

ATTACHMENT B

Affordable Housing Siting Policy – Community Meeting

Wednesday, March 4th, 2021 – District 5 Meeting

Total Attendees: 10

Subcategories topics	
Summary	Overall, advocates were concerned on how developers would work with concentration of affordable housing, parking and increasing incentives for developers to build in other districts
Other Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expressed Parking is a huge issue/need in their community• Concern regarding displacement and continued pressure on the cost of housing• Desire for new affordable housing in their neighborhood to create affordable homes for existing families living in overcrowded conditions• Concerned San Jose does not have the transit infrastructure to support density in these areas• Community felt the City Council should encourage market rate and affordable housing in the same development
Polling Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern regarding a large number of affordable developments in a concentrated area (50%); High housing costs (25%); Need for AH (25%)• Prioritize/order funding decisions (25%); all AH should be funded w/ priority given to high opportunity areas (25%); multiple tiers (50%)

Wednesday, March 3rd 2021 – District 7 Meeting

Total Attendees: 14

Subcategories topics	
Summary	There was expressed concern with homelessness, concentration of PSH and affordable housing; lack of affordable housing to meet the demand; and the need to ensure neighborhoods are thriving and not just put in the development in the community without thinking about the impact
Maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some concerns the map was difficult to understand and was not clear which is high resource and high gun violence

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language used to describe the maps is too wonky/jargony
Other Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some expressed frustrations with more developments in their district, which is overpopulated, while other surrounding districts are not • A concern on issues of trust and fairness - for example, for the tiny homes - lots of sites were proposed but only two sites were selected, one in District 7 • Some stated a high concentration of PSH and affordable housing within 5 mile radius
Polling Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding a large number of affordable developments in a concentrated area (100%) • Prioritize/order funding decisions (40%); all AH should be funded w/ priority given to high opportunity areas (20%); multiple tiers (40%)

Thursday, March 4th 2021 – District 3 (Spartan Keyes Residents) Meeting

Total Attendees: 14

Subcategories topics	
Summary	The pressing issue of PSH and affordable housing within close proximity to another was expressed. A common phrase used throughout the meeting was equity across all districts.
Maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed a need for changes in the transit system in order to open up these opportunity rich areas • Some felt they cannot support a policy that sites the affordable housing in the highest poverty areas only; supports affordable housing wherever it is located, but feels strongly that it need to be located across all districts
Transit- accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some expressed being uncomfortable with using transit accessibility since not everyone is using public transit; uncomfortable excluding areas, specifically
Other Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some stated affordable housing burdens neighborhoods (reduction of park fees, for example) • It was stated it is important for us to consider how individuals with special needs such as PSH are provided with life skills on how to be a good neighbor
Polling Responses	No poll was used during this meeting

Friday, March 5th 2021 – District 3 (Affordable Housing Siting Policy Advocates) Meeting

Total Attendees: 7

Subcategories topics	
Summary	It was mentioned for consideration the mitigating impacts to already burdened neighborhoods as part of your vision for the siting policy when development is already in distressed community. Additional comments on adding permanent supportive housing, shelters and Affordable housing in close proximity restresses the intact community. It was suggested the city should encourage more people choice when identifying high resource neighborhoods.
Opportunity Rich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was expressed more community buy in and we need to support the development an exchange and participation is key and ensure the new residents are acclimated into the neighborhood • The opportunity-rich framework should be expanded to include residential involvement and opportunities for integration into the local community • In the high resources area does not have gun violence or poverty and it will be difficult in this area • It was suggested to withhold funding in certain areas where PSH and shelters proposing to be located in areas already with a high share of these types of housing.
Transit- accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some expressed the cities Transit system is the worst in the valley and transit should not be a key indicator for affordable housing
Other Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An advisory board is needed for when development is being built within high concentration areas • The goal of the balance is not equitable • A good neighbor policy to encourage participation from surrounding neighborhood to incorporate new residents in the community • The City should track where there are county/state funded developments already in place and NOT fund near communities that are already concentrated compared to others.
Polling Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award points for desired areas (33%), tiered (67%) • Require dev (100%) • No (33%), Yes – if mitigation (33%), none (33%)

Wednesday, March 10th 2021 – Broad Community Meeting

Total Attendees: 99 participants registered and 75 attended the meeting

Subcategories topics	
Summary	<p>The broad community meeting expressed the same three themes across the previous district meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentration of affordable housing in certain districts • Encourage City Council to consider the neighborhood characteristics before and after development • Concern for lack of parking
Opportunity Rich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Council should consider existing affordable housing when developing new affordable housing • There should be an intentional added investments to category 3 areas • Affordable housing should be in higher opportunity areas
Maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be more details in the maps (static versions in presentation were difficult to assess) • The maps do not necessarily identify a neighborhoods clearly • Mapping should take into account lived experiences of residents • An expressed concerns about frequency of updating maps
Transit - accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The broad community meeting stated not to focus on too heavily transit accessibility and affordable housing
Other Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to look at existing locations of affordable housing to not overburden one area • Current version of map is incredibly difficult to read, absorb, orient; add street names at a minimum • Housing should be connected to job centers • Concentration of PSH and supportive services have created an uneven distribution of homeless encampments • In-lieu fees are enabling developers to not contribute to affordable housing needs • Policy should take into consideration location of current shelters and PSH • Worried about neighborhoods being overburdened (economically) by affordable housing • Affordable housing actually does have negative impacts on local residents (per Nextdoor comments about folks living b/c of affordable housing) • You don't live next to buildings, you live next to people; creating a ghetto isn't the solution • Affordable housing should be spread equitably across all housing buildings • Really frustrating to have the maps be so hard to read and absorb; it feels like the city is intentionally making resources hard to read/access • Institute a moratorium on new housing development in district 3 until other district step up

