

## City of San Antonio



### Bond Committee Meeting Minutes

San Antonio Public Library  
Central Branch  
600 Soledad St.  
Thursday, October 20  
6:00 PM

---

#### Bond Committee Members

A majority of appointive members, other than ex officio, shall constitute a quorum.

#### **6:05 P.M. - Call to Order, Board Room**

Co-Chair Jim Leonard called the meeting to order. He acknowledged that Co-Chair Jackie Gorman was not present.

- Attendance of Committee Members
- Head count of general attendance: 24
- Claudia Mancillas, Interpreter Translation Services, was present

#### **I. Opening Comments and Meeting Procedures by Committee Chairs**

Opening comments by Co-Chair Mr. Leonard, including introductions, guidelines for Residents to Be Heard, and translation services.

#### **II. Staff Presentation on Recommended Areas of Focus for Future Meetings and Committee Input on Neighborhood Area Rankings**

Deputy City Manager Peter Zanoni presented on the upcoming meeting schedule and bus tour of proposed improvement sites. Mr. Leonard opened the floor for a vote to determine if a tour was needed. The committee voted to take the tour.

Richard Jimenez, District 10, proposed moving the tour from October 29 to a date between the third and fourth meeting. Mr. Leonard noted this would be discussed later in the meeting.

Mr. Zanoni provided a recap of topics covered in the first committee meeting, including: committee roles, use of bond funds, the requirements of the Urban Renewal Plan, steps prior to and following the May election, and the concept of rough proportionality and how it is applied to the bond allocations.

Beverly Watts Davis, District 2, asked for a breakdown of the district-wide projects that were shown on

Slide 15.

### **III. Staff Professional Recommendation of Neighborhood Improvement Projects and Potential Development Types**

Richard Keith, Assistant Planning Director presented on the state requirements for distressed properties, potential development for the recommended sites, and an overview of how each of the 15 sites meets the state criteria, strategic criteria, and the staff recommended development for the site. Additionally, Mr. Keith gave an overview of the eight properties that were not selected by staff.

### **IV. Bond Committee Discussion and Analysis**

Co-Chair Mr. Leonard opened the floor to committee questions.

District 2: Beverly Watts Davis asked if there was a reason why there was no mixed income listed. Mr. Keith clarified that staff listed the potential development type, and it could be any income level.

District 5: Al Rocha asked if the properties would be owner occupied or rental. Mr. Keith clarified that single-family is typically designed for home ownership and that mixed use allows for more flexibility.

District 7: Ana Sandoval asked for the definition of unsafe properties. Mr. Keith responded that the property could contain environmental dangers, including lead, asbestos, or soil contamination. Mr. Zanoni added that this could include properties that area generally unsafe structurally.

Ms. Sandoval asked about parking at multi-family housing developments. Mr. Keith responded that a good site plan includes adequate parking and City Code has requirements for parking that is appropriate for the number of units.

Ms. Sandoval asked if new development would increase congestion. Mr. Keith stated that anytime new units are constructed, the family may have a car, so there is a possibility of increased congestion.

Ms. Sandoval asked Mr. Keith to address safe access to alternate transportation in these areas to relieve traffic congestion. Mr. Keith responded that access to public transportation was taken into consideration when identifying locations.

District 8: Coda Rayo-Garza asked who the stake holders groups were that recommended projects, and if the meetings were open to the public. Mr. Keith responded that stakeholders included individuals, community groups, for-profit and non-profit developers, and Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO).

Ms. Garza showed opposition for the Wurzbach location (Site 13) due to existing development and C3 zoned businesses operating. She asked staff to consider a location further down Wurzbach, near the I-10 corridor, where a refugee population is located.

Ms. Garza asked what we are doing to incentivize Low Impact Development (LID). Mr. Zanoni responded that the City is working to address LID practices and principles, but have not gotten to that level of detail. Mr. Zanoni noted these practices are optional, and requiring and enforcing LID practices would be a policy question for the City Council. Ms. Garza asked to see more LID practices be

discussed more for any of the multi-family or mixed use developments.

