

**ADDITIONAL DATA REQUESTS FROM CHAIR SOLOFF IN CONNECTION WITH HOUSING COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT HTF PLAN:**

**Additional Information Regarding Housing Needs:**

“Census data indicates that Santa Monica has 17,135 low- and moderate-income renter households, and that 7,700 of those households pay more than one-half of their income toward rent.” (pp. 1-2). **Please provide (1) breakdown of the two numbers above by extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households, and (2) identify specifically which census data is being relied upon.**

“The 2017 Santa Monica homeless count found 921 individuals living on the street, in vehicles, and shelters.” (p. 2). **Please have relevant City Department(s) advise:**

**(1) Does “living in . . . shelters” mean temporary shelters or something else (and how many of the 921 are in these shelters, broken down by temporary versus permanent if both are included)?**

**(2) What is the number of persons on the Santa Monica Homeless registry, broken down by whether they qualified because (a) their last pre-homelessness housing was in Santa Monica, (b) because they have lived in Santa Monica more than \_\_\_ years (and what is the required minimum number of years), and (c) both of the above [and, if I am mistaken about the criteria for the registry, what are the criteria and how do the persons on the registry breakdown by those criteria]?**

**(3) Are any of the persons on the registry already housed either (1) permanently, or (2) temporarily in shelters?**

**(4) Were all of the persons on the registry counted during the homeless count (if not, why not)?**

**(5) At our last Housing Commission meeting, Tod Lipka indicated his understanding that 36% of those in the most recent homeless count (i.e., well over 300 people) have lived in Santa Monica for at least five years—(a) is that correct (and if so, what is the number) and (b) is that figure higher than the number of persons on the registry based on that criterion (and if so, why is there a difference) [and if there is some other basis in the most recent homeless count for comparing the number of people who qualify for the registry with the number of persons who actually are on the registry, please advise (and if the numbers differ on one or more criteria between those on the registry and those who qualify, why do the numbers differ)]?**

**(6) Have we moved three persons from the registry to the three units in the Venice affordable housing project to which the HTF made a loan last year (and if not, what is the projected time frame for doing so)?**

(p. 4):

The current Housing Elements covers the period of 2013 – 2021. The following table lists Santa Monica’s *Quantified Objectives* and the current status of housing production.

Table 4  
Housing Element 2013-2021

QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES TRACKING						
Income Category	Quantified Objective	Units Built	Units in Construction	Units with Planning Approval	Total	Quantified Objective Surplus/Deficit ( )
Extremely Low-Income (30% AMI)	83	80	10	60	150	67
Very Low-Income (50% AMI)	214	130	97	65	292	78
Low-Income (80% AMI)	263	104	24	13	141	(122)
Moderate-Income (120% AMI)	111	19	8	60	87	(24)
Above Moderate (Market Rate)	700	555	548	1020	2,123	1,423
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>1,371</b>	<b>888</b>	<b>687</b>	<b>1,218</b>	<b>2,793</b>	<b>1,422</b>
<b>Affordable Housing Subset</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>(146) *</b>

\* counts only negative #'s from above

The quantified objectives tracking table (Table 4) indicates the housing production goals for the *Low-Income* and *Moderate-Income* categories have not yet been met, with a current deficit of 122 and 24 units, respectively.

Please advise and/or have the Planning Department advise:

- (1) What is the metric the State uses for determining whether the City has satisfied the “Quantified Objective” of the Housing Element (units built by 2021? Something else?)?
- (2) Do we anticipate completion within the current Housing Element period of all units in the “in construction” category? If not, what portion do we anticipate will be completed in that period (by each category, so we can do a calculation for the entire period based on percentage of constructed units when that is the relevant metric (as it is, for example, under Prop R))?
- (3) What portion of the approved units that are not yet in construction do we anticipate will be built by 2021 (by each category, so we can do a calculation for the entire period based on percentage of constructed units when that is the relevant metric (as it is, for example, under Prop R))?
- (4) Does this table include the two new construction projects approved for HTF funding after the new HTF guidelines were adopted that are referenced at page 6 of the draft report? If not, (a) why is that (not yet submitted to Planning Department for

**administrative approval? Something else?), (b) how do these proposed units break down by the income categories above, and (c) do we anticipate these units being constructed within the current Housing Element period?**

**(5) What affordable housing criteria (in terms of percentages and income targeting) is the Planning Department using in the negotiation of pending DA's in the downtown that pre-date applicability of the newly adopted DCP? Why are these criteria being used? Could City Council direct use of different income targeting? How many units are in these projects, and what is the projected number and income targeting of the affordable units being negotiated?**

**(6) Please provide the most recent SB 35 report provided by the City to the State. What are the metrics the State uses under SB 35 to trigger developer right to seek approval of project pursuant to SB 35's special procedures? Is there any possibility these will be triggered in this Housing Element period (why or why not)? If so, what are those special procedures?**

**Additional Questions Regarding Past And Projected Future Sources And Uses Of HTF Money:**

“Since the most recent update to the Housing Trust Fund Guidelines in July 2017, the City has issued three funding commitments for affordable housing. Two of the funding commitments involve future new construction of 47 apartments and the other involves the rehabilitation of 26 existing apartments. One of the future new construction developments is targeted to seniors and the other is targeted to young adults who are at-risk of becoming homeless. The affordable housing property pending rehabilitation is comprised almost entirely of studio and one-bedroom apartments. (p. 6).

