

Why are the “Legal” Sites for Public Housing being kept Secret?

By David Stanowski

President

Galveston Open Government Project, Inc.

For the C-Crewe 24 August 2011

Because the current site-selection plan does NOT conform to the “legal” process

What this means will become clear as we proceed!

There are three ways to select the location of housing:

1. Using the free market process

2. Using the political process

3. Using the legal process

1. Free Market Process

Two parties come together in a free and voluntary exchange.

Each party gives something and each party gets something.

**The buyer or renter gets a house, condo, or apartment
in a location and at a price that they like.**

The seller or landlord gets paid.

This is the IDEAL way to determine the location for any housing.

**Unfortunately, it is NOT available in the Public Housing program,
because it is GOVERNMENT HOUSING, NOT free-market housing!**

2. Political Process

Politics is NOT a free and voluntary exchange between two parties.

Much of the time, Politics is the process whereby certain benefits are transferred from a larger group to a smaller group.

There is a cost to the larger group and it receives little or no benefit.

There is a windfall gain to the smaller group with little or no cost.

Good public policy can be best described as government actions that do the least harm to the larger group.

Politically powerful groups lobby politicians to make themselves into small “beneficiary groups”.

Once a political deal has been made, various token gestures and rationalizations are employed in an attempt to obscure the true nature of the political “transaction”; to make it look like good public policy.

History of Public Housing Site Selection

Public Housing began as part of the New Deal in 1937.

It started in Galveston in 1940.

From the beginning of the program, the location of Public Housing was chosen using the political process.

Deals were made so that Public Housing would benefit and not harm politically-powerful groups.

For example, Public Housing is nearly always located far away from affluent neighborhoods.

In 1968, the Fair Housing Act was passed.

The FHA demanded a rule-based or “legal” process for site selection, but most locations were still chosen using the political process.

Gradually, more and more political site selections were challenged in court.

The remedies from these lawsuits more precisely defined the legal site selection process.

Is the GHA plan Political or Legal?

It features:

NO Public Housing to be built **on the Mainland** in some of the best neighborhoods in the County.

ALL OF THE PUBLIC HOUSING FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTY to be built in the City of Galveston.

NOTE: The City ALREADY HAS ALL OF THE EXISTING PUBLIC HOUSING FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTY (450 units).

NO Public Housing to be built on the **West End** of the Island in some of the best neighborhoods in the City.

MOST of the Public Housing to be built in its **prior locations** in some of the worst neighborhoods in the City.

The location of Public Housing in this plan will cause harm to the larger group (the general population of the City) while it benefits certain smaller

groups (West End residents, District 1 political operatives, local contractors doing business with the GHA, etcetera)

But, most importantly, it will offer Public Housing residents the **lowest opportunity** to escape from a life of intergenerational dependency and poverty, which will also cause harm to the larger group (the general population of the City).

The GHA is **rationalizing the choice of obviously bad locations** by using mixed-income development and extra “human-capital” investments to mitigate the damage that the locations will do!

They also claim that they “have to” build on the land that they now own; but that is **NOT** what HUD said in 2009.

It is very unlikely that this plan can be changed using the political process.

The **only remaining remedy** is to force the plan back into the legal process in **court**.

3. Legal Process

The legal process relies on state and federal statutes to define acceptable locations for Public Housing.

Their vague and general language is further refined by court cases.

The HUD Fair Housing Planning Guide calls for a **regional approach to Public Housing**.

Court cases beginning with Gautreaux, in 1966, up to and including Thompson, in 2005, have further defined the regionalization process.

The **GOGP is proposing** a plan relying on **Opportunity-Based Public Housing** as defined by the Communities of Opportunity approach developed for the Thompson v. HUD remedy.

Politicians at the federal, state, county, and city level **REFUSE** to consider Opportunity-Based Public Housing, so the **GOGP is sponsoring a lawsuit** that will argue that GHA should not be allowed to **FORCE** all of the eligible residents, in the entire County, to live in the City of Galveston, primarily in **District 1**.

It will further argue that they should be allowed access to all of the high opportunity neighborhoods in the County, including the West End.

How does Opportunity-Based Public Housing work?

Opportunity-Based Public Housing

Professor John A. Powell developed a **14-point objective scoring and ranking system** to determine high opportunity locations.

He said "The remedy must be **sensitive to opportunity and to the importance of location** in determining access to opportunity."

In other words, the **LOCATION of housing is far more important than the type of housing** (barracks, high rises, scattered sites, mixed-income, etc).

The Communities of Opportunity approach has three major sections:

1. Employment

2. Neighborhood

3. Education

The final analysis will be done at the census tract, or neighborhood level, but we'll begin by comparing city to city.

Indicators of Economic Opportunity and Mobility

- 1. Job growth over the most recent 4-year period.**
- 2. The number of entry-level and low-skill jobs.**
- 3. The number of entry-level and low-skill jobs per capita.**
- 4. The percentage of the area within one-half mile of a public transit line.**
- 5. The median commute time.**

City	Employment Growth 2001-2011 (2011 BLS)
Galveston	-8.7%
Texas City	-2.6%
Friendswood	+8.3%
League City	+44.8%
Santa Fe	?
Dickinson	?
La Marque	?

