care) should be provided separately from housing.
 - A person should not lose her services if she loses her housing and vice versa; and in order to protect privacy, one's housing provider should not be one's service provider.
 - Furthermore, the vast majority of people with disabilities either do not require services to stay housed or are capable of being independent consumers of whatever services they do need.
4. Similarly, the needs of ELI (extremely low income, i.e. households with incomes lower than 30% MFI) households who do not have any form of rental subsidy should be highlighted. The last time the Housing Authority of the City of Austin opened its waiting list, it had over 40,000 applicants for 2,500 spots.
5. The plan should take into account the units that Austin is projected to lose over the next 10 years due to subsidized properties aging out of their affordability periods and rents rising in non-subsidized currently affordable properties.

Housing Production Goals

This section should be clearer, with better defined goals. Specifically:

6. The Plan should specify housing production targets by income level: >80% MFI, 50-80%, 30-50%, 15-30% and <15% (or 20%).
7. These goals should bear some proportionate resemblance to the needs of income groups and target populations.


8. The Plan should include a goal for serving households at <20% (or <15%, aka Deeply Low Income, or DLI) MFI. This approximately represents the amount an individual on Social Security Income earns.
9. We commend the department for including a goal for serving ELI and DLI households without vouchers; but we believe that goal needs to be raised to meet the severe need in the community.
10. 100% of newly-built units should at least meet adaptability standards.
11. Overall, the plan should recognize that some goals and targets are ambitious and aspirational, and it may not be clear today how to achieve them all; however that they reflect a commitment by the community to solving these problems.
 - *For example:* The Comprehensive Market Study found that 25% of people with disabilities lived in housing that does not meet their accessibility needs. In the state of Massachusetts, they addressed the problem by creating the Mass Access Housing Registry, (<http://www.massaccesshousingregistry.org>) which contains live listings of accessible properties. Obviously this is ambitious and expensive; but setting it as a goal reflects the commitment by the City to addressing this problem.
12. The draft plan currently states that “At least ___% of new housing units should be within Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors.” Additionally it should add: “At least ___% of housing units within Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors should be affordable to households below 50% MFI and ___% below 30% MFI.” This point should be made for any housing planned for transit corridors.
13. The plan should clearly identify which entity is responsible for achieving which goals, and how performance will be monitored and measured. For example, some goals may be achieved through AHFC funding; others through the PHAs, Imagine Austin or state funding. The plan should recognize the goals of the local public housing authorities (PHAs) and incorporate them into the larger targets.

Strategies

14. Include partnering with TDHCA’s Section 811 program to achieve affordable, accessible and integrated housing for people with disabilities (not counted in no-voucher goal). For more information, see <http://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/section-811-pra/index.htm> or talk to Spencer Duran, Program Manager, at (512) 475-1784.
15. The plan should identify models for serving ELI and DLI households without vouchers or rental subsidies; and the City should test such models and track their effectiveness.
16. The National Housing Trust Fund is a new and exciting source of funding primarily for renting households under 30% MFI. Although it is small now, it has the capacity to grow. It is currently being managed by TDHCA. The City of Austin should work with TDHCA to ensure that it is being used to target the lowest income Austinites, preferably under 20% MFI and without vouchers, and that it is accessible for use by smaller, mission-driven nonprofits, and not just large tax-credit developers.
17. The plan should recognize the opportunity presented to develop certain key sites, for example the Austin State Hospital and the Austin State-Supported Living Center into affordable, accessible and integrated housing for people with disabilities and other low-income households.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Again, thanks for all the staff’s work on this.

Sincerely,



Isabelle Headrick, Accessible Housing Austin!

[Redacted signature block]

Comments on the Draft Austin Strategic Housing Plan
by Fred L. McGhee, Ph.D.
Member, City of Austin Community Development Commission

General Comments:

- This paper is more *prescriptive* than descriptive, which is unfortunate. This white paper could be the place where NHCD and its extensively skilled and credentialed affordable housing experts could demonstrate the depth and breadth of their scholarly understanding of Austin's affordable housing crisis. What this document furnishes instead are mostly milquetoast recommendations that are not sufficiently supported by empirical evidence and comparisons with other American cities. It also demonstrates a lack of knowledge and engagement with how cities around the world have both historically and recently tackled housing affordability crises.
- This plan mostly focuses on affordable housing *production* not preservation. This is short-sighted. The "preservation fund" resolution passed in 2014; why does this report not have concrete recommendations for how to fund it?
- Nowhere does this document discuss public housing. In a city that literally helped to pioneer the idea, that is a disturbing example of amateurish thinking when it comes to the question of affordable housing.
- There is no discussion of environmental justice or of human rights. The Human Rights Commission recently found gentrification to be a human rights violation, not a technical matter. Advocacy for expanded density bonuses produces environmental impacts that further harm our quality of life. Density bonuses have also not nearly produced the amount of affordable housing that our city requires.

Recommendations:

- We must properly quantify what "affordable housing" truly means. 50% of MFI is a number that could work for Austin. Calling 80% MFI housing "affordable" is at this stage intellectually dishonest.
- City council districts 1 and 3 currently house a disproportionate share of the city's "affordable" housing. This document needs to produce a strategy for preserving and upgrading that existing housing instead of over-focusing on the placement of new supposedly affordable housing in so-called "high opportunity" areas. On this issue we should be able to walk and chew gum at the same time.
- Produce affordable housing preservation *and* production targets for each city council district that reflect the actual need. The goal of 30,000 housing units at up to 30% MFI is too unambitious. 75,000 units would be an ambitious goal.
- This document needs to dive deeper into discussing veterans housing issues. Granular local research into this area would go deeper than just discussing veterans homelessness.
- This document should talk about the Fair Housing Act itself, not just the usually ignored "impediments to fair housing choice" document mentioned on page 17. A sincere focus on fair housing in Austin would discuss the preservation of existing affordable housing, not just focus on the construction of new housing in high opportunity areas. A refusal to seriously discuss the loss of existing affordable housing, particularly in East and South Austin, is to aid and abet gentrification.

- This document should furnish discussion and analysis of previous Austin efforts at generating affordable housing. Without such analysis not only is there no proper institutional memory and training material available for existing and future NHCD staff, it becomes difficult if not impossible to assess what is and is not working. Two noteworthy examples that should be discussed and evaluated include Mueller and Frontier at Montana. There are others one could choose.
- Page 3: What is the 2016 HUD MFI for Austin? What is 30% of that? And what is the rent at that level?
- Page 10: "Environmental Degradation." Exactly how is this term being used here? Has the gentrification of East Austin produced "environmental degradation" as it is being used here? It bears noting that the National Environmental Policy Act takes a broad view of the "human environment" that goes well beyond a discussion of natural resources.
- Page 13: 80% of \$77,800 (the 2016 Austin MFI) is \$62,240 per year. 30% of that is \$1,556. Do you consider numbers such as this to be affordable? (rather unambitious). Then why are they described as "aggressive?"
- Page 15: Please discuss how the proposed preservation property tax exemption would work. What are the proposed numbers? Our city already offers generous tax abatements for historic properties. Yet many of these properties in East Austin were demolished anyway.
- Page 17-19: The research literature on TIF's is clear: they are a recipe for corruption and for further gentrification. The plan does not produce a coherent argument (no argument at all, actually) for why Austin should deepen its commitment to property tax diversion schemes of this nature.
- Page 18: why only "small scale" preservation?
- Page 20: Why each zip code? Why not each neighborhood planning area? Or some other geographic boundary such as city council district?
- Page 22: ADU's increase affordability? Based upon what evidence? Cite your sources. The dogma that "alley flats" or similar zoning easing schemes improve affordability should be subjected to empirical analysis.
- Page 23: The focus on PUD's is a diversion. They should not be discussed in a document of this nature.
- Page 24-26. Linking transportation costs with housing is a good idea, but why stop there? Basic needs budgets should also include discussion of things such as food, child care, health care, debt, out of pocket medical expenses and other necessities. Our city needs to have a realistic discussion of what it means to be poor in Austin. While biking and walking are laudable goals, they need not and should not be discussed in a document of this nature.

Policy suggestions:

- Austin needs to re-commit itself to maximizing and optimizing its public housing. As the oldest branch of city government dealing with affordable housing, Austin's housing authority could and should do more. It can start by building back up to its Faircloth limit of 1931 units and recommitting itself to preserving and upgrading its historic public housing stock. There is no shortage of tax credit developers in our city, and the housing authority should focus on what it was founded to do first; directly produce and manage publicly owned housing.

- It needs to finally be conceded that market-based technical solutions will not truly tackle our city's affordable housing crisis. It is only when this concession is made that we can have truly productive affordable housing discussions that rise to the level of the problem. Affordable housing is not and should not be dependent on market rate development; the linkage between the two is artificial and unproductive; the city's public housing history demonstrates this. The fundamental reality is this: the private housing market cannot or will not produce housing that is truly affordable; this was understood during the New Deal. A productive discussion, therefore, would be about what government can and should do to preserve and produce the level of housing that is required. Wonkish discussions about the technical details of density bonuses, property tax diversion mechanisms, or zoning abatements are just ways of continuing to talk around the problem.
- Housing, including affordable housing is more than just a matter of quantity, it is also a question of quality. This document should discuss how Austin can start to move in the direction of implementing the Passive House standard in all existing and future affordable housing. Existing greenbuilding standards are not as rigorous or straightforward.
- Austin should re-calibrate how it spends its CDBG and other federal grant funds. While business development sees a reasonable expenditure at first glance, block grant money is too precious to remain sub-optimally focused on the main problem, which is the preservation and generation of maximum amounts of affordable housing. If the money can be proposed for the destruction of public housing projects such as Rosewood Courts, it can also be purposed for that housing project's preservation and revitalization.
- Lessons from New York: nearly 60% of the \$7.5 billion used to finance New York City's housing programs is derived from the city's capital budget; that is from the issuance of municipal bonds. What is Austin's percentage? The policy recommendation explains itself.
- Austin needs to move in the direction of impact or linkage fees, perhaps both. They are easier to administer, furnish regulatory certainty, and most importantly, produce funding that can be used for affordable housing preservation and production. Political leadership should rise to the challenge.

The City's Household Affordability Prescription Paper Policies Will Not Produce Affordable Housing for Low-Income Austinites

I. Overview. The City's Household Affordability Prescription ("Prescription Paper") fails to address Austin's low-income affordable housing crisis. This memo makes six main points:

- **Low-income renting households (defined here as 50% of Median Family Income ("MFI")) face the largest and severest housing crisis in Austin.**
- **The Prescription Paper fails to address Austin's need for affordable low-income rental housing.**
- **CodeNEXT will provide little positive benefit for low-income affordable housing. Regardless of the city's new land development regulations, low-income housing will remain unprofitable and will not be built by the market.**
- **Austin's current density programs are ineffective, producing only 1163 units in ten years, and only 232 of these are at 50% MFI or less.**
- **Proposals to strengthen Austin's density bonus programs are unlikely to appreciably increase low-income affordable housing— and may in fact be counterproductive.**
- **Broad-based, low-rate affordable housing linkage fee on new construction can provide needed public funding necessary to preserve and produce low-income affordable housing.**

II. Low-Income Austinites Have Austin's Greatest Affordable Housing Needs. Low-income Austinites face the city's most severe and acute affordable housing problems. This growing crisis has forced many to leave Austin or to endure a severe income burden for housing. While Austin's housing crisis has worsened, poverty has increased significantly, with the percentage of children in poverty rising from 17% to 30%.¹ Unfortunately, low-income Austinites have not shared in the city's general prosperity during our economic boom.

Thirty-three percent of Austinites who rent (60,000 rental households) are currently extremely low-income, earning less than \$25,000 a year.² Nearly 48,000 of these households lack affordable rental housing³, which has worsened in the last few years as 7,000 older, affordable housing units have been eliminated.⁴ There are an additional 22,700 Austin renting households who are very low-income, earning only \$25,000-\$34,999 a year (\$37,700 a year is 50% of MFI for a family of four).⁵ Forty-six percent of Austin renting households— nearly half — make less than \$35,000 a year, or less than 50% of MFI.

¹ 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis (City of Austin), Executive Summary Section, p. 5

² 2014 Housing Market Analysis, Executive Summary Section, pp. 8-9

³ Affordable housing is defined as housing for which households pay 30% or less of their gross income. 2014 Housing Market Analysis, Executive Summary Section, p. 10

⁴ 2014 Housing Market Analysis, Executive Summary Section, pp.8-9

⁵ 2014 Housing Market Analysis, Section 1, pp. 10; Section 2, pp. 26. This memo's median family income household figures originate from the City's 2014 Housing Market Analysis; Austin's 2016 median family income figures are higher. 2016 Program Income Limits by Household Size (City of Austin Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Dept., March 28, 2016).