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I didn't realize that there was no siting planned for single family neighborhoods. Doesn't limiting affordable housing to multi unit areas just mean that everyone will be funneled into the blue or white areas
<p>Breakout Room responses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1: • Did we get the neighborhood characteristics right? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ : Yes, except should do away with any consideration of transit ○ Marissa G: Public transit is not necessarily set up for people to be fully dependent on it; until the infrastructure of public transit is improved, it shouldn't be a qualifier ○ Stephen Swiecicki: Most people do have cars, regardless of if they live in affordable housing or not, so transit might not be the best indicator; need to make sure there's enough parking; should also consider giving higher priority to urban villages to be most efficient ○ Antonina Ettare: Need to make sure enough parking is available; I want to see high resource areas having a variety of housing; wants even distribution across the entire city ○ Stephen Swiecicki: Disperse throughout entire city, especially in places where we're not seeing much housing • How should we use the maps in the Siting Policy? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Antonina: Do away with this map altogether; just consider where affordable housing, shelters, etc. are currently considered and go from there. • How should the City balance investment in different parts of the City? • Group 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Folks need more details in the maps (static versions in presentation were difficult to assess) ○ Affordable housing should be in higher opportunity areas ○ Concerns about frequency of updating maps ○ Value in preference policy for folks living in community already ○ Transit changes over time and is flexible. ○ General consensus the maps got it right - high resource areas and where there is a concentration of poverty. ○ While overwhelming the group felt that the affordable should be dispersed - one person said she thought we should provide affordable housing in the white areas for people who already lived there and wanted an opportunity to remain in the neighborhood. It was important for the person to maintain their connections and community. It would allow the person to live and die in place - age in place. But it would be an exception and not the rule. ○ If we don't do anything we are perpetuating redlining in our community. By do anything - dispersing the housing. • Group 3:

- City should look at transit definition
- On transportation it is recommended the city to look at the definition of transit and overlay the VTA schedule with the city district – every neighborhood is touched by transit
- Making sure equitable dispersion in every district equally not only affordable but different neighborhood has market rate, supportive and luxury housing

- **Group 4:**

- Did we get the neighborhood characteristics right?

- Transit should not be a characteristic/data point
- Transit is fluid whereas housing not fluid
- Current public transportation options are limited
- Transportation Infrastructure is sub-par
- Walkability is important – access to amenities/jobs ought to be a priority
- Streamline Urban Village projects to create better access to amenities – transportation included
- People prefer access to cars (used/new) to navigate San Jose’s transportation system – San Jose is not public transportation friendly

- How should we use the maps in the Siting Policy –

- Create a map overlay highlighting where all types of affordable housing is currently located to better understand overconcentration or underdeveloped districts
- District 3 takes the lion share of the burden whereas more affluent neighborhoods are not taking their fair share of affordable housing
- Stop the concentration of affordable housing (all types) in high poverty neighborhoods
- It is not a coincidence that Rich Areas’ land-use designations don’t allow for affordable housing.

- **Group 5:**

- People have plenty of transit options and affordable housing is already in transit-accessible areas; maybe don’t focus too heavily
- We should consider existing affordable housing in the policy
- Parks, bike paths, and other positive local indicators should be considered
- Some rural Tier 1 areas are too remote for affordable housing residents
- Need to consider how to improve bad neighborhoods rather than just leaving them

- **Group 6:**

- Perhaps have it consider local amenities

- Should consider existing affordable housing
- Should intentionally add other investments to category 3 areas
- Transit should not be a characteristic/data point
- Transit is fluid whereas housing not fluid
- Current public transportation options are limited
- Transportation Infrastructure is sub-par
- Walkability is important – access to amenities/jobs ought to be a priority
- Streamline Urban Village projects to create better access to amenities – transportation included
- People prefer access to cars (used/new) to navigate San Jose’s transportation system – San Jose is not public transportation friendly

- **Group 8:**

- Affordable housing burdens local communities by not contributing to property tax base
- Mapping should take into account lived experiences of residents re: where folks want to live

- Did we get the neighborhood characteristics right?

- Maps are very hard to read. Cant tell what is where.
- Hard to give opinion if you can't read the map
- Not enough to build... how can-Legend is not on there so it is hard to understand
- Why not show existing housing on the map as well
- Cant tell where existing roads and neighborhoods are
- Cant read the map without roads/orientation

- How should we use the maps in the siting policy?