District 3: Joy McGhee asked if discussions had taken place with neighborhood associations to make sure that these aligned with community goals. Mr. Keith responded that the City had not spoken directly with the neighborhood associations regarding the selection of these sites. Planning Director Bridgett White clarified that right now the committee is just looking at the geographical locations, and neighborhood discussions would come later in the process when the developers have been chosen.

Ms. McGhee noted that some of the sites would be better used for just commercial development instead of housing.

District 10: Peggy Sue Wilson showed support for the slides reflecting the potential displacement.

Ms. Wilson asked if there was any intention to use eminent domain against commercial, industrial, or third-generation businesses in these areas. Mr. Zanoni noted that the Urban Renewal Agency and the City do have power of eminent domain, but the goal is to not use that tool.

Ms. Wilson asked what is the process for eminent domain. Mr. Zanoni noted that each property acquisition using eminent domain would have to be approved by City Council.

District 7: Michael Taylor asked if these properties took into consideration properties that go to the Building Standards Board or that are registered in the Vacant Buildings Program. Mr. Keith noted that this was not used as criteria in selecting the geographical areas, and when the city is looking to acquire individual properties this could be used as a tool for consideration.

District 6: Bill McDonough asked if staff had an estimate of the cleanup costs regarding environmental issues, specifically for the Former Fire Academy (Site 9). Mr. Keith responded that the City has done a study of that site. Mr. McDonough asked for the quote for that cleanup.

District 9: Sylvia Lopez-Gaona asked if the City knew the plans for the property in Area 5 that has recently been purchased by Brooks. Mr. Keith responded the City does not know what the development will be. He added that there is nearby residential development, and there is a strong possibility that there could be more residential development.

Ms. Lopez-Gaona asked what projections for growth we had for the entire City area, and if there was a map we could overlay with these 15 areas. Mr. Zanoni replied that the City does not have a map detailing demographic growth over time, but the San Antonio area is projected to grow by 1.1 million in 25 years.

Ms. Lopez-Gaona asked if these sites were selected for blight, projected growth, or because there was a need for housing in the area. Mr. Keith replied that site selection began with the state criteria and then looked for sites meeting strategic criteria. Mr. Zanoni added that blight was the first criteria looked at.

District 2: James Dickerson noted that most of the development is multi-family, and asked how traffic congestion would be addressed. Mr. Zanoni noted that there are issues outside of this program that will affect transportation, and as part of the Comprehensive Plan, the City Council approved a Multi-Mobile Plan, to address transportation. He added this plan not only includes additional roads, but increased public transportation, biking, and pedestrian options.

District 10: Ricardo Jimenez asked staff to create a map showing all of the proposed bond projects in the 15 sites so to reflect the true investment in the areas.

Mr. Jimenez asked staff to include the costs associated with these areas. Mr. Zaroni noted that the costs associated with these areas are to be determined after the election. He continued that after the election, the City would release a Request for Proposals (RFP) to determine what type of development would take place on these properties.

Mr. Jimenez asked if one developer would receive all \$20 million, or how will the bond money be split between all 15 areas. Mr. Zaroni responded that developers would not receive bond money, and the money will be used to acquire property prepared for development, and then sold to a developer. Mr. Zaroni continued that the ranking of the areas will help give City Council and staff guidance on areas to issue RFPs for development.

Mr. Jimenez asked if the committee was to rank the areas or identifying the areas eligible to receive the funds. Mr. Zaroni clarified that the committee could do both. He added that staff recommended 15 areas and the committee could add, delete, or expand these geographical areas. Mr. Zaroni noted that staff recommends selecting more areas are than fewer so that the City has more flexibility in acquiring property, getting a better price for the property, and development options. He added that geographic areas identified in the Urban Renewal Plan will be the only areas that are eligible for redevelopment.

Mr. Jimenez asked if the public hearing on January 18, 2017 is to satisfy the State Statute 374.014. Mr. Zaroni responded that it is one of the state requirements.

