

# Memorandum

**TO:** HONORABLE MAYOR  
AND CITY COUNCIL

**FROM:** Julie Edmonds-Mares

**SUBJECT:** COUNCIL PRIORITY  
SETTING SESSION

**DATE:** October 16, 2017

Approved

*D. D. S. L.*

Date

*10/16/17*

## SUPPLEMENTAL

### REASON FOR SUPPLEMENTAL

To provide an updated Nominated Items list which includes staff's initial review of the Council proposals and staff's recommendations for organization of the ranking of the Council Priority List.

### ANALYSIS

#### *Nominated Items Update*

The Nominated Items list has been updated to include relevant staff comments on most of the proposed items (see Attachment A).

Additionally, after staff's initial review, three items have been identified as work in progress and therefore included in various staff workplans (green light). They have been removed from the list of nominated items, as follows:

- *Data Storage & Use Policy* submittal by Councilmember Khamis. This item is currently a part of the Civic Innovation and Information Technology workplan.
- *Identify Underutilized or Blighted Opportunity Sites for Housing* (from the Mayor's memorandum on 'Responding to the Housing Crisis'). This item is being evaluated with the items in the secondary staff supplemental.
- *Move 4,000 Housing Units into Phase 1 of the North San Jose Development Policy* (from the Mayor's memorandum on 'Responding to the Housing Crisis'). This item is included in the current Council Priority list established on March 7, 2017 (Item #11).

With the removal of these items, the number of nominated items is now **19**. **Each Councilmember will be given 7 votes** (19 items ÷ 3; staff has proposed to round numbers up). In Step 1 of the prioritization process, votes cannot be clustered; each member's votes must be distributed. **Each Councilmember will be allocated 1 vote per item and allowed to vote for up to 7 items.** With 77 total votes (7 x 11 members) available, a maximum of 16 nominated items could move on to the ranking process.

*Council Priority List Ranking Organization*

Staff is recommending the following organization changes to the ranking of Council Priority list:

- **Freezing the Top 10**  
As established in the past two Council Priority Setting Sessions, staff is recommending to hold in place and re-rank the top priority items on the Council Priority list established on March 7, 2017, due to the activity level in which staff is engaged in moving these items forward (Attachment C).
- **Removal of Prior Zero Votes Items**  
Removal of the past items receiving zero votes in the March 7, 2017 ranking process would result in four fewer items for consideration. The items removed would be items 21-24 on the current Council Priority list:
  - Real Estate Transactions Streamlining (Phase 3)
  - Development Agreement Policy
  - Off-Sale Alcohol at Grocery Stores Streamlining
  - Zoning Ordinance Quarterly Modifications
- **Capping the New Council Priority List at 25**  
Limiting the new list to 25 items will ensure that Council priorities with the greatest value and community benefit become the focus of the policy agenda.



JULIE EDMONDS-MARES  
Deputy City Manager

For questions please contact Julie Edmonds-Mares, Deputy City Manager, at 408-535-8155.

Attachment A: Nominated Items  
Attachment B: Sample Step 1 Ballot  
Attachment C: Sample Step 2 Ballot

## Attachment A – Nominated Items

List includes all ideas referred to priority setting since March 2017

Each Councilmember will get 7 votes (n/3) that cannot be clustered and must distributed. Those nominated items getting at least 5 favorable votes will be moved to the Council Priority list and included in the Ranking Process.

| <b>New Items for Consideration</b> |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                    | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>  | <b>Referred By</b>  |
| 1                                  | <b>Expansion of City of San Jose's Investment Policy, Social Responsibility Clause</b><br><br>Update and expand the City of San Jose's Investment Policy, Section 22, "Social Responsibility-Foreclosure Mitigation," to include language that demonstrates the City's commitment to fair and responsible business practices. | March 7, 2017 (Council) – <a href="#">Item 3.5</a>  |
| 2                                  | <b>Safe Parking Program</b><br><br>Explore and develop an ordinance which would allow for a legal use of “safe parking” in public and privately-owned parking lots for people who live in their vehicles.   | August 29, 2017 (Council) – <a href="#">Item 4.1</a>  |
| 3                                  | <b>Smoke-Free Housing</b><br><br>Explore a prohibition on smoking in multifamily housing units.   | September 20, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(4)(1)</a><br><br>Staff comments:<br><br>This ordinance would cover all apartment units as well as all condos and townhouses. Should this item be prioritized, additional staffing resources would be needed to research; conduct extensive community outreach; and to enforce a Smoke-Free Housing ordinance. |