Only Austin households earning less than \$25,000 a year face an affordable housing shortage today, according to the City.⁶ As a result, Austin’s “top affordable housing need” is addressing “a shortage of deeply affordable rental units (primarily those renting for less than \$500 a month) for renters earning less than \$25,000 per year.”⁷

III. The City’s Household Affordability Code Prescription Paper has 5 major goals; none of these goals address improving affordable housing for low-income Austinites⁸ As the following analysis shows, the Prescription Paper’s five goals do not address the affordable housing needs of low-income Austinites:

1. The Prescription Paper’s goal of “improving alignment between land use and transportation” does not address directly the housing needs of low-income Austinites. The Paper presents no evidence that providing more transportation options along corridors will increase low-income affordable housing. There are reasons, however, to believe that providing alternative transportation options will accelerate the destruction of older, low-end housing along these corridors.⁹

Under current projections, Austin is likely to lose in the next decade from market forces 40,000 affordable housing units along transportation corridors even without increased transportation alternatives.¹⁰ If the City were to enhance these transit centers and corridors, and provide effective alternative transportation options as recommended in the Prescription Paper, then the likely result will be even less affordable housing along these corridors for low-income Austinites.¹¹ By allowing more uses, types of structures, and density on the land along these transit corridors, the City’s proposed policies likely will encourage developers to tear down the remaining lower-income affordable apartment units and replace them with new, high-end units. As walkable, mixed use developments with multiple transportation options become more desirable, developers will seek to maximize profits by displacing low income Austinites and gentrifying the transit corridors. As an example, developers might purchase and then tear down an older, lower-end apartment complex with 100 units along a transit corridor, and replace it with 200 high-end, more profitable units. Although the developer would be required to produce 20 “affordable” units under the City’s density bonus program, the result would be a net loss of 80 affordable units.¹²

⁶ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy (Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Dept., June 2016), pp. 8-9

⁷ 2014 Housing Market Analysis, p. 10.

⁸ Developing Complete Communities for All Austinites: Household Affordability Code Prescription (City of Austin, 2016), pp.10-11.

⁹ Kahn, Gentrification Trends in New Transit-Oriented Communities (UCLA, January 2007), pp. 17, 25-26.

¹⁰ McGlinchy, With Oracle’s Expansion, Some Renters Lose, Others May Gain (KUT Radio, June 8, 2016).

¹¹ Kahn, Gentrification Trends, pp. 25-26.

¹² Levin, The Irony of ‘Inclusionary’ Zoning, 54 Southern California Law Review 1167, 1215-1216 (1981); ‘Largest-Ever’ Silicon Valley Eviction to Displace Hundreds of Tenants (The Guardian July 7, 2016); Redmond, Plan that Could Lead to Massive Displacement Moves Forward, Quietly (48 Hills December 20, 2015)

2. The Paper’s goal of “promoting opportunities to increase the housing supply with different types, sizes, and diversity of product” will not necessarily provide low-income affordable housing. The housing marketplace has proven incapable of providing low-income housing— whatever the housing type. Whether Euclidean or form-based zoning applies, the housing market alone cannot provide affordable housing for low-income people. See Section IV below.

3. The Paper’s goal to “improve the development review process” will not produce more low-income affordable housing. Assuming that Austin’s permitting process were more efficient, it would result in only marginal savings; there is no evidence that these marginal savings are significant enough to overcome the large profitability problems with building low-income affordable rental housing. There also is no assurance these savings will be passed on to renters, because owners price their rental units at what the market will bear.

As explained below, the market alone doesn’t provide low-income housing anywhere in the United States— whether the locale has many or few land use regulations, or has a well-functioning or poorly administered permitting process. Government funding is the only proven approach to overcome the inability of the housing market to provide low-income housing. See Section IV below.

4. While the goal of “balancing the needs of affordability with other public needs and values” is an indisputable bromide, it is not particularly appropriate for low-income Austinites who are struggling just to get by day-to-day. Their economic struggles are the central concern of their lives, unlike middle class and affluent Austinites. Affordable housing is an essential necessity for low-income Austinites and cannot be balanced easily against other needs.

5. The last goal of increasing “affordability impacts on small business including cultural arts”, while important, has nothing to do with addressing low-income affordable housing.

In sum, while the City’s Household Affordability Code Prescription Paper may fulfill other public policy goals, it does not even speak to affordable housing for low-income Austinites. The Paper appears to recognize this fact, stating: “It must be noted that *many other actions outside of land development regulations are needed* in order to comprehensively address our affordability challenge.” (emphasis added)¹³ “A new Land Development Code *will not be the solution* for Austin’s affordability challenges.” (emphasis added)¹⁴ The Prescription Paper is not intended to, and will not, help low-income Austinites obtain affordable housing. Its policies, however,

¹³ Household Affordability Code Prescription, p. 9

¹⁴ Household Affordability Code Prescription, p. 10

actually may worsen the affordable housing gap for lower income Austinites by incentivizing the destruction of existing lower income housing stock (as noted above).

IV. New Land Development Regulations Will Not Produce More Low-Income Affordable

Housing in Austin Because Such Housing Will Remain Unprofitable.

Throughout the United States, the housing marketplace – whatever a city’s land development regulations – has never provided more than a negligible amount of affordable housing for low-income Americans.¹⁵ Studies have shown repeatedly that “it is nearly impossible to build and operate rental housing that is affordable for extremely low-income renters (50% MFI or below] in most market.”¹⁶ Nationally, only 5% of affordable housing units for households at 50% MFI or less are provided by the market without government funding.¹⁷

Developers cannot make low-income rental units “pencil out,” meaning they cannot make a profit at the rental prices that low income renters can afford. The basic reason the market does not work for low-income housing is that low-income renters lack the income to afford even the most basic rental units.¹⁸ The marketplace alone has never produced low-income affordable housing, and there is no reason to expect that to change in the future.¹⁹

Because of these housing market realities, American cities that have the smallest affordability gap for low-income renters are the ones that provide the most government housing programs. Cities in the Northeast and Midwest, although they often have more restrictive land use policies, have the smallest housing affordability gaps, while the South and West have the largest gaps.²⁰ “Counterintuitively, some counties with the most expensive housing markets—including Boston, San Francisco, and Washington D.C. – have the smallest gaps in affordability of extremely low-income renters. For the most part, these reflect a higher proportion of rental units targeted to extremely low-income renters, not fewer extremely low-income renters.”²¹ These cities have succeeded by providing more government programs to produce or preserve affordable low income housing.

V. The City’s Density Bonus Proposals Will Produce Little Low-Income Affordable Housing.

Although Austin’s current density bonus programs have had negligible impact in providing low-income affordable housing, the Prescription Paper recommends that the programs should be “strengthened” and made more “consistent”.²² It provides little programmatic details other

¹⁵ Leopold, et. al., The Housing Affordability Gap for Extremely Low Income Renters in 2013 (Urban Institute 2015), p. 1

¹⁶ Leopold, p. 2; See also America’s Rental Housing: Evolving Markets and Needs (Harvard University’s Joint Center for Housing Studies 2013), p. 6

¹⁷ Leopold, p. 5

¹⁸ Leopold, p. 2; America’s Rental Housing, p. 6.

¹⁹ Logan and Molotch, Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place (2nd Ed. 2007), pp. 21-49 (the housing marketplace does not follow neo-classical models of supply and demand)

²⁰ Leopold, pp. 9-13

²¹ Leopold, pp. 9-23

²² Household Affordability Code Prescription, pp. 13-16

than suggesting that the program be focused on “Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors”.²³ The Paper is convinced that “the density bonus program remains a powerful tool to achieve a multitude of outcomes with regard to affordability.”²⁴ Similarly, in a just released report on the City’s density bonus policies, the Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department is proposing a third-party comprehensive economic analysis “to inform *expanded* density bonus programs under CodeNEXT.”(emphasis added)²⁵

A. Austin’s Current Density Bonus Program Produces Few Housing Units for Low-Income

Austinites. Austin’s and other cities’ density programs have proven ineffective at producing significant low-income affordable housing.²⁶ Opticos Design, in its Austin Code Diagnosis, recognizes that Austin’s “current density bonus programs are not yielding the needed results.”²⁷ Over ten years, Austin’s density bonus programs have produced only 1163 units and \$4.8 million in fees-in- lieu of units, compared to a current need for 48,000 affordable housing units for low-income Austinites at 30% of MFI.²⁸ Of these 1163 units, only 232 units (20%) are available for low-income Austinites at 50% MFI or less.²⁹ Even more telling, only 15 rental units have been produced for Austin households at 30% MFI or lower, and those were produced voluntarily by the builder.³⁰

Most units (702) are at 80% MFI and appear to be one bedroom efficiencies that rent at or close to market rate³¹— meaning these units could have been built by the market without the city’s programs. 80% MFI units also are severely unaffordable for low-income Austinites (50% MFI or less, and efficiency units are unsuitable for families with children.

More than half of the “affordable housing units” (593) were built under the University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Density Bonus Program.³² These units mainly serve students, who if they are poor, they are only voluntarily poor for a temporary period.

B. The Paper’s Proposed New Density Bonus Policies Will Not Produce Substantial Low-

Income Affordable Housing. Revising the City’s programs is unlikely to provide significant increases in low- income affordable housing. First, developers generally are not interested in

²³ Household Affordability Code Prescription, p. 16

²⁴ Household Affordability Code Prescription, p. 14

²⁵ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 50

²⁶ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, pp. 39,41-42, 46; Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program (July 2014), pp. 9-18; Levin, The Irony of ‘Inclusionary’ Zoning, pp. 1178, 1192-1193, 1197, 1215-126; Johnston, et. al., Selling Zoning, 36 Washington Journal of Urban and Cotemporary Law 45, 52 (1989)

²⁷ Opticos Design, Land Development Code Diagnosis (May 5, 2014), p. 57

²⁸ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, pp. 9, 15

²⁹ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 15

³⁰ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 15

³¹ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 15; Prioritization of Affordable Housing Development Audit (City of Austin Auditor, November 2015), pp. 10. Conversation with Austin Apartment Developer Ed Wendler, Jr. (July 8, 2016). See also Levin, The Irony of ‘Inclusionary’ Zoning, pp. 1178, 1192-1193, 1197, 1215-126

³² Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 15

including low-income units in their new, higher-end apartment complexes. Thus, they will continue to game the system by seeking waivers, providing efficiencies that rent at market rates, failing to qualify applicants, and neglecting compliance. Second, many new developments do not need extra density, and, therefore, developers have no incentive to participate in the density bonus program. And this lack of demand for density bonuses will grow under CodeNEXT, with its enhanced land use flexibility. Third, for those new developments that may want extra density, many developers will decline to participate if the City increases the program's requirements for affordable units or deepens the affordability. As shown in other cities, the economics of the development often will not work if a city strengthens its affordable unit requirements.³³

Because of the inherent unprofitability of building low-income housing, Austin's density bonus program proposals are incapable of providing significant onsite affordable housing for low-income Austinites. As noted recently by the City's Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department, developers almost always prefer paying the fee-in-lieu rather than provide onsite low-income affordable housing units: "While the existing density bonus policies do not secure onsite units affordable to this level [30% MFI], revenue secured through the fee-in-lieu of onsite units provide a funding source to support the development and preservation of housing affordable to the lowest income households."³⁴ As a funding source, which is the primary means by which the density bonus program serves low-income Austinites, the program has produced only \$4.8 million over ten years— less than half a million a year.³⁵

V. Linkage Fees: A Solution for Austin's Low-Income Affordable Housing Crisis.

A. High-Growth Cities Are Turning Away from Density Bonus Programs and Adopting Linkage Fees. A number of cities have recognized recently that their density bonus programs have proven ineffective and they are replacing their programs with affordable housing linkage fees. Cornerstone Partnership, which the City cites as leading experts on density bonus programs³⁶, recommended that Seattle adopt a linkage fee program rather than strengthening its density bonus programs.³⁷ Cornerstone analyzed revising Seattle's voluntary density bonus program, which is similar to Austin's; it determined that while this "would likely result in incremental increases in the number of affordable housing units produced through the program, it is unlikely to dramatically change the level of production. Many local stakeholders expressed

³³ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program (July 2014), pp. 9-18; Rosen, Seattle Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis (July 16, 2014), p. 11; Johnston, et. al., Selling Zoning, p. 52

³⁴ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 9

³⁵ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 15

³⁶ Draft City of Austin Density Bonus Policy, p. 32-33

³⁷ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, p. 21

frustration with the limited impact of Incentive Zoning given the overall strength of Seattle's real estate market."³⁸

Cornerstone found that because of housing economics, most Seattle developers paid a fee-in-lieu, rather than build onsite affordable units.³⁹ It also found that many developers were not interested in the extra density bonus, even without the affordable housing requirements, because it did not fit their projects. Cornerstone noted as well that "increasing the performance requirements under a voluntary incentive zoning framework could be counterproductive".⁴⁰ "Inclusionary zoning requirements can impact development if they are set too high based on local conditions. Requirements that are too high can push development costs to a point that new projects will not be profitable. In this case, owners of property will decide it is not in their interest to redevelop their land."⁴¹