**Please provide for each project referenced above: (1) total dollars anticipated from HTF, (2) anticipated cost to the City on both a per unit and a per bedroom basis, (3) number of units / bedrooms directed to the various target populations, and (4) the income targeting.**

Assuming HTF average annual revenue of approximately \$15 million for the years 2018-2021 (i.e., \$60 million), plus the existing HTF balance of approximately \$45 million, and an average HTF subsidy of \$350,000 approximately 300 affordable homes could be created through new construction. However, creating affordable housing through acquiring, rehabilitating, and dedicating existing apartments typically requires a significantly higher City HTF subsidy - recently more than \$500,000 per home. Opportunities for obtaining non-City funds to preserve existing housing is minimal, resulting in the necessity for 100% HTF financing for acquisition/rehabilitation properties. Newly constructed affordable housing developments obtain tax credit financing, which typically covers 40%-60% of the total development cost. Under the two HTF subsidy scenarios mentioned above, \$110 million in HTF monies can produce approximately 315 newly constructed affordable homes, but only approximately 220 affordable homes created through acquisition and rehabilitation. For the sake of developing funding plan goals, a maximum projected production of 300 affordable homes is used. (p. 6)

**Please provide the following:**

- (1) What amount of one-time redevelopment loan repayment money was placed into the HTF, and when was it placed there? Is there any other one-time redevelopment loan repayment money that the City currently anticipates receiving (and if so, when)?**
- (2) What amount of recurring boomerang tax increment funding did the City place into the HTF in 2017? What does the City project as the amount of additional recurring boomerang tax increment funding that the City will receive and place into the HTF during the rest of the Housing Element period?**
- (3) How much money has gone into the HTF from Measure GS, and over what period of time? What does the City project measure GS will generate for the HTF during the rest of this Housing Element period in light of its long range forecasts of future sales tax revenues (provided to City Council as part of the budgeting process)?**
- (4) What other recurring funds, if any, are currently committed to the HTF (other than CDBG and HOME funds, which are subject to an existing HUD five year plan)?**
- (5) Is the \$45 million current balance in the HTF net of funds needed to fund these the currently approved projects (and if not, what portion of the \$45 million is spoken for already by the currently approved projects)?**
- (6) Are there any other existing commitments for HTF monies included in the current \$45 million or the projected additional future funding?**
- (7) At the March meeting we were advised that the City is negotiating an MOU with the County over expanded (and continuing) County funding of homeless services in recognition of City financial commitments. Is there a potential that this MOU will result in a future commitment of HTF monies? If so, how much money, over what period of time, for what purposes? If it is to create housing for the homeless, what preference if any is for those who are on the Santa Monica Homeless registry and/or qualify to be on that registry? How much is the projected cost to the City per person to be housed?**
- (8) What is the full inventory of projects funded by HTF that were included in the quantified objectives chart on p. 4 of draft report, broken down by (a) the categories in that chart, and (b) what was the target population for each of those projects?**
- (9) If there are other HTF funded projects (whether new construction or acquisition rehab) that were either completed, are under construction, are approved by Planning, or are simply approved for an HTF loan during this Housing Element period, please provide a breakdown of units by those stage of completion categories that includes income targeting and target populations (and distinguishes acquisition / rehab from new construction).**
- (10) In 2015, Andy Agle provided the Housing Commission with the attached chart regarding sources and uses of the then most recent 12 projects funded by HTF, and the**

**both per unit and per bedroom cost to the City of those projects (as well as overall costs). Please update this chart through the present (or, if that is too difficult in time available, at least update with the number of units, number of bedrooms, and cost to City and overall cost per unit and per bedroom. Please also provide the same data on the project on currently occupied land that was discussed at the March Housing Commission meeting as a case study.**



Exhibit A - Sources  
Uses for AH 100915 (

### **Other Issues**

**Please provide (or have the relevant City department provide) the following:**

- (1) What portion of the below market units on the quantified objective chart are accessible, or otherwise service the physically and/or mentally challenged members of our community?**
- (2) How many private market units have accepted Section 8 voucher recipients since the time the City adopted the HOUSE program, and what population has been served by those vouchers (seniors? physically or emotionally challenged? households with minor children? Veterans?)?**
- (3) What is the inventory of City owned land (other than parks, City Hall, and Police and Fire Stations), and what are the current uses on those properties?**