Mr. Jimenez asked what the impact is to the properties and surrounding areas once they are declared slum or blight. Mr. Zaroni replied that the City is not aware of any impact to the property value after being declared as slum or blight. He added that the areas must be blighted or slum to qualify for this program. Mr. Jimenez asked for research or studies from other cities that shows the financial impact to properties after being declared a slum.

Mr. Jimenez asked if the Urban Renewal Agency was the same as the San Antonio Development Agency. Mr. Zaroni replied that they are different.

Mr. Jimenez asked for a chart by category of how the bond money is being distributed among the ten districts.

District 4: Andrea Sanchez asked for a clarification of the state criteria regarding inadequate streets. Mr. Keith responded that inadequate streets could include connectivity. Clay Binford, a member of the City's bond council, clarified that the state does not give a statutory definition and relies on the plain meaning of the word, therefore giving more discretion in the determining the meaning.

Ms. Sanchez asked if any of these areas are being included in the Streets section of the Bond, and if that might disqualify any sites from this program. Mr. Zaroni responded that staff will create an overlay map, but the areas are so blighted and include multiple state criteria, so any proposed street projects would likely not preclude them from the list.

Ms. Sanchez requested a map of other areas that may have health hazards.

District 3: Dr. Deirdre Stokelin asked if the other bond areas are going to compliment the neighborhood improvement funding. Mr. Zanoni noted that the City Council took the recommendation of the Housing Commission to start small and demonstrate success to voters. He added that the funding is revolving as properties sell, the revenue will be reinvested into the program. Mr. Zanoni stated that the funding could be used to improve the infrastructure immediately surrounding the areas.

Dr. Stokelin asked how quickly the money will be put back into the neighborhood improvements. Mr. Zanoni noted that the \$20 million may be used for infrastructure improvements near the developments. Mr. Zanoni replied that the goal is to pick something that will be a success to demonstrate to the community, and provide more affordable housing.

District 9: Colleen Waguespack asked if there will be community input during the development and rezoning process. Mr. Zanoni responded that the stakeholders would be engaged during the development process.

District 1: Claudia Castillo Gonzalez asked how staff has considered the historic significance of the properties. Mr. Keith responded that staff has considered the historic significance of structures and would not be redeveloping structures that are historic in nature.

Ms. Gonzalez requested any history of proposed sites to be shared with the committee.

District 8: Chris Laia asked if it is possible to estimate the number of affordable homes for each site to help the committee prioritize projects. Mr. Keith responded that because the property availability and acquisition is unknown, it cannot be determined what will be built on the sites. Mr. Keith added that the RFPs will address the specific properties acquired and potentially the type of development. Mr. Binford clarified that it is important to be general enough to increase competition for developers.

District 1: Tom Heger asked if there was a potential role for this committee after the bond had been approved as the pilot project unfolds. Mr. Zanoni responded that the City Council has created these committees specifically for the bond, and if they are interested in continuing to contact their City Council member.

District 10: Ricardo Jimenez showed concern for the unknown cost and areas, since the City has the power of eminent domain, and believes property values will decrease after being declared a slum. Mr. Zanoni responded that this program could be analogy to the Edwards Aquifer Protection Program that has similar unknowns in terms of property acquisition.

Mr. Jimenez asked if the Urban Renewal Agency used to be the San Antonio Development Agency. Lori Houston, Assistant City Manager, clarified that the San Antonio Development Agency was terminated and rebranded as the Office of Urban Renewal Agency San Antonio, which is an agency staffed by the Center City Development Operations Department and has seven board members that are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council.

Mr. Jimenez asked Ms. Houston to clarify how this agency was restructured. Ms. Houston responded that since the City took it over, the Office of Urban Renewal San Antonio has focused on three programs: Infill Pilot Program, Neighborhood Stabilization Program, and RENEWSA Program. She gave an overview of each of the programs, including property acquisition and development processes.

Mr. Jimenez showed skepticism for lack of cost information given the success of the Office of Urban Renewal San Antonio's other programs. Ms. Houston explained that the challenge is that the lots still have to be selected, titles cleared, and closed, therefore it is difficult to know how many lots will be able to be purchased.