Cornerstone recommended that Seattle replace its density bonus program with an affordable housing linkage fee program: "[a]n increasingly popular alternative to inclusionary zoning [density bonus] programs is to charge linkage fees on new residential or commercial developments to pay for affordable housing."⁴² Dozens of fast-growing cities with housing crises, including Seattle, have adopted recently linkage fees as a better solution for providing affordable housing, including low-income housing.⁴³

B. What is a Linkage Fee? Affordable housing linkage fees are applied by the square foot on all new commercial and/or residential construction. It is paid by the developer at permitting based on their building plans. The revenues usually are placed into a dedicated trust fund for lower income affordable housing. Linkage fees are simple to administer and collect, unlike density bonus programs, which frequently involve lengthy negotiations, compliance problems, and monitoring costs. Moreover, since the city controls the funds, the city can dictate a deeper income level, permanent affordability, and the unit sizes and configurations so families with children are served.⁴⁴

The rate of the linkage fee is based on an in-depth study, called a nexus study. The Austin City Council authorized in its fair housing resolution of June 16, 2016 such a nexus study by outside experts.⁴⁵ Nexus studies look at the projected additional employees from new retail, hotel, commercial, and residential developments, and then the studies calculate these employees' likely income by job classification. Comparing these new employees' projected income to the

³⁸ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, p. 5

³⁹ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, pp. 9-19

⁴⁰ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, p. 19

⁴¹ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, p. 11

⁴² Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, p. 21

⁴³ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, p. 21; Overview of Commercial and Residential Linkage Fee Programs in US and Colorado (Denver Office of Economic Development January 2016); Denver City Council Briefing on Affordable Housing Revenue (February 6, 2016), p. 10

⁴⁴ Denver City Council Briefing on Affordable Housing Revenue (February 6, 2016), pp. 17, 20

⁴⁵ Austin City Council Resolution No. 20160616-035 (June 16, 2016)

housing available in the marketplace, the study determines the dollar value of the affordable housing gap between their income and the cost of available housing. The maximum legally justified linkage fee is the rate per square footage to close this affordability gap. The feasible linkage fee rate, which is a lower rate, is the actual set rate and is designed to raise substantial revenues but not impede developments.

Courts have upheld linkage fees when there is a reasonable nexus between the fees and the affordable housing costs from new development incurred by a city. Clark Richards, a prominent Austin attorney, has analyzed Texas law and has concluded a linkage fee is allowed under state law and is constitutional when based on a valid, reasonable nexus study.⁴⁶ Fees in the United States typically range from \$1 to \$6 per square foot on commercial and/or residential new construction. In some high-cost cities, the fees are much higher.⁴⁷

Because an affordable housing linkage fee is applied broadly to all commercial and/or residential property, it can raise substantially greater affordable housing resources at the same fee rate than density bonus programs. This is because linkage fees are mandatory and apply throughout a city to all new commercial and/or residential construction. Density bonus programs, on the other hand, are voluntary, available in only certain areas, and their bonus incentives are often not suitable or profitable for particular developments.⁴⁸ With a much broader-based fee, the linkage fee rate can be kept lower than the density bonus fee (or the costs of the onsite units) on new construction. This helps ensure that the fee does not impede new developments. Thus, according to Cornerstone, Seattle's linkage fees per square foot "would be lower than the current Inclusion Zoning Fee in Lieu", and yet "Seattle might be able to generate significantly more total revenue."⁴⁹

An affordable housing linkage fee also provides more flexibility than onsite affordable unit requirements. Required onsite units are located wherever developers want their market developments, not where the demand for low income housing exists. The onsite units fit the needs of the development, which often results in the construction of efficiency units that are not suitable for families. With a linkage fee, the development pays a fee, and the city can use the funds to purchase and preserve the types of units (larger for families), for residents with the greatest need (low income), in the areas of town that are underserved.⁵⁰

C. How A Linkage Fee Program Could Work in Austin. In Austin in 2015, a \$2 per square foot fee on all new commercial and residential construction would have generated \$60 million. (There was approximately 30 million square feet in new construction in Austin in 2015: approximately 15 million square feet in commercial new construction and 15 million square

⁴⁶ Clark Richards, Affordable Housing Linkage Fees Under Texas Law (June 7, 2016 on file with author)

⁴⁷ Overview of Commercial and Residential Linkage Fee Programs in US and Colorado (Denver Office of Economic Development January 2016);

⁴⁸ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, pp. 21-25

⁴⁹ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, p. 25

⁵⁰ Cornerstone Partnership, Policy Options for Refining Seattle Incentive Zoning Program, pp. 21-25

feet in new residential construction).⁵¹ The funds could be directed to the Austin's low-income affordable housing priorities.

D. Advantages to Austin of Having a Linkage Fee Programs. In addition to raising substantial sums to seriously address Austin's low-income affordable housing crisis, linkage fees have these advantages:

- 1) Developers have certainty as to the cost to them of providing affordable housing, as opposed to the uncertainty of density bonus negotiations.
- 2) Linkage fees spread the cost of affordable housing fairly across all types of new construction, including commercial and retail, as opposed to density bonus programs, which are applied only to a limited number of developments.
- 3) The linkage fee is broad-based, which allows a lower rate to generate larger revenue.
- 4) New residents pay for the costs of affordable housing caused by their moving to the city.
- 5) Linkage fee programs are much simpler to administer than density bonus programs.
- 6) Planning decisions are based on best planning principles, and are not distorted by the City's need for affordable housing.
- 7) The City has much greater control over the housing size, the depth of affordability, and the length of affordability.

⁵¹ Ed Wendler, Jr., Analysis of Austin Commercial and Residential Construction by Square Footage in 2015 (April 4, 2016) (based on 2015 City of Austin building permit records (chart on file with author)).

Support Housing for the Chronically Homeless through Housing First/Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Landlord Participation:

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is housing for extremely low-income people at or below 30% MFI (\$24,300 or less for a 4-person household in 2016) with voluntary supportive services available, and ~~often~~ targets households ~~individuals~~ experiencing chronic homelessness and have multiple barriers to housing stability (such as substance abuse issues, no income, medical or mental health issues, etc). Housing First PSH focuses on quickly housing people who are experiencing homelessness first, and then providing supportive services as needed. Core elements of the model include lower screening criteria regarding sobriety, criminal history, credit history, or other behaviors generally held to indicate a lack of “housing readiness.” All newly created Permanent Supportive Housing is expected to align with the local Continuum of Care’s Coordinated Assessment system to ensure those households identified as most vulnerable will be served. Working with private landlords to accept chronically homeless residents is another way to increase the supply of PSH.

OCCUPANCY LIMITS AND FAIR HOUSING CHOICE

June 28, 2016

This memorandum is offered to identify erroneous statements made in the CodeNEXT *Household Affordability Prescription*. The CodeNEXT Advisory Group, City of Austin staff, and external consultants should make applicable corrections to the Prescription and to the Draft Strategic Housing Plan.

The CodeNEXT *Household Affordability Prescription* contains the following statement:

“In 2014, the City adopted a notable code amendment regarding dwelling unit occupancies, which has a negative impact on fair housing choice.” (p. 20)

The recently released *Draft Strategic Housing Plan* written by the Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department contains this statement:

“On March 20, 2014, the City of Austin amended its city code regarding dwelling unit occupancy to reduce the maximum occupancy limits for single family homes in certain zoning districts and for duplexes from six unrelated adults to four. The ordinance has a provision excluding group home-type settings from the limit. This occupancy change could raise the cost of housing for unrelated roommates since housing costs will be split among fewer occupants. The limits are most likely to affect the city’s student population and co-ops but could also have implications for persons with disabilities who reside together in a group setting that is not a licensed group home. In this case, the city would need to make a reasonable accommodation to the ordinance to avoid fair housing violations.” (p. 17)

These two statements are neither factual nor accurate, and they should be deleted from both the prescription and the draft housing plan.

The first statement, saying that Austin’s occupancy limits have a negative impact on fair housing choice, is not founded in either fact or law.

The second statement is apparently drawn from language in the report by BBC Research in 2014 titled *Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice City of Austin*, which is paraphrased and copied selectively by city staff. In its analysis of impediments to fair housing, BBC Research says this:

“On March 20, 2014, the City of Austin amended its city code regarding dwelling unit occupancy to reduce the maximum occupancy limits in single family homes in certain zoning districts and for duplexes from six unrelated adults to four. The ordinance has a provision excluding group home type settings from the limit.

This change has the potential to raise the cost of housing for unrelated roommates since housing costs will be split among fewer occupants. It is unclear how many of Austin's households are made up of units with five and six unrelated occupants and, thus, how many "excess" roommates need to find other housing units. [Emphasis added.] At any rate, the change in occupancy limits will create additional demand for housing for those displaced from their current units. [Emphasis added.]

Without further study of the types of households living in five- to six-roommate situations, it is also unclear if the change disproportionately impacts a certain protected class. The change is most likely to affect the city's student population, but could also have implications for persons with disabilities who reside together in a group setting that is not a licensed group home. In this case, the city would need to make a reasonable accommodation to the ordinance to avoid fair housing violations." (Section IV, p.18)

The Planning and Zoning Department staff has asserted that occupancy limits have "a negative impact on fair housing choice". BBC did not say this. It simply said that the amendment "has the potential" to raise housing cost and that the impact is "unclear". **BBC, however, made its own inaccurate statement by assuming that the 2014 amendment displaced current occupants.** BBC's statement showed a lack of basic understanding of Austin's ordinance for the following reasons:

- 1) It ignored that the 2014 amendment applies to only **newly constructed** dwelling units within the McMansion area.
- 2) The purpose of the 2014 amendment was to preserve affordable existing housing by taking away financial incentives for its demolition and the displacement of longtime residents – **both owners and renters.**
- 3) **The 2014 amendment did not affect the over 200,000 units grandfathered by the ordinance.** These units continue to be available for occupancy of up to six unrelated adults.
- 4) While the current number of households with more than four unrelated adults is small, the impact of items 2) and 3) is to increase the likelihood of the preservation of existing high occupancy units – both those currently used by six unrelated adults and those that might be similarly used in the future
- 5) The report ignores the common use of occupancy limits in both small and large U.S. metropolitan areas,
- 6) Both the United States Supreme Court and the U.S. Department of Justice have found that occupancy limits are not discriminatory *per se*, and
- 7) It is not shown how an occupancy limit of four in Austin would be any more discriminatory than an occupancy limit of six. Note that the Austin occupancy limit of four is above the national average and significantly above the average in the State of Texas (based on 2014 research).

The 2014 amendment passed by the prior city council with only one dissenting vote. It was renewed by the current city council in 2016 by another large margin. None of the usual real estate industry interests spoke against the 2016 action. There is clearly a community consensus in favor of the current occupancy rules.

The 2014 amendment worked. It achieved its intended purpose. It slowed dramatically the demolition of older, affordable housing to be replaced by high-occupancy, less affordable duplex buildings, particularly in the neighborhoods near the university. The change had an immediate and beneficial impact on neighborhoods. In the Northfield neighborhood, for example, demolitions for these types of buildings practically ceased.

Austin's occupancy rules and the enforcement thereof do not violate fair housing laws. As a protected class, students and persons with disabilities have not been prejudiced by the current rules, and there is no basis in federal or state law for implying the contrary. The city already makes reasonable accommodation for unlicensed homes occupied by persons with disabilities, and there is more than ample grandfathered housing available to them. Further, since the enactment of the 2014 ordinance, neither the City nor the Austin Tenants' Council have recorded complaints from people with disabilities who believe they have been denied housing because of the occupancy rules.

Years have been spent discussing this ordinance. It was reviewed for more than a year by the City Planning Commission. Two different city councils voted almost unanimously in favor of the current rules. Twenty-plus neighborhood associations – representing East, West, South, and North – supported the 2016 amendment. It is time to put this discussion to rest and to remove all references to the occupancy ordinance from the Draft Housing Plan and the Affordability Prescription.

There do exist real barriers to fair housing choice; this is not one of them. Let's stop the fabrication of specious arguments in favor of density and start a real, transparent dialogue about how the CodeNEXT process can implement the vision of *imagine Austin*.