|   | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>  | <b>Referred By</b>   |
|---|---|--|
| 4 | <p data-bbox="268 170 888 203"><b>Enhanced Tobacco Retail License Ordinance</b></p> <p data-bbox="268 243 1010 492">Explore amending San Jose’s existing Tobacco Retail License Ordinance to establish additional restrictions on the sale of tobacco products, such as prohibiting new retailers from operating within 1,000 feet of a school, and banning the sale of flavored tobacco products, menthol cigarettes and flavored e-cigarettes in all but adult-only stores.</p> | <p data-bbox="1060 170 1619 203">September 20, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(4)(2)</a></p> <p data-bbox="1060 243 1272 272">Staff comments:</p> <p data-bbox="1060 316 1990 532">The inspection of businesses that would be banned from selling flavored tobacco products, etc. is already included in Code Enforcement’s Tobacco Retail Licensing Program because these businesses sell other tobacco products, however if prioritized, exploration of an expanded ordinance would need to include extensive community outreach in addition to thorough evaluation of implementation.</p> |

|   | Policy/Ordinance Name   | Referred By  |
|---|---|--|
| 5 | <p><b>Ban on Gasoline-Powered Leaf Blowers</b></p> <p>Explore a ban on gasoline-powered leaf blowers in San Jose. As part of their analysis, staff should consider whether there are ways to implement the ban that would lessen the negative impact on small landscaping businesses.</p>                               | <p>September 20, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(4)(3)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>Blower devices are an efficient tool for businesses maintenance practices. The use of a broom to replace a blower would be cost prohibitive. Should this item be prioritized, a comprehensive and extensive community outreach plan would need to be undertaken to determine business impacts.</p> <p>Blower devices are also critical to City maintenance operations. They are used to efficiently perform clean up and maintenance work on City parks, street landscaping, special districts, building facilities, and roadway markings. The use of a broom to replace a blower would not be feasible due to the amount of infrastructure that is maintained by various City departments with in-house and contractual resources. However, PRNS and DOT are open to exploring options for maintaining City property without the use of gas powered leaf blowers. There are electric battery operated options that may might be able to replace the use of gas blowers. If this action is prioritized, PRNS and/or DOT could pilot the use of this alternate equipment to determine if the electric versions can match the effectiveness of the gas powered versions, what the associated costs would be for in-house operations (related to purchasing the equipment, and operating the equipment) and what other benefits or impacts staff identify. Staff could also assess the service level and cost impact on activities performed contractually. Once this pilot is completed staff would be able to report back on any potential costs and service level impacts of this proposal.</p> |
| 6 | <p><b>Urban Street Park Pilot</b></p> <p>Creation of an urban street park, pilot for no more than 12 months at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. San Pedro Street between West Santa Clara Street and West St. John Street, and</li> <li>2. Post Street between South First Street and Lightson</li> </ol> | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(3)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The policy portion of this recommendation, “creation of an urban street park pilot for no more than 12 months” is one aspect of this nomination.</li> </ol>  |

