

ATTACHMENT C

Affordable Housing Siting Policy – Community Meeting

Wednesday, March 4th 2021 – Developers Meeting

Attendees: 35

Subcategories topics	
Summary	Overall developers supported siting policy goals and metrics of typology of neighborhood characteristics. They expressed concerns regarding implementing this policy without a grandfathering clause because many of them have secured sites that are not in high opportunity areas and are seeking funding from the City to move forward.
Transit-Accessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A concern with defining transit accessibility areas. Aligning any new changes to siting policy should be defined and correspond with recent legislation changes and how it would impact developments • Some developers suggested the neighborhoods characteristics are not the only factors for a thriving community
Maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers stated concern on color system of interactive map – how it intersects with the transit boundary • The desire to see an actual map of what areas will be eligible is published, knowing a policy is coming is not enough to decide to invest or not invest in a particular site.
Other Concerns	<p><i>Tracts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A concern with ensuring the census tract overlayers with the realities of what is effective <p><i>Other concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A grandfather clause to be considered • An overall support of the siting policy, but does not support a policy that exclusively allocates city funding to those areas • A points system would get you better results and would be a smoother transition and allow time for zoning and General Plan to catch up with the housing siting plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for properties with purchase contracts after that date should be prioritized to properties that meet the siting policy • All Council Districts do not have the same level of housing opportunities. • Developer were concern if funding priorities of the city match other funding sources at state/local
Polling Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award points for desired areas (50%), higher funding (28%), tiered (22%) • Require dev (72%), limit (6%), align (22%) • No (12%), Yes – if mitigation (17%), Yes – if developer can demonstrate effective programs (39%), Yes – Affordable Housing should be everywhere (33%)

Wednesday, March 4th 2021 – Advocates Meeting

Total Attendees: 20

Subcategories topics	
Summary	Advocates expressed largely concerns over redlining, displacement of current community makeup and a sense of unequal dispersion of affordable housing within all districts
Displacement and Exclusion Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure our indicators for both displacement and exclusion risk were defined • Defining what displacement and exclusion risk defined to ensure an objective is not excluded any from development but as a priority area within certain categories. • Proximity to cultural centers are important to their community, builds pride within the community
Tracts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocates expressed concern affordable housing projects actually raise the median income of the area in very poor neighborhoods
Opportunity Rich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas in which the threshold would fall into the second tier for family housing • There are neighborhoods that would not meet the definition of opportunity or would be too high to qualify
Other Concerns	<p><i>Transit:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some expressed the current map did not display all the transit accessible areas within the city and whether or not the district 7/8/10 have enough infrastructure for transit accessibility

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further understanding how each District is absorbing their share of wealth of affordable housing and ensuring fair housing is being adhered too • It is important to pay close attention to how school districts and low income neighborhoods • Advocates felt it is important to understand the dynamics of those moving from high poverty neighborhoods and when moved into another community – loss of support systems and cultural aspects • When looking at binary threshold level applied for the 5 layer criteria what would be the cut off for when considering high crime levels
Polling Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award points for desired areas (40%), higher funding (20%), tiered (40%) • Require development (80%), limit (10%), align (10%) • No (0%), Yes – if mitigation (40%), Yes – if developer can demonstrate effective programs (0%), Yes – Affordable housing should be everywhere (60%)