From:	Public Testimony
To:	Rice, Howard
Cc:	Sanders, Monica
Subject:	FW: Public Testimony – Finance, Governance & Public Safety Committee – April 7, 2026
Date:	Monday, April 13, 2026 11:16:33 AM

Please attach as public testimony. Thanks

From: Gary Rhoades <garyrhoades2323@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2026 5:37 PM
To: Public Testimony <Public.Testimony@kcmo.org>
Subject: Re: Public Testimony – Finance, Governance & Public Safety Committee – April 7, 2026

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside the kcmo.org organization. Use caution and examine the sender address before replying or clicking links.

Hello,
Could I get confirmation that my public comment below was received on time? I didn't see it appear in the City Clerk's compilation of testimony for Item #260286.
Thanks!
Gary Rhoades

On Mon, Apr 6, 2026 at 10:37 AM Gary Rhoades <garyrhoades2323@gmail.com> wrote:

> Chair Bough, Vice Chair and Mayor Lucas, and members of the Finance, Governance and Public Safety Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide this comment on Item 260286 as related to affordable housing.
>
> Kansas City should hold firm on its affordable housing requirements for developers rather than retreat from them. As I understand it, the City's current policy requires developers receiving public subsidies in the form of tax breaks to either set aside affordable units or pay an in-lieu fee of $100,000 per unit into the Housing Trust Fund.
>
> That meaningful fee reflects a simple principle: when public subsidies help finance private development, the public deserves more housing that working families can afford. Drastically cutting that fee to only $5,000, as recently proposed, would weaken that principle and remove the incentive for developers to produce mixed-income housing throughout the city. In other words, it risks turning a serious housing policy into an empty symbolic one.
>
> I understand there are pressures involved, but the record of cities that have maintained strong inclusionary housing policies shows why patience and consistency matter. During my sixteen years as a deputy city attorney advising

Santa Monica on affordable housing and enforcing those requirements, I saw how an inclusionary housing program can mature over time. Santa Monica requires that roughly 30% of newly constructed multifamily housing be affordable to low- and moderate-income households (whether developers receive tax breaks or not) to help ensure that market-rate development contributes directly to the city's housing needs.

Programs like that did not transform a city overnight. They worked because the city held firm through years of political cycles and development pressures, allowing the policy to become part of the normal economics of building housing.

Kansas City should further study such experiences before making such a drastic reduction of the fee. Also, the City's program would benefit from additional staffing and further development of its administrative processes. Strengthening the program in these ways would track the path that is a part of the growth process of a successful program. And instead of weakening the requirements for developers, the City should consider strengthening them — moving toward a true inclusionary housing model that applies to all major residential developments, not just those receiving subsidies.

In my view, retreating now risks wiping out future mixed-income housing opportunities, influencing where projects are located — both of which raise fair housing concerns — and sending the wrong message to developers, residents, and other stakeholders. If Kansas City wants thriving, inclusive neighborhoods in the decades ahead, the stronger move is not retreat but to continue asking developers to do more so that Kansas City families have real affordable housing options.

While I am a new member of the Housing Trust Fund Board, I am submitting this comment solely on my own behalf as a concerned Kansas City resident.

Gary Rhoades
Kansas City, Missouri