SAN JOSE CAPITAL OF SILCON VALLEY Early Consideration Response Form

| Departr | nent | | Housing/Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement | | | | | Rules Date 10/4/2023 | | | | 3 Item C.2 | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------|--|---|---------------------|----------|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--------|--------------|--|
| Department Rep. Name/Ext. Policy/Ordinance Subject | | | Raga | Ragan Henninger/Robert Manford | | | | | Councilmember Sponsorship | | | Mayor Mahan, Vice Mayor Kamei, | | | |
| | | | Shelt | ter Crisis and | | | | | and Councilmembers Torres and Cohen | | | | | | |
| | | | Hom | elessness De | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff Recommendation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GRI GRI | | | tradeoffs YELLOW Refer to Prior to Budget | | | | | RED Recommend Council r | | | | | | | |
| | outlined | on ne | | | | | Process adopt nominated ide | | | a MORE TIME TO EVALUATE | | | | | |
| Staff Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is this already underway in a department work plan? Is this time critical or an er | | | | | | | | | | s require substantial resources, staffing, budget, egic <u>sup</u> port? | | | | | |
| Ves | No | | | Yes I | | | | No Yes | | | | | | | |
| Criterion to Determine Scale of Project Complexity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | complexity is d | | | | | h of the | e 3 criterions | below and the | en summin | g the sc | ore. | | | | |
| a. Low Complexity is a sum of 6 or less. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Medium Complexity is a sum of $7 - 9$. Total Score = 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | C. High Comp | lexity | is a sum | of 10 or greater. | | | | Medium Complexity | | | | High Complexity | | | |
| Scoring Criterion | Estimated Duration | | | | | | 9 - 18 months $\Box = 2$ | | | More than 18 months $\Box = 3$ | | | | | |
| | Organizational | | Can easily be absorbed $\boxed{1}$ | | | | Planned work (future) $\Box = 2$ | | | | Work not currently proposed $\Box = 3$ | | | | |
| | Complexity | | into existing work plan | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (Internal) | | Have staff with required $x = 1$ skillset/knowledge | | | | Have staff with required skillset/ $\Box = 2$ | | | Do not have staff with required □= 3 skillset/requires significant research | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | requires moderate research | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Less than or equal 2 $\Box = 1$ | | | | 3 - 4 staff required $\Box = 2$ | | | More than 5 staff required $x = 3$ | | | | | |
| | (Eutoweal) | | staff required | | | | | | | | 3 or more departments and/or external $x = 3$ | | | | |
| | (External) | | | 1 Additional department; no □= 1 community outreach required | | | | 2 Other departments Involved; □= 2 some community outreach required | | | | partners involved; significant community | | | |
| | | | sommanity our cach required some | | | | Some com | onintanty outcourrequired | | | | outreach required | | | |
| DEPT. Required | Airport Airport | | ditor | ★ CMO | □ OEDCA | | ESD | 🗆 Fire | □ HR | ПП | | PRNS | Police | □ Retirement | |
| | 🗵 Attorney | Clerk | | □ CMO – Budget | Community Energy | | ▪ Finance | ✗ Housing | 🗆 IPA | 🗆 Lib | rary | ▶ PBCE | × PW | □ DOT | |

CMO Approval: /s/ Lee Wilcox

Date 10/04/2023

Analysis

Explain the rationale for staff recommendation, including any mitigating factors that need to be considered (recent legislative action, significant work plan changes, etc.). Please address the following as well.

GREEN LIGHT: The Administration can implement this nominated idea under its current work plan. Item should be sent to Council to add to department work plan. (1) How will the idea be approached? (2) If adopted, what is its impact and/or tradeoff to the City Council Focus Area or to a department work plan, including strategic support? (3) What is the minimum viable scope to move the idea forward and reduce its complexity?

Recommendations 1-7 [GREEN] - For several weeks, City staff have been drafting an amendment to Title 5 of the San José Municipal Code to add Chapter 4.12 adopting reasonable local standards for homeless shelters and drafting a resolution for a declaration of a shelter crisis and proclamation of a local emergency. The items included in recommendations 1-7 are included in the draft ordinance amendment and draft resolution. The ordinance amendment, including environmental clearance, and the resolution are currently scheduled to go to City Council on October 24, 2023. In regard to the recommendation to prioritize aligning City policies and procedures with state laws such as SB 35 and AB 2162 that streamline the development of permanent, 100% affordable housing projects; reduce duplicative public meeting requirements; and explore additional options to accelerate the creation and construction of affordable housing: The City is required to comply with all new state housing streamlining laws. (see pg 3)

YELLOW LIGHT: The Administration recommends Council send this nominated idea to the Priority Setting Process or to the Budget Process due to (describe cost implications, workload impacts, or other factors).

RED LIGHT: The Administration recommends Council not to adopt this nominated idea due to (describe reason implementation would be difficult if not impossible – conflict with other laws, etc.).

Analysis (Continued)

As laws are enacted, City staff align City policies and procedures to those state laws. For example, staff have been processing SB 35 and AB 2162 applications since those laws were passed in 2017. Staff will continue to comply with state laws and establish procedures to streamline the entitlement process and facilitate affordable housing production, such as reducing duplicative public meeting requirements.

The Shelter Crisis Act affords increased flexibility and streamlining specifically for public projects to address the emergent need for additional shelter. City staff is also separately evaluating approaches to streamline the entitlement process for private projects such as for religious institutions or non-profit organizations.