From: Kim Johnson < <u>imeeshebee@aol.com</u>> Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2023 8:56 AM

To: SmHousing Mailbox < SmHousing.Mailbox@santamonica.gov>

Subject: Public Comment

EXTERNAL

Draft FY2023-2024 Annual Plan has been nothing but good news & blessings for my household. I Kimba have been a section 8 participant for 20years. I have also been on the Self Sufficiency Program & had recently graduated the program June 2022. The program help me make & progress with self sufficiency & I learned a lot about myself keeping on top of all my goals that was planned, with the main thing being that if California rent wasn't so detrimental expensive, many residents will be able to make it on their own as like the FSS trained & taught the ones who participated. Sadly I make just enough income to take care of my essential needs & partially necessary after graduation with completion's of the FSS program. California residents would have to work 150 hours a pay period to not need any available programs. So you get life's point for myself & millions of other. We all are grateful for Housing, DPSS, Social Security & countless more Programs that are readily available. My feelings are that the programs should continue on. Spread the word for the next generation coming up who may need the services. Just a small summary to comment being that I have/am a participant.

Respectfully,

Kimba

From: OZ <<u>zurawska@yahoo.com</u>>

Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2023 12:00 PM

To: SmHousing Mailbox < SmHousing.Mailbox@santamonica.gov>

Subject: 5-A: public comment re Admin Plan

EXTERNAL

SMHA continues to skirt federal regulations:

- 1. There is no functioning RAB, and SMHA has been aggressively obstructing the creation of one despite a dire need and a strong interest from program participants.
- 2. There are no HCV reps on SMHA Board and yet SMHA sends out misleading correspondence to program participants claiming that such reps exist.
- 3. There are no CoC reps on SMHA Board SMHA obtained an unwarranted "waiver" of this requirement.

24 CFR 578.75(g)(1):

(g) Participation of homeless individuals.

(1) Each <u>recipient</u> and <u>subrecipient</u> must provide for the participation of not less than one <u>homeless</u> individual or formerly <u>homeless</u> individual on the board of directors or other equivalent policymaking entity of the <u>recipient</u> or <u>subrecipient</u>, to the extent that such entity considers and makes policies and decisions regarding any <u>project</u>, supportive services, or assistance provided under this part. This requirement is <u>waived if</u> a <u>recipient</u> or <u>subrecipient</u> is <u>unable</u> to meet such requirement and obtains HUD approval for a plan to otherwise consult with <u>homeless</u> or formerly <u>homeless</u> persons when considering and making policies and decisions.

The participation of an unhoused or formerly unhoused citizen on the Housing Commission is not an acceptable equivalent to CoC representation on the SMHA Board. The Housing Commission is NOT a policymaking body but merely an advisory

body to SMHA Board (i.e. City Council). Barbara Collins and James Kemper asked HUD for a waiver of the above regulation, and, inexplicably, obtained it. This waiver is baseless and should be ignored. If HCV participants have their reps on SMHAB, why don't CoC participants have one as well? This is discriminatory towards CoC participants, and typical of the stigma assigned to unhoused or formerly unhoused individuals. A governmental body should not be furthering this stigma. SMHA has never asked CoC participants whether there is a volunteer ready to represent on the SMHA Board, so what is SMHA basing their assertion that they are unable to create the required representation on? Additionally, a proper assessment of the feasibility of administering HUD's HCV Homeownership Program should be a goal of SMHA as part of its efforts to affirmatively further fair housing. Regards,

Olga Zurawska