Indicators of Neighborhood Health

- 1. Population change over the last 10 years.**
- 2. Crime rate.**
- 3. Poverty rate.**
- 4. Vacant property rates.**
- 5. Median value of owner-occupied homes.**

City	2000-2010 Population Growth (2010 Census)
Galveston	-16.60%
La Marque	+6.04%
Texas City	+8.62%
Dickinson	+9.28%
Friendswood	+23.31%
Santa Fe	+28.01%
League City	+83.87%

City	Crime Rate National Average = 319 <small>(2009 FBI UCR)</small>
La Marque	635
Galveston	492
Texas City	380
Dickinson	358
Santa Fe	267
League City	187
Friendswood	97

City	% of Individuals Below Poverty Level (2000 Census)
Galveston	22.3%
La Marque	17.5%
Texas City	14.9%
Dickinson	13.1%
Santa Fe	6.5%
League City	4.8%
Friendswood	3.3%

City	Vacant Housing (2010 Census)
Galveston	38.3%
La Marque	11.9%
Texas City	11.4%
Dickinson	8.2%
Santa Fe	7.5%
League City	5.9%
Friendswood	3.9%

City	Median Value of Owner-Occupied Homes (2000 Census)
La Marque	\$59,500
Texas City	\$63,800
Galveston	\$73,800
Dickinson	\$83,400
Santa Fe	\$86,800
League City	\$112,000
Friendswood	\$124,500

Indicators of Educational Opportunity

- 1. The percentage of elementary and middle school students qualifying for free and reduced lunch.**
- 2. The percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- 3. The percentage of elementary school students proficient in reading.**
- 4. The percentage of elementary school students proficient in math.**

City	% Economically Disadvantaged Students (2010 TEA)	Great Schools District Ranking (2010 GS)
Galveston	66%	4
La Marque	64%	3
Texas City	58%	5
Dickinson	57%	6
Santa Fe	27%	6
League City	18%	9
Friendswood	4%	10

The percentage of elementary school students proficient in READING

**2010 TAKS reading test results Grade 3:
GISD 85% - State average 92%**

**2010 TAKS reading test results Grade 5:
GISD 82% - State average 85%**

The percentage of elementary school students proficient in MATH.

**2010 TAKS math test results Grade 3:
GISD 76% - State average 86%**

**2010 TAKS math test results Grade 5:
GISD 83% - State average 86%**

Probable Opportunity Rankings

**Friendswood, League City, and Santa Fe
appear to be high-opportunity cities.**

**Galveston, La Marque, and Texas City
appear to be low-opportunity cities.**

Dickinson appears to be a moderate opportunity city.

Location of Public Housing

It would be easy to make the case that the **City of Galveston is the worst location for Public Housing in the County**, and that no Public Housing should be built in Galveston, La Marque, or Texas City.

Most, if not all, Public Housing should be located in Friendswood, League City, and Santa Fe.

Galveston Census Tract Data

An even closer look at Poverty and Race and Ethnicity.

Census Tract (2000 Census)	% of Individuals Below Poverty Level (2000 Census)
<u>7240</u> Oleander Homes	55.1%
<u>7241</u>	18.9%
<u>7242</u>	18.1%
<u>7243</u> Magnolia Homes	31.5%
<u>7244</u>	24.9%
<u>7245</u>	39.4%
<u>7246</u> Cedar Terrace	63.9%
<u>7247</u>	30.6%
<u>7248</u>	22.4%
<u>7249</u>	20.9%
<u>7250</u>	17.0%
<u>7251</u>	18.9%

<u>7252</u>	30.8%
<u>7253</u>	8.1%
<u>7254</u>	19.0%
<u>7255</u>	7.9%
<u>7256</u>	14.6%
<u>7257</u>	5.1%
<u>7258</u>	16.9%
<u>7259</u>	19.6%
<u>7260</u>	4.0%
<u>7261</u>	7.8%

Census Tract (2010 Census)	% Black (2010 Census)	% Hispanic (2010 Census)
<u>7240</u> Oleander Homes	20.9%	18.5%
<u>7241</u>	24.7%	20.3%
<u>7242</u>	18.2%	19.2%
<u>7243</u> Magnolia Homes	13.1%	27.2%
<u>7244</u>	25.5%	31.4%
<u>7245</u>	17.0%	16.4%
<u>7246</u> Cedar Terrace	59.9%	34.1%
<u>7247</u>	52.5%	31.8%
<u>7248</u>	27.0%	34.8%
<u>7249</u>	20.1%	36.6%
<u>7250</u>	12.2%	47.9%
<u>7251</u>	44.2%	37.2%
<u>7252</u>	28.8%	60.4%
<u>7253</u>	10.4%	44.8%

<u>7254</u>	11.0%	54.8%
<u>7255</u>	6.4%	17.4%
<u>7256</u>	16.4%	24.9%
<u>7257</u>	6.2%	21.4%
<u>7258</u>	12.7%	38.8%
<u>7259</u>	7.1%	21.0%
<u>7260</u>	2.2%	12.0%
<u>7261</u>	1.4%	6.7%

Summary:

The City of Galveston is already hosting **ALL of the Public Housing** for the entire County (450 units).

If 569 additional units are built, the City will have **5 TIMES the NATIONAL AVERAGE per Capita.**

Based on the city-to-city and census tract data shown, **the City of Galveston probably has very few, if any, favorable locations for Public Housing.**

However, it should be obvious from the city-to-city comparison that **most, if not all, of the best neighborhoods are on the Mainland.**

Regardless of these facts,
ALL of the additional Public Housing is slated to be built in the City of Galveston!!

This is The End