



6/30/17

Fact Check!

...about preserving public housing in Minneapolis.

A response to MPHA's "Guiding Principles" Q&A

MPHA says the "Guiding Principles" document they mailed out is "a pledge that no resident will lose housing because of redevelopment."

"Guiding Principles" actually says: "If the eventual redevelopment effort results in the loss of units, MPHA commits to *develop replacement units elsewhere* in the city. *To the extent feasible*, MPHA will develop replacement units prior to the demolition of existing units."

This means you might lose your housing – MPHA has only pledged to *eventually* develop replacement housing elsewhere in the city. MPHA has not been able to prove. We are yet to see replacement units. MPHA continues to contradict. MPHA says they are facing cuts, but then they have money to build more and displace at the same time. Even if replacement units are made in another part of the city, some people are not able to pick up and move across town due to work, school, family obligations, disability, community, or other reasons. Even if some residents are able to move into a different apartment, the Guiding Principles says MPHA will develop replacement units before demolishing existing ones "to the extent feasible." That means if MPHA deems it not feasible, those residents would be homeless in the interim period. MPHA has not made a true pledge to protect housing, because they did not guarantee anything.

MPHA says "every effort and action MPHA will take is about preserving and improving our housing for the low-income people we serve. MPHA does not want to lose a single unit of affordable housing or see a single family lose their housing benefit. Anyone who tells you MPHA is trying to eliminate housing or do anything to harm the people we serve is misleading you, and does not understand our mission statement."

Good intentions are nice, but for public housing residents, the actual impact of MPHA's actions is what counts. In the end, it doesn't matter what MPHA wants or is "trying" to do. According to *federal* regulations, when a private developer gets a

Low Income Housing Tax Credit to build affordable housing, they only need 20% of the units to be affordable to residents earning 50% AMI or 40% of the units to be

affordable to residents earning 60% AMI. This means a landlord would have to expand an existing MPHA building 2 ½ - 5 times its current size to be obligated to provide housing to all the existing residents in a building – and that's only *if* those residents qualify for the apartment. Many MPHA residents make less than 50% of the area median income, so residents *would* be without housing if their building was sold to a private developer under the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program. According to 2016 MPHA stats, the waitlist to receive public/ income based housing at MPHA buildings and family housing is 12,719 people, and 4,091 people are on waitlist to receive Section 8 vouchers from MPHA. In addition, 26,000 current low-income residents are at risk of being displaced by MPHA, if private developers take over the buildings and family housing through the Low Income Housing Tax Credit.

<http://tinyurl.com/MPHA-Resident-Ltr>

Sincerely,
Defend Glendale Campaign

Learn more:

defendglendale@gmail.com_____

[facebook@defendglendale](https://www.facebook.com/defendglendale)

[twitter@defendglendale](https://twitter.com/defendglendale)

<http://defendglendale.weebly.com>

P.O. Box 14616,

Minneapolis, MN 55414