Mr. Jimenez requested the last annual report for Office of Urban Renewal San Antonio. Ms. Houston clarified the difference between the Office of Urban Renewal San Antonio and San Antonio Affordable Housing, and said the committee would be provided both reports.

District 2: Beverly Watts Davis asked Co-Chair Mr. Leonard if there was a way for the committee could share with each other greater knowledge of these areas via huddles. Mr. Leonard responded that the bus tour will provide an opportunity for members to better understand the areas.

## **V. Citizens to be Heard**

Mr. Leonard opened the floor for public input. It was noted that seven individuals had signed up to speak.

1. David Matlock, with Matlock Homes, stated that there are 58 acres near Pearsall Park that his company is interested in developing. He showed support for the site across from Pearsall Park (Site 8).
2. Brady Alexander, Elected Representative of East Pyron Symphony Neighborhood Association and a member of Hotwells Neighborhood Association, showed opposition for Sites 5 and 6, noting the current amount of subsidized housing. He added opposition for any multi-family, transient, or rental properties in the area.
3. Jose Gonzalez II asked the committee to expand the areas to the Midtown area to provide workforce housing.
4. Therea Ybanez, President of the Mission San Jose Neighborhood Association, showed concern for development near Site 6. She stated that other developers did not engage with residents when developing near the missions, and committee members to consider more community input.
5. Elena Gonzales was called, but was not present.
6. Bianca Maldonado, President of the Monticello Park Neighborhood Association, showed opposition for development of Site 12 due to bordering the northside of her neighborhood's viewshed. She added that the development has led to the 100 year flood plain, and asked that development inside 410 should be considered for increased drainage.
7. Eiginio Rodriguez asked who the stakeholders for Sites 1, 10, and 11. He asked what was considered affordable housing. He asked if the blight was caused by the City. He asked for the committee to remember the people that could be displaced.

**VI. Next Steps for Community Bond Committee Process**

District 7: Kimberly Carter-Schmittou asked if there was other funding available to clean up the Brownfield District 1 and District 5 projects. Mr. Zaroni responded that there would be funding to clean up sites that needed to be cleaned up.

Ms. Carter-Schmittou asked what oversight there will be to ensure developer responsibility. Mr. Zaroni noted that there are frequent inspections to ensure compliance.

Co-Chair Mr. Leonard called a vote for the bus tour date. It was voted that the tour would tentatively take place from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. on Saturday, October 29, 2016. Mr. Zaroni noted that staff will provide further information via email.

District 7: Ana Sandoval asked who the committee could send additional unanswered questions to. Mr. Zaroni noted that Jessica Shirley-Saenz with Transportation and Capital Improvements would be the point of contact.

District 4: Andrea Sanchez asked if Citizens to be Heard could be moved to the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Zaroni stated that this is a decision for the committee. Mr. Leonard said that he had no issues with moving it up on the agenda, but wanted to make sure that residents had adequate time to sign up to speak.

District 9: Colleen Waguespack asked for clarification on the Strategic Criteria of Recommended by City Council Office. Mr. Keith responded that this is not an indication of council support, but was recommended to research by the council office. He clarified that lack of that criteria did not indicate disapproval or opposition of a site.

District 8: Coda Rayo-Garza asked if after the tour, the committee could revisit the idea of sub-groups to examine the sites more closely. Mr. Zaroni noted that the committee members may visit the areas at any time either together or individually.

Co-Chair Mr. Leonard encouraged committee members to attend the bus tour of the geographic areas. He reminded the committee that they will rank geographic land areas after the tour. Mr. Zaroni clarified that the committee would not be identifying any projects in the Urban Renewal Plan.

Mr. Leonard noted the next Neighborhood Improvements Committee Meeting would be held on Thursday, November 3, 2017, at 6 p.m.

District 2: James Dickerson asked if the committee members would be provided paper copies of electronic documents. Mr. Zaroni noted that these will be made available to committee members in the future.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.