Mary Sanger, Secretary, Hancock Neighborhood Association

Mike Wong, former President, Northfield Neighborhood Association

Mike Hebert

The following endorse this memorandum:

Olivia Primanis

Schieffer Willowbrook Neighborhood Association

David Boston, President, Schieffer Willowbrook Neighborhood Association

Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association

Cory Walton, President, Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association

Diane Presti, V-P South River City Citizens Neighborhood Association
Natalie and Al Axe
Merianne Gaston
Anne Heinen, Heritage Neighborhood Association Steering Committee
Jolene Kiolbassa
Betsy Greenberg
Don & Sharon Brown
Kathy Lawrence
Ellie Hanlon
Adrian Skinner
Sammy Easterday
Kata Carbone
Joyce Basciano
David King
Shoalcrest Neighborhood Association
Robert Jarry, President, Shoalcrest Neighborhood Association
Andy Homer
Toti Larson
Bryker Woods Neighborhood Association

STRATEGIC HOUSING PLAN REVIEW- City of Austin Planning Commission Workgroup			
Item #	Pg	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO TRACK	PC Comment
1		Unsubsidized Affordable Housing- The 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis states that the vast majority of our affordable housing is unsubsidized or market rate affordable housing (62,000 unsubsidized units+/- compared to 18,000 +/- subsidized)	The housing plan must call for the tracking of unsubsidized market units and incorporate them into the overall affordability strategy.
2		Family friendly housing- PC received a presentation on the loss of families in the urban core. This is not only problematic for our existing schools, but also for the overall health of our city.	We are concerned about defining family friendly housing at 2+ bedrooms. This is not to say that 2 bedroom units could not meet the needs of some families, but we need to acknowledge that there is a large percentage of families whose needs would not be met with 2 bedrooms. Please expand definition of family friendly to encompass 2 bedroom units and 3+ units, tracking them separately. The tracking should include both affordable and market, with an eye towards geographic balance.
3		Balance of ownership and rental opportunities- The report mentions economic segregation. To ensure we have geographically balanced mix of opportunities, we need to track and have goals for areas that have disproportionate rates of either rental or homeownership rates.	The housing report must track balance of home ownership/rental rates per zip code and introduce a goal to better balance those opportunities. The goals could better inform land use commissions about the housing types needed in particular areas.
4		Depth of Affordability- The report frames the problem within the context of 30% MFI housing shortage (\$11.18 billion gap).	The housing plan must show the projected number of units that will serve individuals at the 30% MFI income level, along with other income levels. This should tell planners to what degree the gap will be closed through this Strategic Housing Plan.
Item #	Pg	CALIBRATION OF ENTITLEMENTS AND DENSITY BONUSES	
5	8	that "half of all new housing demand will be for attached homes and the other half for small lots homes. homes Demand for large lot homes will decline below 2011 levels.	% of land where we can do small lot or create attached housing - predominant product will be tear downs to create duplexes in SF-3 if we want to accommodate with existing zoning. How much land area would be necessary to accommodate with duplexes on SF-3 lots vs. land area for townhomes on SF-6 or MF-3? Informs mapping.

6	20	Adopt Affordable Housing Goals to Guide Policy. These goals should guide decisions to reach the goal of having each zip code contain at least 10% of rental housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 30% MFI (\$24,300 or less for a 4 person household in 2016) and at least 25% of owner ship housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 120% MFI (\$93,360 or less for a 4-person household in 2016).	Need to have a mapping process to locate areas that affordable housing can exist and what densities will be needed to hit that target...if it is even possible. In areas of large parcels, it is easy to do so. Some areas of town, the land is so expensive that it is a challenge. If numbers cannot be reached, increase incentives, development further into the neighborhood... or more drastic tools need to be implemented. By mapping, can get an idea what needs to be done.
7	20		How many SF lots in each NP area meet affordability levels of 80%-120% MFI; other zip codes outside of NP areas? Look at SF house on average lot, Duplex unit on average lot, 4plex on average lot. This will help us understand the baseline affordability level as impacted by the land prices across the city before we look at then number of units on a piece of land that would allow us to reach specific levels of affordability.
8	20		This needs to be analyzed from a planning and zoning perspective based on densities necessary to achieve these unit costs with respect to land value.
9	20		Where do the land values align with the zoning so that new units for the range of users (young adults, seniors) by right can be closer to affordable ranges? We need to look at the nexus if we really want to land plan for this.
10	20	Adopt Affordable Housing Goals to Guide Policy. These goals should guide decisions to reach the goal of having each zip code contain at least 10% of rental housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 30% MFI (\$24,300 or less for a 4-- person household in 2016) and at least 25% of owner ship housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 120% MFI (\$93,360 or less for a 4- person household in 2016).	This needs to be analyzed from a planning and zoning perspective based on densities necessary to achieve these unit costs with respect to land value.
Item #	Pg	ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION	

11		Potential Tools and Strategies	It would be very helpful if these tools and strategies were noted with which other topics they would need to be linked to in order to succeed. Perhaps it's similar to a list at the end of the topics that lists the other topics that are assumed would ride in tandem. I.E., Allow homeowners to rent part of their houses would list Protect Renters from Discrimination or Density Bonus as items that could/should be considered at the same time.
12		Potential Tools and Strategies	It would be helpful if these topics were organized or highlighted to show which entities would be responsible for enacting the principal; i.e. Legislative Strategies, Code Strategies, Planning principles, Private Development Strategies. Easier to implement and draw links even if items overlap responsibilities.
13		Current Programs and Tools	It would be helpful to have an appendix of the type of programs and in which city they were used and how successful they actually were. This would help the city better prioritize the implementation of the different elements of this plan
Item #	pg	KEY HIGHLIGHTED POINTS	
14	3	Austinites noted that affordability is not just defined by the price of housing, but also by where one lives and if one has access to daily needs and opportunities.	There is strong consensus in that we need to PROACTIVELY plan greenfield sites outside of the urban core to ensure connected nodes of complete communities with available transit. This is where we could have the greatest impact.
15	3	By ensuring that there is coordination with the City's Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, and other citywide initiatives to implement Imagine Austin, such as the CodeNEXT revision of the City's land development code, the Austin Strategic Housing Plan seeks to address these interconnected issues comprehensively.	
16	3	The Austin Housing Plan provides roadmap for Austin to maximize the most impactful opportunities sustainably achieve affordability goals and ensure Austin remains a great city for people with different needs, values and incomes	There is strong support for the "other tools" that can help with affordability without funding housing programs: inclusionary zoning, minimum wage increases, and state income tax. We look forward to robust legislative work to achieve them.
Item #	pg	Text from Strategic Plan	
	5	Community and Stakeholder Engagement Summary	

17	5	A majority of participants agreed that affordable housing needs to be distributed as evenly as possible throughout the city to reduce any concentration, and that this housing should also be connected to transit and schools.	In addition to a goal of housing near transportation and corridors, we need goals for adding housing in accordance with existing and planned educational facilities.
18	5	Some residents were concerned that affordable housing could have a detrimental impact on the neighborhoods in which it is located	Some of this sentiment may be exclusionary in nature, while others may be wanting to see development of affordable units better integrated from a design standpoint or as a mix with market rate housing for improved housing stock of construction.
19	5	As above	We need to give recognition in the report to the density absorbed through neighborhood planning efforts. We also express the desire that changes in entitlements intended to produce new housing types or absorption of new density be applied to currently developed areas through a fully public planning process.
20	6	What is the Need?	
21	6	Rising housing costs in a handful of redeveloping neighborhoods, which could cause longtime residents to seek more affordable housing.	Seems like an understatement based on the information quoted in the statement directly proceeding. The redevelopment IS causing long term residents to be displaced and it IS happening throughout out central city
22	7	Job Growth in Low to Moderate Paying Jobs	
23	7	Of the 100,000 new jobs in the Austin Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), 36,000 are in the Education and Health Services industries, which pay about \$40,000 per year on average. Another 26,000 jobs are in the low paying Leisure and Hospitality industries, paying less than \$20,000 per year on average. Workers in these and other low and moderate paying professions struggle to find homes to buy and rent in Austin. Austin's job growth is forecast to continue adding disproportionately more low to moderate paying jobs.	Instead of MSA data, or in addition to, please include city of Austin salary data. It will be more relevant to the housing study.
24	8	As above	The 2014 Strategic Housing Market Analysis Figure 11-4 shows a breakdown of Austin's housing types in relation to similar cities. It would be good to insert the chart into the ASHP to show where we are and where we might want to be.
25	11	Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Targets Link Housing with Transportation - 25% of affordable housing created or preserved to be within ¼ mile of high frequency transit	remove parking requirement for these units increases unit yield/density and reduce construction/ land costs. With an affordability requirement, it can maximize the transit/affordable unit relationship.

26	12	Figure 7	It would be helpful to see the OTHER TOOLS portion better broken down to give the city a better idea of how these programs should be prioritized.
27	12	Figure 7	Is OTHER TOOLS, based on current program use or projected use?
28	12	Figure 7	I'm concerned that the SMART housing accounts for 12% of the puzzle while only reaching 5 years' affordability for a 10-year plan.
29	13	Each zip code should contain: - At least 10% of rental housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 30% MFI or (\$24,300 or less for a 4-person household in 2016); and - At least 25% of ownership housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 120%MFI or (\$93,360 or less for a 4-person household in 2016).	The housing plan should start with a baseline of opportunities at 120% MFI in the various zip codes. When looking at preservation strategies, there should be a plan to ensure we are not incentivizing the demolition of homes that naturally occur in the market at \$350,000 or below. As an example, a significant part of the housing stock in 78741 is priced at 120% or below of MFI. Neighborhood representatives have brought to PC's attention that the infill tools are encouraging the demolition of that product and it is being replaced with a more expensive product. This unintended consequence should be acknowledged in the report and strategies should be added to the plan to prevent it.
30		...critical to prevent displacement of existing low-income homeowners.	Based on the information regarding the lack of homes less than \$250,000 in the central city and west, it seems that this statement should include Mid-income homeowners as well
31		...new funding, new regulations, new programs, legislative changes, land development code changes and participation from the private sector as a level not previously experienced in Austin.	It would be helpful to have an appendix of the type of programs and in which city they were used and how successful they actually were. This would help the city better prioritize the implementation of the different elements of this plan
32	14	Potential strategies identified by stakeholders to maintain affordability for existing owners or create more affordable (but not income-restricted) ownership options include:	Maintaining affordability for homeowners is crucial. Piling on extra taxes and fees for housing for others may force some out of their homes. (37 years of home ownership has not insulated me from rising taxes!)
33	14	distributing housing and jobs throughout the Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors to try to lessen the pressure on prices in central Austin	List IA policies that align
34	14	adjusting lot size minimums and maximums to accommodate a diversity of housing options including missing middle housing types	If lot sizes are to be adjusted to improve affordability, they must be accompanied by regulations that prevent "big, expensive" houses on small lots. We have seen that that type of product can incentivize demolitions which can further negatively affect affordability. We need tools to create small houses on small lots.

35	14	As above	These are all nice tools. The question comes back to WHERE? Destroying existing neighborhoods is not going to help. If we don't know where these things belong, how do we put so much faith in these solutions? We are myopic not to understand where we are putting these. One row of townhouses, or two or three mid-block between bungalows is not good planning. We must begin to describe WHERE.
36	14	simplifying the permitting process for missing middle projects between three and ten units when they adhere to the form-base standards in the land development code;	site plan review for 3-10 unit developments kills the idea for many
37	14	As above	Yes, we might modify site plan requirements, but every time we give fee breaks these are loaded up on others. What about all the homeowners who are building an ADU or just adding on? We should not pile these waived fees on other homeowners.
38	14	As above	Commercial review times are crazy, have smaller projects that we won't even consider building to full density potential for the extra one or two units because of the costly property hold time paying the mortgage. In addition, the extra cost for infrastructure improvements...no way to justify the additional costs. Larger projects may be able to absorb, but not smaller ones
39	15	List of Potential tools	The tools that are most effective and currently available to us should be better highlighted throughout. This includes the ones listed in this category; homestead preservation districts, density bonuses as well as others like TIFS and preservation of existing housing stock (develop programs, resources and guides to aid with small scale preservation)
40	15	Ensure that New Development Covers the Cost of Growth: Unless a development is providing income restricted affordable housing, new development should be paying the actual costs of growth through direct investment, impact fees, or other fees, to reduce the pressure for additional property tax increases, which are regressive and impact lower income households more than higher income households.	If so, then suburban development at our fringe should pay for fair share to added infrastructure of city rather than utilizing existing infrastructure. The risk here is we are simultaneously reducing affordability at fringe too if we don't get core redevelopment incentives with affordability opportunities/requirements right.

