ATTACHMENT C: Possible Types of Tenant Preferences and Legal Issues Assessment

| # | Туре | Possible Definition of | Example | Analysis | Number of |
|---|--------------|---|---|--|--------------|
| | | Population | | | Legal Issues |
| 1 | Live or Work | Those who live or work in San José. Evidence of residency includes a lease or evidence of utility bill payments at a SJ address. Local workers include those who spend 75% or more of a 40-hour workweek at a San José- based company or work location, and those who have received job offers at such an employer. | Many jurisdictions have this preference, including San Francisco, Emeryville, Boston. New York City has a tenant preference for NYC residents but not its workers. Housing authorities also establish live or work preferences through housing voucher programs. | Standard preference in many jurisdictions. Legal rationale is established and is recognized by State HCD. Applies to a broad population so legal analyses may be easier. | Low |
| 2 | Displaced | Residents displaced due to Ellis Act evictions or expiration of affordability restrictions | San Francisco gives a preference to residents displaced by an Ellis Act eviction. This preference also includes those displaced by "Owner Move-in" evictions and those displaced by fire. It defines a set-aside of 20% of most newly-funded affordable housing developments for this purpose. Boston has an Urban Renewal Displacee program for those displaced during a defined time period due to urban renewal programs. New York City has a similar program for residents of | Residents would need to show proof of residency and proof of eviction. City will now be notified of Ellis Act evictions and landlords' notices of intent to withdraw the units from the market, and can validate the information. City tracks its affordability restriction expiration dates and would know which buildings were affected. Disparate impact data analysis would need to be done. | Low |

| AREA-V | AREA-WIDE TENANT PREFERENCE POLICIES | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| # | Туре | Possible Definition of | Example | Analysis | Number of | | |
| | | Population | | | Legal Issues | | |
| | | | certain urban renewal areas in | | | | |
| | | | certain years. | | | | |
| 3 | Disaster | San José residents | San Francisco's preference for | Would need to create | Low | | |
| | victims | displaced from their | displaced fire victims requires a | acceptable substitutes for | | | |
| | | residences for more than | tenant to have been ordered by a | occupancy paperwork if it is | | | |
| | | 90 days due to natural | fire official to vacate and be | ruined in the disaster. Illegal | | | |
| | | disaster (flood, fire, etc.) | displaced for at least 6 months. | units may not have had an | | | |
| | | based on a state of | San Francisco includes this | official mandated evacuation | | | |
| | | emergency declaration, | preference in its "Displaced" | order for that address, so need | | | |
| | | date that a City official | preference. Many housing | to create alternative procedures | | | |
| | | mandated evacuation of | authorities give preferences for | and standards. | | | |
| | | the unit, or other specific | housing vouchers for disaster | | | | |
| | | disaster event declared by | victims. | | | | |
| | | City. | | | | | |
| 4 | Anti- | Residents living in certain | San Francisco's Anti- | Housing staff's analysis of | Low | | |
| | displacement | low-income neighborhoods | Displacement Housing | neighborhoods determines | | | |
| | | with defined boundaries | Preference would allow up to | eligibility, potentially based on | | | |
| | | that are undergoing | 40% of new certain new | objective analysis such as UC | | | |
| | | extreme displacement | affordable housing units to be | Berkeley. Need to determine an | | | |
| | | pressure, as determined by | occupied by residents with this | appeal process and whether | | | |
| | | City staff analysis annually. | preference. Location is defined | illegal units would be covered. | | | |
| | | | by census tracts per staff | Disparate impact analysis would | | | |
| | | | analysis. | need to be done, and HUD's | | | |
| | | | | approval would likely be | | | |
| | | | | needed. | | | |
| 5 | Neighborhood | Existing residents in a | San Francisco has a preference | Applicant must prove residency | Low | | |
| | | neighborhood or within a | for existing neighborhood | in a location currently | | | |
| | | 0.5-mile radius that has a | residents to occupy newly- | undergoing development, as | | | |
| | | restricted affordable, City- | leasing or for-sale affordable | defined by City. Neighborhood | | | |
| | | supported rental or for-sale | housing developments of 5 or | eligible for preference would | | | |

| # | Туре | Possible Definition of Example Analysis Num | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | Population | | | Legal Issues | |
| | | development of 5 or more | more units that it subsidizes. The | change over time. HUD may | | |
| | | units can occupy up to | preference is limited to 40% of | need to approve as under Fair | | |
| | | some percentage (40%) of | units in the new developments at | Housing law, program cannot | | |
| | | the new development. | the time of lease-up or sale. | concentrate race or poverty. | | |
| | | | Neighborhood is defined as same | | | |
| | | | Supervisorial District or 0.5-mile | | | |
| | | | radius from the new | | | |
| | | | development. New York City now | | | |
| | | | reserves 50% of subsidized | | | |
| | | | affordable apartments for | | | |
| | | | neighborhood residents and has | | | |
| | | | had this preference since 1988. | | | |
| 6 | Rent- | Existing City residents who | San Francisco has a Rent- | A large part of San Jose's overall | High | |
| | burdened | pay more than a certain | burdened Preference for City | population or its low-income | | |
| | | percentage of their income | residents who pay over 50% of | population would qualify, which | | |
| | | towards housing costs. | gross income towards housing | makes this an impractical policy | | |
| | | | costs. Effectuated only in | to implement. | | |
| | | | affordable housing produced via | | | |
| | | | Development and Disposition | | | |
| | | | Agreements of former RDA. | | | |
| 7 | Non-chronic | Households experiencing | City of San José's Transition in | Rationale is that need for | Low | |
| | homeless | homelessness that do not | Place (TIP) / Rapid Rehousing | permanent homes for homeless | | |
| | | qualify as chronically | program. | residents is overwhelming and | | |
| | | homeless and who have a | | immediate. Consistent with City | | |
| | | residence and work history. | | policies. | | |
| 8 | Domestic | Residents and dependents | Many housing authority voucher | HUD considers this population | Low | |
| | Violence | fleeing domestic violence | programs give priority to the | to be qualitatively similar to the | | |
| | Survivors | who do not need intensive | Violence Against Women Act | homeless re. evidencing need. | | |
| | | services provision through | population. Some DV survivors | Status relies on self-reporting, | | |
| | | on-site service provider. | may be more traumatized - more | which may be a re-traumatizing | | |

| # | VIDE TENANT PR | Possible Definition of | Example | Analysis | Number of |
|------------|---|---|--|---|--------------|
| | .,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | Population | | · | Legal Issues |
| | | | appropriate for higher-services environments - while others might not need service intensity of supportive housing environment. | event that should be handled delicately with staff trained to help this population. Confidentiality also is a significant issue for this population, so administration of this policy would be more difficult than for other preferences. Appropriate precautions are unlikely to occur if DV units are interspersed in non-supportive affordable housing. | |
| 9 (NEW) | Public Safety City employees | Current City employees of Fire, Police, and Office of Emergency Response. | New York City has created a preference for municipal employees in its City-subsidized developments' units which includes but is not limited to public safety personnel. Preference applies to 5% of units in each development. Staff's research found that affordable housing for first responders is typically done through funded homebuyer loan programs, not tenant preferences. | All tenants must income-qualify as low-income households at or below 60% of the Area Median Income to be eligible for affordable housing, so the pool of eligible City employees will likely be relatively small. If City salaries are similar to statewide EDD average salaries, few firefighters and police likely qualify as low-income. However, support staff and other municipal employees could. | Low |