|   | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>   | <b>Referred By</b>  |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>Alley.</p> <p>The pilot should include community outreach prior to implementation in partnership with the affected businesses, San Jose Downtown Association, City Staff and the Council District 3 office.</p>   | <p>2. The selection of locations and fiscal requirements to implement the pilot would need to be evaluated by the Administration as a part of the budget process in light of the City’s budget outlook and other citywide and departmental funding priorities.</p>  |
| 7 | <p><b>Suicide Prevention Policy</b></p> <p>Development of a Suicide Prevention Policy, including but not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assessment of city-owned properties with recommendations for preventative measures.</li> <li>2. Explore how the City could support the County’s efforts to promote suicide prevention education and align its policies.</li> <li>3. Review all the City’s public safety protocols in the event of a suicide attempt and make any necessary updates including internal procedures for suicide prevention awareness for city managers and supervisors.</li> </ol> | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(4)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>Most City facilities/buildings don’t need any additional preventative measures because the roofs are not accessible to the public. However, the major challenge is that all City-owned Parking Garages are opened to the public and the roofs and every floor is accessible and a potential problem area.</p> <p>If prioritized, a policy would be created followed by training after the facility evaluation and the other items are completed.</p> |

|   | Policy/Ordinance Name   | Referred By   |
|---|---|---|
| 8 | <p><b>Expansion on the Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance</b></p> <p>Explore an expansion on the Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance, banning door-to-door marketers from using plastic bags to place items in front of residential homes or business storefronts.</p> | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(5)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A focus of the Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance is a positive impact on the storm water system. These types of bags are not included in the waste audits so there is no data to support an environmental benefit, if banned.</li> <li>• Staff initiated research and did not find any cities in CA or outside that have banned these types of bags. In fact, San Francisco, Tacoma, WA and Minneapolis have specific exemptions for newspaper bags and door hanger bags in their ordinance.</li> <li>• This expansion would require a significant investment of time and would be resource intensive to identify all stakeholders since any type of business could use this method of marketing. In addition, staff would need to explore legal aspects.</li> </ul>                            |
| 9 | <p><b>Private Property Graffiti Abatement Ordinance</b></p> <p>Ordinance that will allow staff to warn private property owners to abate graffiti on their property within 72 hours, or the City will abate the graffiti and bill the property owner.</p>  | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(6)(b)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>On May 3, 2016 staff provided a supplemental memorandum to the Mayor and City Council as part of Item 5.1 (<a href="http://sanjose.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=&amp;event_id=2134&amp;meta_id=571400">http://sanjose.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=&amp;event_id=2134&amp;meta_id=571400</a>). This memorandum estimated that if the City had this process in place, approximately \$136,000 would be needed annually to implement graffiti removal on private property. This includes the contractual cost for the removal as well as staff costs for coordination with the property owners.</p> <p>These operation changes would need to be evaluated by the Administration as a part of the budget process in light of the City’s budget outlook and other citywide and departmental funding priorities.</p> |

|    | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>  | <b>Referred By</b>   |
|----|---|--|
| 10 | <p><b>Unified Marketing Function for City Departments</b></p> <p>Evaluate the feasibility of unifying marketing efforts across City departments by forming an in-house team of marketing professionals or by contracting with a professional marketing organization (such as Team San Jose) in order to more effectively promote our revenue-generating assets, advance community pride and unity, and better communicate City services to our residents.</p> | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(6)(c)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>If prioritized, staff recommends consulting services for an assessment of departmental communications and marketing efforts, as well as a public survey to quantify how City messages are received and perceived. Future steps could include an update and protocols on City branding guidelines for all City communications. Funding the assessment, survey and new guidelines would need to be evaluated by the Administration as a part of the budget process.</p>  |
| 11 | <p><b>Develop Innovation Strategies to Hire Crossing Guards</b></p> <p>Develop new and innovative strategies to hire crossing guards.</p>   | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(7)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>The Police Department has implemented new recruiting strategies that have improved hiring of crossing guards. However, retention of existing crossing guards has been challenging. A deeper analysis is necessary to determine how to make this position more attractive to candidates and to retain existing crossing guards. Additional resources and time are needed to complete this analysis. Funding this additional work would need to be evaluated by the Administration as a part of the budget process.</p> |
| 12 | <p><b>Women’s Bill of Rights</b></p> <p>Explore a Women’s Bill of Rights.</p>   | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(8)</a></p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>If prioritized, staff would need to conduct research on best practices from other agencies and then create a policy. There may be legal issues that would require coordination with the City Attorney.</p>  |