41	15	Strategic Investments to Minimize Displacement	What tools are being explored for preserving affordable housing? Maybe disincentivizing demolitions. This encourages more reuse of existing buildings, lessens landfill impacts, and maintains neighborhood character. Many homes are simply being moved out of the city to serve as affordable housing elsewhere.
42	17	Add Flexibility to Occupancy Limits: On March 20, 2014, the City of Austin amended its city code regarding dwelling unit occupancy to reduce the maximum occupancy limits for single family homes in certain zoning districts and for duplexes from six unrelated adults to four. The ordinance has a provision excluding group home type settings from the limit. This occupancy change could raise the cost of housing for unrelated roommates since housing costs will be split among fewer occupants. The limits are most likely to affect the city's student population and coops but could also have implications for persons with disabilities who reside together in a group setting that is not a licensed group home. In this case, the city would need to make a reasonable accommodation to the ordinance to avoid fair housing violations.	There are a few factual errors in this paragraph. The simplest one is the assertion that the occupancy reduction measure would could affect co-ops. Co-ops require MF-4 or higher zoning. This ordinance did not affect MF-4 zoning or group residential use. In 2014 there were very long hearings, including a PC run workgroup that met regularly for months looking into high-occupancy structures and affordability implications. The crux of the affordability issue was that the high occupancy structures were so lucrative, that viable, older housing stock was being demolished to be replaced by high occupancy structures. Rents were consistently higher per bedroom in the new structures compared to the older structures. The occupancy changes to bring Austin more in line with other cities affected only new construction from the day the ordinance went into effect, in order to prevent future demolitions while not disturbing established occupancy arrangements. The fair housing study assumed the ordinance was retroactive and that current residents, at the time of the ordinance change, would be displaced. After much study, PC recommended in 2014 to make the occupancy adjustment to 4 unrelated persons per site permanent. Relaxing occupancy requirements should be carefully considered in light of surrounding development. Current code allows up to 10 senior citizens to house share.
43	20	Better Utilize Land for Affordable Housing: The City should continue to offer density bonuses.	Consider adding specific national best practices (similar to the way best practices were inserted on pages 137-139 in the Imagine Austin Plan) and add existing bonus programs and how they have worked and how they could be improved.
44	21	Figure 9: Existing Density Bonus Programs	Consider adding data into legend, for example, Downtown Density Bonus (went into effect in 20xx) Produced x units

45	22	Implement Density Bonus Program for Missing Middle Housing:"residents are more sensitive to building height and building size. In this type of bonus program, the "density"could take the form of units (rather than height or bulk), allowing more units with in the same size building. This program could effectively provide missing middle affordable units. Relaxation of parking requirements could promote affordability and potentially maintain neighborhood character. Economic modeling has confirmed that such programs would be financially feasible while also producing affordable housing benefits."	a few case studies will show this will likely not yield 2+ bedroom units in needed numbers due to lot depths, compatibility, impervious parking, with parking being a major deterrent
46	22	Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots:With increased demand for housing in central locations, land prices are likely to continue to rise. One potential way to enable more people to be able to afford to live in these locationefficient areas is to make it easier to build smaller houses on smaller lots	smaller lots will be more sensitive to imp cover limits and parking
47	22	As above	Strong support for this in greenfield. Should be done through a planning process, ensuring does not encourage unintended demolitions.
48	23	Utilize PUDs to provide a range of Affordability: ...Programs and regulations should provide incentives to developments that help address affordability...	Consider adding what incentives are currently being used? How are they successful? How might they be improved? What are national best practices?
49	24	Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions: ...incentivize the development of a range of housing types (including missing middle) and a connected street grid...	Consider adding what these incentives might look like? What are national best practices?
50	24	Link Housing Choices with Transportation Choices: Prioritize infrastructure investments in activity centers and along activity corridors. Infrastructure is critical to developing a transit supportive environment and thus ridership.	CIP connection to Housing Plan and CodeNEXT. Increased focus by PC in upcoming IP efforts
51	25	Figure 12: Relationship Between Parking Requirements and Affordability	
52	23	As above-	Please clarify that the scenario presented is only accurate with a FIXED profit margin of 8% (Per Fregonese and Associates)
		Comments for future implementation of tools	

53	15	Affordable ownership process	The goal of all home ownership affordability programs should be for the program to fund itself. Appreciation and profits should be reinvested to fund future affordability opportunities.
54	15	Taxing on Homestead and special provisions for certain groups of people	Solution cannot be weighed heavily by offsetting one group's taxes to make others pay for it. Everyone is feeling the pain of increase in taxes. Add the need for Bonds and it increases again. Solution needs to be to gain other funding sources than this. otherwise give those being burdened by this some tool to help offset the additional tax burden. We may possibly hurt the middle class's ability to stay.
55	15	As above	Shift of taxes to homestead units, meaning rental units, increases rental costs.
56	15	Target a Preservation Property Tax Exemption to Communities at Risk of Displacement	What level of affordability will this target? How do we prevent the unintended consequence of creating a district that incentivizes gentrification by holding down taxes? Is this tied to longevity? Who is eligible and who is not?
57	15	CLT	How do we incentivize private development to create CLT? Are there examples of existing programs that use this model? Or is it exclusively non-profits & cities? Could there be a private public partnership where the small homeowner sells part of their property to the city to be included in a CLT in exchange for an affordable unit being built at the back of their property and thus rental income?
58	17	Legislation	Pursue legislation to keep more of the tax money in the area that it was collected from. When residents pay more and more taxes each year, more and more of it goes to other parts of the state. By passing legislation to keep more of it local, we increase the funds we have available for affordable housing, education, infrastructure, etc.
59	17	Subsidies	Some opportunity to float subsidy tools from property to property. Gives flexibility so landlords and offer at different places at different times... not locked at a specific location.
60	18	Maximize Public Property to Build or Include Affordable Housing	Love the idea...if we are to use taxpayer money to purchase land and take it out of the taxable pool and hence increase tax burden on ourselves, at least let all taxpayers be able to also enjoy the land. By combining Civic use that all can enjoy, and piggybacking affordable housing, it is a win for all

61	18	Challenge the Private Sector to Participate in a Fund for Affordable Housing a/o Workforce Housing	Could this be tied to a density bonus program for commercial development?
62	18	Develop Programs, Resources and Guides to aid with Small Scale Preservation: ...offer guides, tools and programs specifically geared toward helping small landlords preserve...	Consider adding specific ideas to develop these guides and tools. For example, local non-profit design and development centers (like ACDDC) could be tasked with producing a guide for ADU's - obstacles and resources.
		Comments not supported by full workgroup	
63	10	2015 the Martin Prosperity Institute named the Austin metro area the most economically segregated area in the United States, stating that "it is not so much the size of the gap between the rich and poor that drives segregation as the ability of the super wealthy to isolate and wall themselves off from the less well-to-do.	: Compounded by poor transit with exclusive zoning practices, escalating land costs, lack of inclusionary zoning and unit/lot size restriction. The fact that we are "THE MOST ECONOMICALLY SEGREGATED" must be more seriously looked at as planning conversation with real actions to follow. This cannot be about adjusting some little things with expectations that we are altering the severely flawed affordability equation. The entire system of planning and regulations must be fully evaluated otherwise we continue to push affordability to our surrounding communities and risk of future success as a city.
64	10		I don't believe that this segregation has been by design except in the 1928 City Plan. Inserting different types of housing in existing areas is a difficult task and depends on available land. Again, minimum wage, tax reform, and good planning in the greenfields will have the greatest impact. Infill along corridors is helping with multi-family housing.
65	10		This segregation can also be attributed to the strength and protection of Zoning and Neighborhood Plans that we created... we've push so hard to preserve our old neighborhoods; the problem is that times have changed... City needs are so different now. This plan is very ambitious and if the People really want this to happen, then they need to make the difficult choice of accepting drastic changes.
66	3		Without adding affordability to what Austin can offer, the City will begin to lose growth to our neighboring cities who are offering it. We are already losing some...not only are business locating elsewhere, but developers are giving up on Austin due to the complex and expensive processes, planning greenfield between existing Austin and neighboring cities with amenities mixed housing, mixed uses, and transit.

67	14	Potential strategies identified by stakeholders to maintain affordability for existing owners or create more affordable (but not income-restricted) ownership options include:	Maintaining affordability for homeowners is crucial. Piling on extra taxes and fees for housing for others may force some out of their homes. (37 years of home ownership has not insulated me from rising taxes!)
68	14	de-incentivizing the construction of new big, expensive houses through fees;	added or increased fees for low density units/lots? Penalty for not addressing affordability and redeveloping with lower densities? (NURIA: Dense doesn't necessarily mean small and inexpensive, and low-density doesn't necessarily mean "big and expensive", maybe there is a better way to try to capture "big and expensive")
69	11	Each zip code should contain: (same in each zip)	Will be very difficult to make this happen... imposing the same standards across the board, however the cost of the land is so vastly different. Need to find some mechanism to mediate this if we want this to happen...some tool for these areas of high cost of development to meet the same specifications or areas that inexpensive...otherwise adjust targets...
70		McMansion	Also, need to review the design requirements so they don't increase costs...IE elements in McMansion are costly and inefficient to build
71		Tree ordinance	Need to look at the impact of the Tree Ordinance and see if there is another way to allow structure to be built efficiently...nice to design with existing trees, but can also be costly to do so... potentially rendering a site unbuildable.
72		Historic landmark homes / districts	Need to look really hard at the this... there is a cost to affordability... may not be the most efficient use of the property and may be costlier to maintain- need to weigh the Community Benefit that Historic Designation provides with the Community benefit that more housing units provides to affordability.
73	15	Displacement	Displacement is not necessarily BAD. If displacement of a group comes with a Replacement with same ability to house, but with an increase in density, the replacement fairs better. Occupying a prime piece of property with an inefficient housing type will not help with getting us where we need to be.
74	21	Increase in development capacity tied to affordability requirement	Increase in development capacity should be calibrated to what is needed. Sometimes it may not need any affordability specific and just need great unit numbers... might not be in an ideal spot like TOD or walkable or amenities, etc.

75	23	Create a Multifamily Property Tax Exemption Program: Multifamily Property Tax Exemption Programs are effective incentive programs used in other cities that ensure a percentage of housing in participating new developments is affordable for low and moderate-income people. In exchange for onsite affordability, the city provides a partial property tax exemption for a number of years. The new program should allow all unit types to participate and should incorporate an incentive for building larger units so that families have more affordable housing choices throughout the city. Multifamily Property Tax Exemption housing can provide housing to retail and service workers, entry level professionals, and retirees on fixed incomes.	For many years, I have paid much higher taxes on my home and garage apartment than the 12-unit apartment building 1/2 block from my home. The appraisal formula does not recognize the location of apartments. Giving them further breaks for affordability will simply add to my taxes and may take my home out of range of my affordability. As it is, a multi-family will incur much lower tax per unit than a single-family home. The taxes should be fair and not added to the adjacent homeowner.
		Comments to PC	
76	6	Geographically limited housing opportunities: Affordable rentals are scarce west of I35; Homes to buy for \$250,000 or less are increasingly concentrated in northeast, far south and southeast Austin. Rising housing costs in a handful of redeveloping neighborhoods, which could cause longtime residents to seek more affordable housing.	New housing types (which current zoning don't often provide) needed at differing sales/rental levels dependent with respect to a wide range of land values. Planning Commission should look at what this might mean for housing solutions based upon existing SF-3 lots at 100k, 200k, 500k, 1M. One size will not fit all yet are zoning has attempted look at them all equally. How will land values impact zoning and tool types? How can PC be more proactive at looking at dispersal of units?
77		Demolitions	The city demographer might help PC locate underused sites that will not require the demolition of existing housing.
78	9	Figure 3 illustrates that growth is expected at all income levels; however, there is not sufficient housing product for people with both very low and very high incomes. These households are being forced to compete for limited housing supply in the middle.	We should recognize that increasing housing stock at all price points is to be encouraged rather than criticized. We should take stock annually with number of units in all zip codes at ranges of price points rather picking on specific projects for the lack of something. Then with more information attempt to plan better thru planning efforts, regulations and approval.
79		Financing	We should also take into account where possible that ownership abilities have changed with banks thus rental affordability is even more critical and shouldn't be held against development as negative when the market and financing capabilities have shifted over the years.

80	24	Link Housing Choices with Transportation Choices: Prioritize infrastructure investments in activity centers and along activity corridors. Infrastructure is critical to developing a transit supportive environment and thus ridership.	Bus lines should immediately be upgraded to serve the areas noted as having lower income housing. Shuttles should allow folks to access buses without having to drive to bus stops.
81	24	As above	Need to work with CapMetro and other transportation bodies on coordinating the future
82	25	Figure 12: Relationship Between Parking Requirements and Affordability	If buses are available, and retail is close by, especially in planned greenfield areas, then families might be able to reduce the number of cars they maintain.