- Siting policy will take the following aspects into consideration:
- Affordable Housing do not pay property taxes because exempt and do not pay into property taxes and are not going to give additional resources to mitigate the impacts which can increase the tax burden on already resource strained neighborhoods.
- Districts, where schools are not good, private school can make a big difference and that can also benefit children by from going to wealthier schools. The existing policy concentrates all in one area when the children already living in low resource areas could also benefit from attending higher resources schools
- Affordable Housing will have reduced parking because they think people will bike and walk and use public transportation but there are not always bus lines going to these new employment areas.
- Not a lot of collaboration between housing and planning to ensure that policies work with one another

- How should the city balance investment in different parts of the City?
 - We can't make the assumption that people want to move to a higher resource area just because there is affordable housing there. Some people would rather live closer to family and friends, there are other types of resources that are not quantifiable such as community support/personal network is the also a major motivating factor in where people choose to live and continue to live. Social factors need to be considered as well as resources because low income residents can become very isolated if not integrated into a high resource neighborhood. This could create a class issue if we continue down this road and could create more division.
 - You don't necessarily want to move child to better school because success depends on the family and the local resources. If family emphasizes education, the student will do well. If a low-resource family moves to high resource area it does not always guarantee success.
 - Additional investments are necessary like in regards to public transportation, light rail and bus take a very long time to make their way across town.
- **Group 9:**
 - Cap amount of supportive housing in category 3
 - Policy goal should be to increase economic integration within each neighborhood in the city
 - How many projects in a particular neighborhood are being built
 - Transit accessible: ½ mile should be raised to one mile, could be workable for some folks
 - Keep in mind the last mile of folks using alt modes of transit
 - Linking housing to transit might be problematic if neighborhoods refuse transit
 - Bus lines are fluid and might not always stay
 - There's other transit options (uber lyft bikes etc)
 - Look at the General Plan for 2040 to see where Urban Villages are being planned
 - Allowing developments to build and pay in lieu fees is pushing a burden onto historic neighborhoods in D3 that are along transit or urban village corridors, it allows SB35 to step in and build without taking consideration of design planning, destroys the character of our historic neighborhoods;
 - there a map of the resources in each neighborhood
<https://csj.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?appid=73a4097001c24366a02272d4ddcfe25a>
 - The solid blue and solid teal seem like solid places for good affordable housing, the patchy areas should have more discretion

Monday, May 4th 2021 – Community Meeting

Total Attendees: 79

Subcategories topics	
Summary	
Breakout Room Questions	<p>Do you agree with the proposed Phase-in and numerical goals for each neighborhood category? If not, what would you change and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on developments already in the pipeline, that the percentages for the phase-in period don't cause unnecessary issues for developments already underway. Otherwise, a phased implementation is smart so that you can see how things play out and adjust course. • Concerned that phase-in period doesn't fully address the inequitable distribution of affordable housing in the City; phase in should be more aggressive • Be cautious that high costs in C1 don't cannibalize funding for C2/3 neighborhoods. • Given the two-phased approach, it might be that the permanent goal may change. Maybe it should be a statement of the principle to go farther in phase 2, but we don't know to what extent until we analyze the first phase
	<p>What, if any mitigation should be required for developers in category 3 neighborhoods?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will need to be elements that are financeable under affordable housing laws so that you don't require developers to fund these things out of their own pockets. • Be sure the mitigation is fundable under an affordable housing scenario and doesn't require extraordinary/out of the realm funding to accomplish • The 5 Year Plan seems like a 5 Year Trial Plan with annual evaluate of the policy and its process. • City to bring resources to these communities. Services, child care, safety, which benefit the community on the first floor of developments of affordable housing • Who will pay for "community benefits" in Category 3 neighborhoods? • Mitigations would include supporting and enforcement of a parking permit program and security cameras to mitigate illegal dumping
	<p>What should the City track as we prepare to evaluate Phase one?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of affordability and concentration of ELI units into C1, etc. • Track housing type and population served to make sure housing of all types are located across the entire city • Tracking adjacent policy changes in terms of how affordable housing is financed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kind of opportunities there are, if there is a tenant preference policy • To evaluate the effectiveness of the program in Phase I, to use some benchmarks with the market, ie. Market rental prices, to ensure that the affordable housing units remain “affordable” • The exception will allow that if the person meets the income levels and can demonstrate that they previously lived in the area for x years before moving away (due to hardship) to be eligible to apply for affordable housing and return
	<p>Should we allow for any exception to this policy? If so, what?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at Geography /Demographics and if the City wants to Developers to in certain areas, and provide more funding per unit for those designated areas • Policy should include county financed, private, all housing
Other concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential impact of the State’s AFFH policies • For developers that have projects in their pipeline – qualifying for City funding not in the siting areas will be an issue • Making criteria too restrictive, such that it precludes production of projects throughout the city • What happens if there is no demand for Category 1 and 2? Will the City reshuffle the funding to Category 3? • New affordable housing should be located close to transit to reduce green house gases