|    | Policy/Ordinance Name   | Referred By   |
|----|---|---|
| 13 | <p data-bbox="268 170 751 240"><b>Downtown Zoning Code Update<br/>(Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p data-bbox="268 279 1039 457">Eliminate parking requirements, establish height minimums, and establish minimum residential densities for residential uses Downtown. Also establish requirements for retail, restaurants or other active ground floor uses on streets with sufficient visibility or foot traffic.</p> | <p data-bbox="1060 170 1669 203">October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 1(B)(i)</p> <p data-bbox="1060 243 1270 276">Staff comments:</p> <p data-bbox="1060 316 2005 860">If prioritized, staff recommends developing zoning code amendments for minimum heights for residential development after or currently with the completion of the Downtown historic survey and the update to the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines, which is part of Council Priority Item #14 - Update Urban Design Guidelines. Both of these bodies of work would inform what minimum heights should be established in which locations to protect and enhance identified historic resources and to ensure that new development is compatible with lower intensity surrounding neighborhoods. The other code updates could move forward independently and prior to the establishments of height minimums. As part of this work item staff also recommends reviewing the Downtown code amendments recommended by SPUR in its Cracking the Code report and proposing additional code amendments, as appropriate, which would facilitate active and pedestrian oriented ground floors in new development.</p> |

|    | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>  | <b>Referred By</b>  |
|----|---|---|
| 14 | <p data-bbox="268 170 919 240"><b>Facilitating SJSU Student and Faculty Housing (Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p data-bbox="268 277 1008 493">Work with San Jose State to identify and facilitate more housing opportunities for faculty, students and the community in the vicinity of the University. Also work with San Jose State to explore City-funded enhancements of potential SJSU educator-focused housing projects to supply additional units for school district teachers.</p> | <p data-bbox="1062 170 1684 201">October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 1(B)(iii)</p> <p data-bbox="1062 243 1272 274">Staff comments:</p> <p data-bbox="1062 316 2007 971">As a result of the University Neighborhoods Strong Neighborhoods Initiative planning process, most, if not all of the “dingbat” apartments built for San Jose State students in the 1950’s and 60’s have an Urban Residential land use designation and an RM Multiple Residence zoning district. If prioritized, as part of the work item, staff would explore whether there are General Plan policy amendments, zoning code amendments, and other strategies to encourage the redevelopment of these older apartments, while at the same time respecting the historic character and resources within the University neighborhoods. Staff would also explore housing opportunities for student and faculty members in the Horace Mann and Northside neighborhoods. Given the active involvement of community members in these neighborhoods around San Jose State, staff anticipates significant community outreach would be needed. Staff would explore opportunities to make use of San Jose State City Planning graduate students to assist with this effort, either as paid interns or as a class project. Staff would also explore the potential for CommUniverCity to assist with this project, however resources would need to be identified to pay CommUniverCity for its assistance.</p> |

|    | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>  | <b>Referred By</b>  |
|----|---|---|
| 15 | <p><b>Impact Fee Deferred Payment Program for Housing (Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p>Consider allowing deferral of payment of impact fees on GP 2040-compliant housing construction to enable payments streams to align with project revenues. Explore financing mechanisms that could allow for-sale housing projects to pay fees over time, at higher aggregate amounts than currently – but reduce the up-front burden.</p> | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 1(F)(ii)</p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>Payment of impact fees at Certificate of Occupancy rather than at issuance of building permits reduces costs to developers. The City’s Affordable Housing Impact Fee (AHIF) is structured to require payment before building permit issuance, although it allows developers paying early in the program to request payment at Certificate of Occupancy. If prioritized, the payment provision for all developers would require an Ordinance change, and development of new policies that would ensure that all appropriate fees get paid.</p>                                  |
| 16 | <p><b>Regional Entitlement Fee Study (Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p>Solicit private sector developer partners to fund a regional entitlement fee study that fairly assesses the aggregate cost to housing development of impact, regulatory and processing fees in jurisdictions throughout Silicon Valley.</p>  | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 1(F)(iv)</p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>If prioritized, staff would need to secure funds from private sector developers and coordinate the scope development and management of a regional fee study through a third party consultant agreement. Staff recommends consulting and coordinating with a non-profit or institutional partner, such as SPUR or SJSU, to undertake this work and ensure a balanced and equitable process that considers the nuanced circumstances that effect fees in different municipalities including but not limited to development taxes, area impact fees and other specialty fees.</p> |