AUSTIN HOUSING PLAN FEEDBACK SUMMARY**Completed Meetings by Consultants****Revised: 07/30/16**

Location	Date/Time	Council District	# of Participants
Alpha Seventh-Day Adventist Church, First Meeting	5/24/16, 6 p.m.	1	1
Kasita House (Dr. Jeff Wilson)	06/15/16, 11a.m.	1	2
Huston-Tillotson University (President's Executive Team)	06/16/16, 9a.m.	1	15
Colony Park Neighborhood Association	6/20/16, 6:30p.m.	1	3
Montopolis Friendship Community Center	6/22/16, 1p.m.	3	2
Conley-Guerrero Senior Activity Center	07/11/16, 11 a.m.	1	48
Alpha Seventh Day Adventist Church Second Follow-up Meeting	07/13/16, 7 p.m.	1	7
Dove Springs Advisory Board	07/18/16, 6:30 p.m.	2	12

Summary of Facilitated Discussions:

Proposed Plan Goals	Feedback
Prevent Households From Being Priced Out of Austin	Provide options for those who own their own home currently to earn income from it by renting an accessory dwelling unit.
	Support for community land trust model to create new opportunities for affordable/attainable homeownership (8 meetings)
	There is a perception that new condos for young, single people are pushing out families with children
	People need to have the ability to pass on their homes to their children. Currently, people are not able to transfer their wealth to family members because of property taxes and other expenses.
	Some families are moving by choice to areas with better schools or for more land; others are leaving against their will because they cannot afford housing in Austin.
	Starting to see effects of higher home prices/potential gentrification areas outside the urban core. People are moving here from other areas of town because they have nowhere else to go.
	Find ways to preserve those sacred spaces that get lost during

	<p>gentrification. And have rent controls. You don't move and the rent is frozen protecting the tenants.</p> <p>See that the integrity of houses and neighborhood stay the same. This (the 78744) is the last affordable area in Austin including Del Valle. Cap everything.</p> <p>People do not want to be (put in) in a box. (after explanation of the Community Land Trust).</p>
	<p>Adjust the code/protection. This is a return to a sharecropper situation. People who acquire wealth and loss of wealth and they are homeless.</p>
	<p>Address hidden homelessness in the Austin community and have shelters away from neighborhoods. We have vulnerable populations who are poor. And you have multiple families living in one place or out in the outskirts/rural areas of the city.</p> <p>Affordable Housing could address the issues of homelessness. Not a separate issue.</p>
	<p>There is overcrowding in the Austin public schools. Quality education needs to be provided in the city as people are moving outside of Austin to get a better education for their children.</p>
	<p>Wages have not caught up for people to afford to live in Austin. There is a wage gap in Austin and the cost of living. This needs to change.</p>
	<p>Stop the floodgate of old landowners being forced out.</p>
Foster Equitable Communities	<p>Low quality public schools are an equity issue that affects housing choice.</p>
	<p>Need for education of elderly property owners to complete elderly tax exemptions.</p>
	<p>Support tenant relocation efforts.</p>
	<p>There needs to be a review of the Zoning Codes. Let the newcomers incur the additional costs and not those who are long term Austin residents.</p>
	<p>Put a cap on the amount of rent for rental properties to allow for affordability.</p>
Invest in Housing for Those Most in Need	<p>Need to support students and young professionals.</p> <p>Council Member Delia Garza - Texas won't allow rent control. It's time to figure in the missing middle people.</p>
	<p>Employer-assisted housing can be a good strategy to allow</p>

	employees to live closer to work; good for employers as well.
Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin	Support for utilizing public land for affordable housing Duplexes should be capped (MFI) at \$850.00 - \$1,400 for a (3 bdrm/2 bath). At Logan Mill, the average is \$1,250 a month. New Houses – let there be a standard tax for all. Do not believe in land grabs and landlocks the same.
	There is support for affordable housing in all areas of town – this area (Colony Park) is already saturated.
	Bring back Rent to Own Programs to allow for home ownership in Austin.
	How often will the % goals for the zip codes be reviewed and adjusted? They will need to be re-evaluated on a regular basis as the housing costs will change.
Help Austinites Reduce their Transportation Costs	Lack of flexible transit options; need for additional transit routes (Colony Park, Dove Springs, Montopolis, etc.) areas.
	Need for more connectivity and sidewalks. Let the developers incur the costs for sidewalk development.
	Transportation costs are a major component of household budgets.
	Bike Share program near work Promote biking among Blacks (African-American Austinites). Go into the elementary/middle schools. Promotion/advertising campaign for bike programs for youth Offer other pushes (promotions) for the transit companies.
	The Rail was built to benefit Southeast Travis County. Do/Go South of Riverside. Bus 127 – there are only two options of Capital Metro for Eastern Addison Park. People need more options. Code Enforcement needs to happen with slum lords of parking (possibly apartments).

Other General Comments:

- The City must support innovation and new models in affordable housing; especially market-based approaches that can be achieved with less subsidy than traditional models.
- Need to drastically reduce site planning time for pre-approved models of affordable housing
- Need for continued public engagement and education around this issue to have engaged citizens.
- How will this plan be different from past plans that just seem to sit on the shelf and were not implemented?

- There needs to be a review of the Zoning Codes. Let the newcomers incur the additional costs and not those who are long term Austin residents.
- Regulations can help create opportunities. Jonathan T. explained that the Mueller Development was an opportunity/experiment of mixed development which included Affordable Housing.

Additional Comments from Informal Interview with Mrs. Dorothy Jo Nunn, on Friday, July 15, 2016.

BRING BACK RENT TO OWN PROGRAMS IN AUSTIN - Informal conversation with beautician Mrs. Dorothy Jo Nunn - They need to bring back the Rent-to-Own program with the City. People were able to pay their rent and pay on a house. Two situations – one young lady thought everything was in order but could not find the paperwork that her father paid for and had to move out of the house. The other situation is that the daughter had all the documentation from her father and the paperwork was in order and she given the house – free title and it was her when he died. That program would help a lot of people with home ownership.

VII. Conversation Kit



ATX Housing Plan – Community Conversations

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

What is the purpose of this exercise?

The activity in the Housing Conversation Kit is an opportunity to stimulate conversation about the tough choices Austin faces regarding household affordability. The City of Austin wants to understand residents' thoughts regarding various funding mechanisms, potential regulations, and other creative approaches the City should utilize to increase housing choices for a range of incomes throughout the city, as envisioned in Imagine Austin, the City's Comprehensive Plan. Your participation will help shape Austin's first Housing Plan, and inform policy makers as they work to align resources, ensure a unified strategic direction, and help facilitate community partnerships.

Why don't you just conduct community meetings?

The Housing Conversations will occur in tandem with 12 community meetings scheduled at various sites in all 10 City Council Districts. The activity in the Kit is the same as the activity at the meeting, giving residents the choice to attend a scheduled meeting or host their own. The Kit is designed to reach a wider audience of Austinites who prefer to have a smaller setting for dialogue on housing issues.

What are the components of the Housing Conversation Kit?

The Kit includes: Conversation Kit Instructions & Topics, Group Activity Sheet (PDF document with ATXhousing Community Conversations at the top), Group Tally Sheet, Frequently Asked Questions, and Individual Feedback Sheet.

Who can participate in the Housing Conversation Kit?

The exercise is open to all residents of Austin. We encourage neighborhood associations, civic groups, non-profit, and faith based organizations and other groups to complete the activity together, whenever it is convenient, before Friday, May 27th, 2016.

How will the information submitted be used?

Feedback collected will help shape Austin's first Housing Plan. City staff will present a draft plan to the Austin City Council Housing and Community Development Committee on June 6, 2016. This will be open to the public and will air on ATXN.

What are the deadlines for submittal of a completed Housing Conversation Kit?

Please return the response sheet by email or in person, by Friday, May 27th, 2016, by 5:00p.m.

Where do I return the Kit when I've finished the exercise?

- Email your completed results by photographing, scanning or filling in the Group Tally Sheet and sending it to: NHCD@austintexas.gov
- Drop off the Kit in person at our building: 1000 E. 11th St., Suite 200, Austin, TX 78702 at the 2nd Floor Reception Desk

Who should I contact for more information?

Please contact Jonathan Tomko at (512) 974-1057 or jonathan.tomko@austintexas.gov



ATX Housing Plan – Community Conversations

Conversation Kit Instructions & Topics

Instructions:

1. Thank you for participating!
2. You will need to print out:
 - a. A Conversation Kit Instructions & Topics packet for each participant
 - b. One Group Activity Sheet for the group (PDF document with ATXhousing Community Conversations at the top)
 - c. One Tally Sheet for the group (Word document)
 - d. One Frequently Asked Questions Sheet (optional)
 - e. An Individual Feedback Sheet for each participant (optional)
3. Before you begin, please designate a facilitator for your group. The facilitator will keep the conversation going, and will try to limit group discussion to 10 minutes per topic. The conversation topics are described in this packet. We'll explain those shortly. The exercise should take about 60 minutes if you stay on pace.
4. Hand out a copy of the Conversation Kit Instructions & Topics to each person in the group.
5. **Please read through your packet in its entirety.**
6. After everyone is done reading through the entire packet, each person should initial above the phrase that best reflects their level of support for the statement on the Group Activity Sheet.
7. [Facilitator] After all participants have written their initials on the Group Activity Sheet for all six topics, the facilitator asks people with initials closest to each end of the spectrum of responses to explain why they feel the way they do. Begin with topic #1 and take no more than 10 minutes to discuss as a group.
 - a. At the conclusion of the discussion for each topic, the facilitator asks everyone if they would like to change their response at that time. If so, participants cross out their initials in the first location and write their initials at the new location.
8. [Facilitator] Move on to topic #2, starting with the people with initials closest to each end of the spectrum of responses explaining why they placed them in those locations. Take no more than 10 minutes to discuss.
 - a. At the conclusion of the discussion for each topic, the facilitator asks everyone if they would like to change their response at that time. If so, participants cross out their initials in the first location and write their initials at the new location.
 - b. Repeat the sequence for the remaining topics.
9. [Facilitator] Once the group has completed the exercise, the facilitator should tally the number of responses in each field on the Tally Sheet (Word document) to email back to nhcd@austintexas.gov, or mail it or drop it by Neighborhood Housing and Community Development, 1000 E. 11th St., Suite 200, Austin, TX 78702, by 5:00pm on May 27, 2016. Participants are invited to fill out Individual Feedback Sheets and submit them by email or at our offices.




Topic #1: Affordable Housing in Austin

Statement to Discuss: *There should be affordable housing options available in your neighborhood.*

Relevant Information

- **Affordable housing** is defined as housing in which the occupants are paying no more than 30 percent of their income for gross housing costs, including utilities. Many in Austin, both individuals and families, pay **more than they can afford** for housing.
- **Austin is in need of housing**, particularly for households earning less than \$25,000 per year. Current data indicates that there is a **shortage of 48,000 units**, up from 37,000 units five years ago.
- Nearly 55% of the city's households are renters, and **only 1 in 6 renters earning less than \$20,000 a year can find affordable housing**.
- **Low- and moderate-wage jobs** range from \$15,000/year to \$40,000/year and include teachers, childcare workers, cooks, musicians, servers, clerks, and home health care attendants.
- While **low- and moderate-wage jobs are found in every zip code in the city**, affordable housing (subsidized or market-rate) is not.
- Some zip codes in Austin **completely lack affordable multifamily housing units**. To address the shortage of affordable housing in some areas, additional multifamily housing would need to be built.






Topic #2: Additional City Funding for Affordable Housing

Statement to Discuss: *The City should dedicate a larger proportion of tax revenue from new developments to affordable housing, which could result in less funding for other City services and programs.*

Relevant Information

- The City of Austin is **limited by state law in the range of tools** it can use to support affordable housing.
- As **new developments** are built in Austin, they **generate additional tax revenue** in the form of property taxes, and sometimes sales taxes, if there are retail shops in the development. Some of that additional revenue could be directed toward the creation or preservation of affordable housing through **Tax Increment Financing**.
- **Tax Increment Financing** for affordable housing is **allowed by state law**, but has not been used extensively for this purpose in Austin.
- Funds collected through Tax Increment Financing could be used to build housing with long-term affordability to ensure that there is **housing that will stay affordable over the long term**, even if overall housing prices increase.
- **Less than 1% of the City of Austin's budget is currently spent on affordable housing.** The additional tax revenue generated by new developments would be used for a range of city services including parks, libraries, roads, public safety, etc., if those funds were not dedicated to affordable housing.



Sources: <http://bettercities.net/images/15879/tax-increment-financing>;
https://austintexas.gov/financeonline/finance/financial_docs.cfm?ws=1&pg=1



Topic #3: Taller Buildings for More Affordable Housing

Statement to Discuss: *The City should allow developers to build taller buildings along major roadways in exchange for on-site affordable housing for households earning less than \$40,000 per year.*

Relevant Information

- **Density bonuses** allow developers to build more housing units, taller buildings, or add more floor space than normally allowed in exchange for a defined public benefit, such as the inclusion of affordable units in a development.
- Density bonuses are a mechanism through which **affordable units are created without public subsidy**.
- The city has several existing density bonus programs that enable developers to secure the increased height or floor space if they **set aside a percentage of units as affordable housing** on site. Two such programs are the Vertical Mixed Use (VMU) and the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) density bonus programs.
- In addition to the affordable units created through these developments, the net **increase in revenue to the city** in property taxes from the larger projects allowed through a bonus program can be used to **fund city services**.




Image Source: http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/bed_stuy/bed_stuy3.shtml

**Topic # 4: Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots**

Statement to Discuss: *The City of Austin should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed, in order to provide more affordable options.*

Relevant Information

- **Housing prices have increased** in Austin within the last five years, a time when there have not been significant changes to the City's regulations for predominantly single-family neighborhoods.
- One potential strategy to address Austin's lack of affordable housing choices is to **allow housing on smaller pieces of land** than is currently allowed.
- Allowing multiple units on the same land can **divide the increasing cost of land between multiple households**, reducing that portion of the cost of housing.
- The name commonly used for a range of multi-unit or clustered housing types is "missing middle." Well-designed "**missing middle**" housing helps make neighborhoods more walkable, more supportive of businesses (by increasing foot traffic), and more likely to support public transit by enabling more people to live within walking distance of transit.
- This type of housing is **allowed at the Mueller Development** in Austin, but not in most of the rest of the city.



Image Sources: <http://www.modative.com/small-lot-subdivision-los-angeles-blog/topic/multi-family-housing>;
<https://www.flickr.com/photos/88104819@N02/11655250595>



Topic #5: Reduce Parking Requirements for Affordable Housing

Statement to Discuss: The City should reduce the amount of parking required for new developments within a quarter of a mile of a bus route or rail line as an incentive to include on-site affordable housing.

Relevant Information

- Parking requirements are **the largest of all regulatory burdens** placed on developers, about four times greater than all other development fees such as levies for schools, parks and roads *combined*.
- **Parking requirements** usually account for about 10% of cost of new developments. This percentage is much higher for lower-priced housing in areas with high land costs.
- **High parking requirements** make it difficult for new development to fit onto small lots.
- **Parking spaces** take up land that could otherwise be used for additional housing, green space, businesses, or some combination of the three.
- **Reducing parking requirements** for developments providing affordable housing would allow the money that would have been spent on parking to be used to provide affordable housing.
- People living within walking distance bus routes or rail lines are able to more easily use transit, **reducing the need for parking**.




Image Source: Fregonese Associates.




Topic #6: Linking Housing and Transportation

Statement to Discuss: *The City should encourage more housing at a range of prices within a quarter of a mile of bus routes or rail lines to enable more people to live within walking distance of multiple transportation options.*

Relevant Information

- **Household Affordability** is defined as *the ability of a household to afford its housing and associated costs, including rent or mortgage, **transportation**, and utilities.* Transportation costs are typically a household's second-largest expenditure after housing itself.
- In Austin, on average, **people spend about 20% of their income on transportation.**
- The cost of ownership, maintenance, insurance, and gas for a car averages **\$9,000 per car per year** in Austin, or enough for an additional \$750/month on housing.
- Longer commute times make it harder for low-income families to move up the economic ladder.
Housing with good access to transit connects people with jobs and services without having to own a car.



SOURCE: <http://www.locationaffordability.info/>

1. Affordable Housing in Austin



There should be affordable housing options available in your neighborhood.

☐

Strongly
Disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Neutral

☐

Agree

☐

Strongly
Agree

2. Additional City Funding for Affordable Housing



The City should dedicate a larger proportion of tax revenue from new developments to affordable housing, which could result in less funding for other City services and programs.

☐

Strongly
Disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Neutral

☐

Agree

☐

Strongly
Agree

3. Taller Buildings for More Affordable Housing



The City should allow developers to build taller buildings along major roadways in exchange for on-site affordable housing for households earning less than \$40,000 per year.

☐

Strongly
Disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Neutral

☐

Agree

☐

Strongly
Agree

4. Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots



The City of Austin should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed, in order to provide more affordable options.

☐

Strongly
Disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Neutral

☐

Agree

☐

Strongly
Agree

5. Reduce Parking Requirements for Affordable Housing



The City should reduce the amount of parking required for new developments within a quarter of a mile of a bus route or rail line as an incentive to include on-site affordable housing.

☐

Strongly
Disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Neutral

☐

Agree

☐

Strongly
Agree

6. Linking Housing and Transportation



The City should encourage more housing at a range of prices within a quarter of a mile of bus routes or rail lines to enable more people to live within walking distance of multiple transportation options.

☐

Strongly
Disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Neutral

☐

Agree

☐

Strongly
Agree



ATX Housing Plan – Community Conversations

Conversation Kit Tally Sheet

Please note in the boxes the number of participants who had their initials in each of the following categories at the end of the exercise:

All responses will be reported in aggregate with no identifying information included.

Topic #1: Affordable Housing in Austin

Statement: *There should be affordable housing options available in your neighborhood.*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>

Topic #2: Additional City Funding for Affordable Housing

Statement: *The City should dedicate a larger proportion of tax revenue from new developments to affordable housing, which could result in less funding for other City services and programs.*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>

Topic #3: Taller Buildings for More Affordable Housing

Statement: *The City should allow developers to build taller buildings along major roadways in exchange for on-site affordable housing for households earning less than \$40,000 per year.*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>

Topic # 4: Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots

Statement: *The City of Austin should allow small houses to be built on smaller pieces of land than is currently allowed, in order to provide more affordable options.*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>

Topic #5: Reduce Parking Requirements for Affordable Housing

Statement: *The City should reduce the amount of parking required for new developments within a quarter of a mile of a bus route or rail line as an incentive to include on-site affordable housing.*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>

Topic #6: Linking Housing and Transportation

Statement: *The City should encourage more housing at a range of prices within a quarter of a mile of bus routes or rail lines to enable more people to live within walking distance of multiple transportation options.*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>

Name of Convener or Organization:

Council District (if known):

Zip Code:

Individual Feedback Sheet

Thank you for attending today's community conversation about the Austin Housing Plan. Your feedback will help inform future community meetings.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

ZIP CODE (where you live) _____

CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT (if known) _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

YOUR E-MAIL ADDRESS IS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED TO PROVIDE UPDATES ABOUT THE AUSTIN HOUSING PLAN.

OPTIONAL

AGE Less than 18 18-29 30-44 45-64 65 and over

GENDER Male Female

RACE / ETHNICITY African American Asian-American Hispanic / Latino White Other

HOUSEHOLD SIZE (how many people live in your home?)

Live alone with spouse or partner only with spouse or partner and children

with children or parent only with housemate, roommate, etc.

TIME LIVED IN AUSTIN

Less than 6 months 6 months-1 year 1-3 years 3-5 years 5-10 years More than 10 years

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Under \$20,000 \$21,000 - \$40,000 \$41,000 - \$60,000 \$61,000 - \$80,000 Greater than \$80,000

DO YOU RENT OR OWN YOUR CURRENT RESIDENCE? Rent Own Do Not Know

WOULD YOU CONSIDER ATTENDING FUTURE COMMUNITY EVENTS ON THIS TOPIC? YES NO

Comments _____

WERE THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE GROUP ACTIVITY EASY TO FOLLOW? YES NO

Comments _____

WAS THE GROUP ACTIVITY FUN AND INFORMATIONAL? YES NO

Comments / How can we improve the group activity? _____

WERE THERE ANY IDEAS YOU THINK ARE IMPORTANT RELATED TO HOUSING AFFORDABILITY THAT YOUR GROUP DID NOT DISCUSS?

Comments _____

For more information about the Austin Housing Plan, to complete the online survey in April, or to request a Housing Conversation Kit to host your own conversation, please visit:

www.austintexas.gov/housingplan

Thank You

VIII. Outreach Flyer



Item C-18

Many households in Austin are

525 of 535

UNABLE to find housing that is affordable.

What should we do?

ATX HOUSING – COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS

Inform Austin's First Housing Plan!

Tuesday, March 29, 6-8 PM

Windsor Park Branch Library
5833 Westminster Drive, 78723, District 1

Wednesday, March 30, 6-8 PM

Southeast Branch Library
5803 Nuckols Crossing Road, 78744, District 2

Monday, April 4, 6-8 PM

Terrazas Branch Library
1105 E Cesar Chavez Street, 78702, District 3

Tuesday, April 5, 6-8 PM

Northwest Rec. Center
2913 Northland Drive, 78757, District 7

Wednesday, April 6, 6-8 PM

Turner Roberts Recreation Center
7201 Colony Loop Drive, 78724, District 1

Saturday, April 9, 10:30 AM-12:30 PM

Manchaca Road Branch Library
5500 Manchaca Road, 78745, District 5

Monday, April 11, 6-8 PM

Pleasant Hill Branch Library
211 E William Cannon Drive, 78745, District 2

Tuesday, April 19, 6-8 PM

Little Walnut Creek Branch Library
835 W Rundberg Lane, 78758, District 4

Wednesday, April 20, 6-8 PM

Spicewood Springs Branch Library
8637 Spicewood Springs Road, 78759, District 6

Monday, April 25, 6-8 PM

North Village Branch Library
2505 Steck Avenue, 78757, District 10

Wednesday, April 27, 6-8 PM

Hampton Branch Library at Oak Hill
5125 Convict Hill Road, 78749, District 8

Thursday, April 28, 6-8 PM

Town Lake Center at Austin Energy
721 Barton Springs Road, 78704, District 9

Tuesday, May 3, 6-8 PM

Austin Board of Realtors (ABOR)
4800 Spicewood Springs Road, 78759, District 10



Housing Conversation Kit

Host your own meeting with a group!



Complete the Housing Survey

Available online in April



Learn More

www.austintexas.gov/housingplan



Mail: NHCD, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767



Email: NHCD@austintexas.gov



Call: 512-974-3100

E-472

December 5, 2016 DRAFT
**Neighborhood Housing and
Community Development**





Item C-18

Muchos hogares en Austin pueden encontrar vivienda accesible. ¿Qué debemos hacer?

526 of 535

ATX HOUSING -

CONVERSACIONES DE LA COMUNIDAD

¡Informar al primer plan de vivienda de Austin!

Martes, 29 de marzo, 6-8 PM

Windsor Park Branch Library
5833 Westminster Drive, 78723, Distrito de 1

Miércoles, 30 de marzo, 6-8 PM

Southeast Branch Library
5803 Nuckols Crossing Road, 78744, Distrito de 2

Lunes, 4 de abril, 6-8 PM

Terrazas Branch Library
1105 E Cesar Chavez Street, 78702, Distrito de 3

Martes, 5 de abril, 6-8 PM

Northwest Recreation Center
2913 Northland Drive, 78757, Distrito de 7

Miércoles, 6 de abril, 6-8 PM

Turner Roberts Recreation Center
7201 Colony Loop Drive, 78724, Distrito de 1

Sábado, 9 de abril, 10:30 AM- 12:30 PM

Manchaca Road Branch Library
5500 Manchaca Road, 78745, Distrito de 5

Lunes, 11 de abril, 6-8 PM

Pleasant Hill Branch Library
211 E William Cannon Drive, 78745, Distrito de 2

Martes, 19 de abril, 6-8 PM

Little Walnut Creek Branch Library
835 W Rundberg Lane, 78758, Distrito de 4

Miércoles, 20 de abril, 6-8 PM

Spicewood Springs Branch Library
8637 Spicewood Springs Road, 78759, Distrito de 6

Lunes, 25 de abril, 6-8 PM

North Village Branch Library
2505 Steck Avenue, 78757, Distrito de 10

Miércoles, 27 de abril, 6-8 PM

Hampton Branch Library at Oak Hill
5125 Convict Hill Road, 78749, Distrito de 8

Jueves, 28 de abril, 6-8 PM

Town Lake Center at Austin Energy
721 Barton Springs Road, 78704, Distrito de 9

Martes, 3 de mayo, 6-8 PM

Austin Board of Realtors (ABOR)
4800 Spicewood Springs Road, 78759, Distrito de 10



Kit de la Conversación de Vivienda

¡Celebre su propia reunión!



Complete la Encuesta de Vivienda

Estará en línea en abril



Aprenda Más

www.austintexas.gov/housingplan



Por correo: NHCD, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767



Por correo electrónico: NHCD@austintexas.gov



Por teléfono: 512-974-3100

E-473

December 5, 2016 DRAFT
**Neighborhood Housing and
Community Development**



Provide Your Feedback on Austin's Draft Housing Plan

A draft of recommended policies and programs to achieve 10-year affordable housing goals for the City of Austin

DID WE GET IT RIGHT?



Email your comments and suggestions on the Plan to nhcd@austintexas.gov



Draft Plan is available at all public libraries
Review and provide written comments



Contribute to the discussion on SpeakUpAustin!
online at www.speakupaustin.org



Provide feedback at a community meeting:
Thursday, July 21, 6- 7:30 PM
Asian-American Resource Center
8401 Cameron Rd, Austin, TX 78754

Wednesday, August 10, 6- 7:30 PM
Austin Community College
-South Austin Campus
1820 W Stassney Ln, Austin, TX 78745



Learn More

www.austintexas.gov/housingplan

All comments due by August 10, 2016

Mail: NHCD, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767
Email: nhcd@austintexas.gov
Call: 512-974-3100

E-474

December 5, 2016 DRAFT
**Neighborhood Housing and
Community Development**



Provea sus comentarios sobre el borrador del Plan de Vivienda de Austin

Un borrador de políticas y programas recomendados para alcanzar las metas de vivienda asequible de 10 años para la Ciudad de Austin

¿LO HICIMOS BIEN?



Envíe sus comentarios y sugerencias sobre el plan por correo electrónico a **nhcd@austintexas.gov**



El borrador del plan está disponible en todas las bibliotecas públicas. Revíselo y provea sus comentarios escritos.