|    | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>   | <b>Referred By</b>  |
|----|--|---|
| 17 | <p><b>Create On-line Map of Vacant Blighted, underutilized housing sites<br/>(Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p>Create a visually simple means to enable affordable and market-rate developers and investors to readily identify properties designated in the General Plan for housing that are vacant, underutilized, or blighted.</p> | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 2(A)</p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>While staff currently has some technical GIS and other skills to address this item, if prioritized, staff would explore opportunities to employ planning graduate students at SJSU or engage other partners to assist in creating a user-friendly online tool.</p>   |
| 18 | <p><b>Align Zoning with General Plan Designations<br/>(Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p>To facilitate housing development, identify properties designated in the General Plan for residential uses but are not zoned for residential uses, and rezone these properties with a conforming residential zoning district.</p>              | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 2(C)</p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>Staff estimate that there are a total of 2,921 parcels designated with a Residential Neighborhood, Mixed Use Neighborhood, Transit Residential or Urban Residential land use designation in the General Plan that do not have a conforming residential zoning district. The majority of these parcels are designated Mixed-Use Neighborhoods (1,676), which supports duplexes and townhomes, or Residential Neighborhood (759 parcels), which supports single family homes. Given that rezoning property requires significant staff time, as well as financial resources for legal descriptions, if prioritized, staff recommends rezoning those properties that could facilitate the most new housing units. Staff further recommends focusing on the rezoning of the 387 parcels designated for Urban Residential and the 99 parcels designated Transit Residential. While a work load and resource estimate still needs to be prepared, staff anticipate that a rezoning process focused on properties with a Transit and Urban Residential land use designation would be a multi-year project involving a multi-staff team. Prior to rezoning property, staff first recommends developing zoning code amendments to better align the RM Multiple Residence Zoning District with the Urban Residential and Transit Residential zoning districts. This task by itself would facilitate higher density housing, reduce the need for Planned Development Zonings, and allowing rezonings to go directly to City Council.</p> |

|    | <b>Policy/Ordinance Name</b>   | <b>Referred By</b>  |
|----|--|---|
| 19 | <p><b>Empty Home/Empty Parcel Fee to Generate Funds for Affordable Housing<br/>(Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p>Evaluate legal and policy justification for an “empty home fee”, similar to the one established by the City of Vancouver, British Columbia, or an “empty parcel” fee to incentive expansion of the rental housing supply, and to generate dollars for affordable housing.</p> | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 3(E)</p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <p>If prioritized, staff would need to dedicate time and resources to research and better understand the definitions and legal justifications for regulating “empty” homes and parcels.</p> |
|    | <p><b>Move 4,000 Housing Units into Phase 1 of the North San Jose Development Policy<br/>(Responding to the Housing Crisis)</b></p> <p>This nominated item is a part of the March 7, 2017 Council Priority List (#11).</p>   | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(10)</a> – 1(C)</p>  |
|    | <p><b>Reinstate the Family Domestic Violence Advisory Commission</b></p> <p>This nominated item was withdrawn by Vice Mayor Carrasco from consideration at the Priority Setting Session.</p>   | <p>October 4, 2017 (Rules) – <a href="#">Item G(9)</a></p>  |

**Council Priority Setting Ballot --October 7, 2017  
SAMPLE BALLOT (STEP 1)**

Councilmember Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Each Councilmember may vote for up to 7 items (n/3). One vote per item.