Contribuya a la discusión en SpeakUpAustin! en línea en **www.speakupaustin.org**



Provea sus comentarios en una reunión de la comunidad

Jueves, 21 de julio, 6- 7:30 PM
Asian-American Resource Center
 8401 Cameron Rd, Austin, TX 78754

Miércoles, 10 de agosto, 6- 7:30 PM
Austin Community College
-South Austin Campus
 1820 W Stassney Ln, Austin, TX 78745

Servicios de traducción al español se ofrecerán en las reuniones de la comunidad.



Aprenda Más

www.austintexas.gov/housingplan

Todos los comentarios deben recibirse antes del 10 de agosto de 2016

Mail: NHCD, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Email: nhcd@austintexas.gov

Call: 512-974-3100

E-475

December 5, 2016 DRAFT

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development





Why are Equity and Inclusion Important?

- The Austin metro area is the “most economically segregated area in the United States,” according to a national study.
- An adequate supply of housing affordable to people working all types of jobs is necessary to maintain a culturally rich, diverse, and livable city. Otherwise Austin risks becoming a city affordable only to the affluent and privileged.
- Without affordable housing, people who work here will be forced to move out of the city, with negative impacts not only on individuals, but also on the region: more traffic congestion, increased environmental degradation, and fragmentation of communities.
- Studies have found that the odds of rising to another income level are notably low in certain cities with concentrated poverty, extensive traffic, and weak public transit systems making it difficult to get to a job. Therefore, policy makers need to address other issues relating to affordability as they address inequality, including access to transportation and the cost of utilities, taxes, and health care costs.



What is Affordability?

- The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development defines **Affordable Housing** as: “Housing in which the occupant(s) is/are paying no more than 30% of his or her income for gross housing costs, including utilities.”
- According to Imagine Austin, the City of Austin’s comprehensive plan, **Household Affordability** includes not only housing costs, but also utilities and transportation costs.
- **Income Restricted affordable housing** refers to housing for which renters or buyers must meet specific income guidelines to be able to live in the unit. This guideline is generally defined in terms of a percent of median family income or MFI.
- **Market Rate housing** generally refers to housing that is rented or owned by people who pay market rates to rent the property or paid market value when they bought the property.



Item C-18 530 of 535 What Housing Goals Does the Plan Propose?

75,000 Homes in 10 Years:

40,000 Market Rate

35,000 Affordable → (80% MFI and below –
About \$62,000 /year for a family of 4)

CITYWIDE

At least __%* of new housing units should be within Imagine Austin Centers & Corridors
(* In development)

Each ZIP code should contain:

- At least 10% of rental housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 30% MFI or (\$24,300 or less for a 4-person household in 2016); and
- At least 25% of ownership housing units that are affordable to households earning at or below 120% MFI or (\$93,360 or less for a 4-person household in 2016).

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Housing for All

- Serve at least 20 unduplicated people under 20% MFI without a voucher each year
- 50% of new affordable housing units created to be adaptable and 25% to be accessible
- Support production of 50 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units each year, ½ of those Housing First

Family Friendly Housing

- 25% of affordable housing units that are created or preserved should have two or more bedrooms

Linking Housing with Transportation

- 25% of affordable housing created or preserved to be within ¼-mile of high frequency transit

How Will We Accomplish these Goals?



**Prevent Households
from Being Priced
out of Austin**



**Invest in Housing for
those Most in Need**



**Foster Equitable
Communities**



**Create New & Affordable
Housing Choices for All
Austinites in All Parts of Town**

E-477



**Help Austinites
Reduce their
Transportation Costs**

December 5, 2016 DRAFT



IDEAS IMPORTANTES SOBRE EL BORRADOR DEL PLAN ESTRATÉGICO DE VIVIENDA DE AUSTIN

¿Por qué son la igualdad y la inclusión tan importantes?

- El área metropolitana de Austin es el “área más económicamente segregada de los Estados Unidos”, de acuerdo con un estudio nacional.
- Un suministro adecuado de viviendas que las personas que trabajan en todos los tipos de empleo puedan pagar es necesario para mantener una ciudad culturalmente rica, diversa y habitable. De lo contrario, Austin corre el riesgo de convertirse en una ciudad que solo pueden pagar las personas pudientes y privilegiadas.
- Sin viviendas asequibles, las personas que trabajan aquí se verán forzadas a mudarse fuera de la ciudad, con un impacto negativo no solo para los individuos, sino para la región: más congestión de tránsito, mayor degradación ambiental y fragmentación de las comunidades.
- Algunos estudios han determinado que las probabilidades de subir a otro nivel de ingresos son considerablemente bajas en ciertas ciudades con pobreza concentrada, tráfico extenso y sistemas de transporte público deficientes, lo que hace más difícil llegar al trabajo. Por lo tanto, las personas encargadas de crear las políticas deben tratar estos asuntos relacionados con la accesibilidad económica a la vez que tratan la desigualdad, incluyendo el acceso al transporte y el costo de los servicios públicos, impuestos y los costos de la atención médica.



¿Qué es accesibilidad económica?

- El Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano de los Estados Unidos define *vivienda asequible* como: “vivienda en la que el(los) ocupante(s) paga(n) un máximo del 30% de sus ingresos por costos brutos de vivienda, incluyendo los servicios públicos”.
- De acuerdo con Imagine Austin, el plan integral de la Ciudad de Austin, la *accesibilidad económica a una vivienda* incluye no solo costos de la vivienda, sino también los servicios públicos y los costos de transportación.
- Las *viviendas asequibles de ingresos limitados* se refieren a las viviendas en las que los inquilinos o compradores deben cumplir con las regulaciones específicas de ingresos para poder vivir en la unidad. Estas regulaciones se definen generalmente en términos de un porcentaje del ingreso familiar promedio o MFI, por sus siglas en inglés.
- Las *viviendas de tarifa de mercado* se refieren generalmente a las viviendas que alquilan o compran las personas que pagan tarifas de mercado para alquilar la propiedad o pagan el valor del mercado cuando compran la propiedad.



Item C-18 532 of 535 ¿Cuáles metas de vivienda propone el plan?

75,000 Casas en 10 Anos:

40,000 tarifa de mercado

35,000 asequibles ➡ 80% del MFI o menos - alrededor de \$62,000/año para una familia de 4

METAS DE CIUDAD

Al menos __%* de las unidades de viviendas nuevas deben estar dentro de los centros y corredores de Imagine Austin

(* en desarrollo)

Cada código postal debe tener:

- Al menos 10% de unidades de **viviendas de alquiler** que sean asequibles para los hogares con un ingreso de o menor de 30% del MFI o (\$24,300 o menos para un hogar de 4 personas en 2016); **y**
- Al menos 25% de unidades de **viviendas de propiedad** que sean asequibles para los hogares con un ingreso de o menor de 120% del MFI o (\$93,360 o menos para un hogar de 4 personas en 2016).

METAS DEL DEPARTAMENTO

Viviendas para todos

- Servir al menos 20 personas sin duplicaciones bajo 20% del MFI sin asistencia cada año
- 50% de unidades de viviendas asequibles nuevas creadas para ser adaptables y 25% para ser accesibles
- Apoyar la producción de 50 unidades de Vivienda de Apoyo Permanente (PHS, por sus siglas en inglés) al año, la mitad de esas Housing First

Viviendas familiares

- 25% de las unidades de viviendas asequibles que sean creadas o preservadas deben tener dos o más habitaciones

Enlace entre vivienda y transporte

- 25% de las viviendas asequibles creadas o preservadas tienen que estar a ¼ de milla de un transporte de alta frecuencia

¿Cómo Austin alcanza estas metas?




Evitando que las familias tengan que salir de Austin por no poder pagar los precios



Invirtiendo en viviendas para los más necesitados



Albergando las comunidades igualitarias



Creando nuevas opciones de vivienda asequible para todos los residentes en todas partes de Austin



Ayudando a los residentes de Austin a reducir sus costos de transporte

E-479

December 5, 2016 DBAF



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (CDC)
RECOMMENDATION 20170110-05a**

Date: January 11, 2017

Subject: Draft Austin Strategic Housing Plan

Motioned By: Commissioner McGhee

Seconded By: Commissioner Tolliver

Recommendation

The following contains the CDC's August 2016 recommendations, and January 2017 comments on the December 2016 revised draft. January comments are marked January 2017. The CDC recommends that if action is taken on the December 2016 revised draft, the January 2017 comments below be included.

Description of Recommendation to Council

The Community Development Commission recommends adopting the following comments and recommendations on the 2016 draft Austin Strategic Housing Plan:

1. Set more ambitious goals overall for affordable units and levels of affordability with goals broken out for each income level (0-30, 30-50, 50-80) below 80% MFI.

January 2017: More ambitious goals were set. However, we note differences in rounding, that the total of low-income households is rounded down while the number of higher income households is rounded up.

See also 5.

2. Add public housing goals and include a discussion of building Austin's public housing stock back up to the Faircloth limit of 1,931 units.

January 2017: More information has been included. The Commission requests apart from the Strategic Plan process why the total number of units has decreased below the Faircloth limit and what the housing authority is doing to bring these units back on line.

3. Elaborate on how the plan's initiatives address or do not address the duty to affirmatively further fair housing.

January 2017: The December draft includes more language around geographic distribution, but does not directly address the provision of affordable housing in higher opportunity areas.

Follow up recommendation: We recommend giving more of an order of progression to the plan's strategies coupled with a lens on creating more geographic choice.

4. Add preservation goals to the plan to include strategies for preserving the ability of lower income people to continue living in gentrifying areas such as those in Council districts 1 and 3. Include these goals in the discussion of community

January 2017: The Commission notes that the first recommendation on preservation is not within in the city's control as it depends on state legislative action.

Follow up recommendation: We recommend establishing an order of progression for the plan's recommendation. In establishing this order, we recommend ranking initiatives that are within the city's control more highly.

5. Conduct initiatives and report on data through Council Districts rather than zip codes.

January 2017: Goals for affordability below 30% MFI for rental and below 120% MFI for homeownership have been added.

Follow up recommendation: We recommend these goals include numerical goals and goals for 30 to 50% MFI for rental and density bonus goals.

6. The Commission expressed concern over the possibility could lead to approving subsidies or incentives to support housing people at higher income levels than standard affordability levels. Revise wording and illustrations that appear to favor or recommend subsidizing new housing above 80% MFI. This is where the needs of low-income Austinites are the most critical and that this is where our focus should be. The Commission also believes a "trickle down" approach to housing supply is not an efficient or effective approach to meet critical housing needs as effectively as programs directly geared to low-income people. Revise the chart and text that indicate great need for market rate units at incomes over \$100K; clarify that there will not be subsidies or building incentives for housing at these higher levels.

January 2017: Staff has added more documentation on general housing needs. As *the* City's commission with representatives of the poor and *the* commission that makes recommendations on housing for low-income people, we must be careful about assuring that City programs benefit low-income people.

7. Staff has suggested that the Commission look to Seattle's model for an example of how Austin might establish similar goals. The Commission will take this suggestion as a future agenda item. Until the Commission has had the opportunity to study Seattle's model and related information, we do not have a position on the statements in the draft plan regarding CodeNEXT.

January 2017: We note that the overall goals have been expanded beyond the Seattle formula.

8. Thoroughly address the monitoring process for this plan and for tracking compliance in the production and preservation programs. Better align with the federal and local budgeting and monitoring process/calendars. Study best practices in monitoring of other cities. State the benchmarks for accountability.

January 2017: This has been added to the December draft. However, the time line for implementation is 3-5 years.

Follow up recommendation: We strongly recommend that this be accomplished in 1-2 years.

Similarly, we note that other time lines do not conform to the Impediments to Fair Housing Action Steps or the CodeNext time lines.

Follow up recommendation: We recommend that all Strategic plan timelines conform to time lines stated in related documents such as CodeNext documents.

9. Reference the core values for affordable housing that Council adopted in 2007; as a City, we believe in deeper affordability, longer term affordability and geographic dispersion.

January 2017: We note that a core values section has been added.

10. The plan has a horizon of 10 years, while SMART Housing only ensures affordable levels for 1 - 5 years; make changes to SMART Housing program so that affordability is longer term, or clarify in the plan.

January 2017: We note this has been incorporated in the December draft.

11. In addition to the family-friendly goal to make 25% of homeownership units be two-bedroom units, set a preference for selling these units to families with children.

January 2017: We note this has been incorporated in the December draft. In addition, we recommend adding "seek family friendly units in density bonus programs".

12. Enhance the greenfield affordable housing density bonus program.

January 2017: We note this has been incorporated in the December draft, but we recommend adding "to increase housing diversity, including affordability".

Rationale: N/A

Record of the Vote: 13-0

For: Chair Rivera, Vice Chair Deshotel, and commissioners Fadelu, Lisa Hinely, McGhee, McHorse, Paup, Singer, Taylor, Tolliver, A. Villalobos, R. Villalobos and Zamora

Against: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Lottie Dailey

Attest: [CDC Liaison, Lisa G. Rodriguez]