| #                       | Nominated Ideas   | VOTE FOR 7                           |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1                       | Expansion of City of San Jose's Investment Policy, Social Responsibility Clause                         |                                      |
| 2                       | Safe Parking Program  |                                      |
| 3                       | Smoke-Free Housing  |                                      |
| 4                       | Enhanced Tobacco Retail License Ordinance   |                                      |
| 5                       | Ban on Gasoline-Powered Leaf Blowers  |                                      |
| 6                       | Urban Street Park Pilot   |                                      |
| 7                       | Suicide Prevention Policy   |                                      |
| 8                       | Expansion on the Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance   |                                      |
| 9                       | Private Property Graffiti Abatement Ordinance   |                                      |
| 10                      | Unified Marketing Function for City Departments   |                                      |
| 11                      | Develop Innovation Strategies to Hire Crossing Guards   |                                      |
| 12                      | Women's Bill of Rights  |                                      |
| 13                      | Downtown Zoning Code Update (Responding to the Housing Crisis)  |                                      |
| 14                      | Facilitating SJSU Student and Faculty Housing   |                                      |
| 15                      | Impact Fee Deferred Payment Program for Housing (Responding to the Housing Crisis)                      |                                      |
| 16                      | Regional Entitlement Fee Study (Responding to the Housing Crisis)                                       |                                      |
| 17                      | Create On-line Map of Vacant Blighted, underutilized housing sites (Responding to the Housing Crisis)   |                                      |
| 18                      | Align Zoning with General Plan Designations (Responding to the Housing Crisis)                          |                                      |
| 19                      | Empty Home/Empty Parcel Fee to Generate Funds for Affordable Housing (Responding to the Housing Crisis) |                                      |
| <b>Total Votes Cast</b> |   | _____ <b>must total 7 (or fewer)</b> |

Councilmember signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**Council Priority Ranking Ballot --October 7, 2017  
SAMPLE BALLOT (STEP 2)**

Councilmember Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Each Councilmember will have \_\_\_ votes (\_\_\_/3) to allocate as they choose.

| #                       | Items Approved by Council  | ___ VOTES                       |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 1                       | Update the City's Rental Rights and Referrals Program                        |                                 |
| 2                       | Local Hiring/Local Business/Apprentice Utilization Program                   |                                 |
| 3                       | Mobile Home Conversions  |                                 |
| 4                       | Housing Rehabilitation Program (Homeless Veterans Vouchers)                  |                                 |
| 5                       | Disadvantaged Business Enterprises   |                                 |
| 6                       | Electronic Billboards  |                                 |
| 7                       | Downtown and/or Citywide Parks Operations and Maintenance Financing District |                                 |
| 8                       | Development of a Soft-Story Retrofit Program                                 |                                 |
| 9                       | Accessory Dwelling Units & Garage Conversion Ordinance                       |                                 |
| 10                      | Personal Care Business Compliance Initiative                                 |                                 |
| 11                      | North San José Policy Review   |                                 |
| 12                      | Spurring High Density Development Along Transit Corridors                    |                                 |
| 13                      | Anti-Displacement Preference Ordinance                                       |                                 |
| 14                      | Update Urban Design Guidelines   |                                 |
| 15                      | Riparian Corridors and Bird Safe Design                                      |                                 |
| 16                      | Commercial Impact Fee for Affordable Housing                                 |                                 |
| 17                      | Downtown Active Storefronts Initiative                                       |                                 |
| 18                      | San José is Open for Business/Legal Non-Conforming Uses                      |                                 |
| 19                      | Food and Clothing Distribution at City Parks                                 |                                 |
| 20                      | Medical Marijuana  |                                 |
| 21                      | Sanctioned Encampments   |                                 |
|                         |  |                                 |
|                         |  |                                 |
|                         | <b>ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO BE ADDED FROM NOMINATED IDEAS LIST FOLLOWING</b>      |                                 |
|                         | <b>PRIORITY SETTING VOTE (STEP 1)</b>  |                                 |
|                         |  |                                 |
|                         |  |                                 |
| <b>Total Votes Cast</b> |  | _____ must total ___ (or fewer) |

Councilmember signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Council member may allocate their \_\_\_ votes through cluster voting; for example, all \_\_\_ votes may be allocated to one or more items