From: Dennis Martin < >
Sent: Tuesday, August 7, 2018 12:05 PM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo
Cc: District 6; District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; District7; District8; District9; District 10; City Clerk
Subject: City Council meeting Agenda item 3.4 Strategic Support Potential General Obligation Bond Ballot Measure.

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,
On behalf of BIA Bay Area, we submit the attached letter of comment for your consideration.
Please include BIA Bay Area on future communications regarding this issue.
Thank you,

Dennis Martin
BIA Government Affairs
408-294-5687

August 7, 2018

Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Jose City Council
San Jose City Hall
200 E. Santa Clara St.
San José, CA 95113
TRANSMITTED VIA EMAIL

RE: August 7, 2018 City Council Meeting Item 3.4 Strategic Support Potential General Obligation Bond Ballot Measure.

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Councilmembers,

Below are several proposals BIA Bay Area would recommend for consideration by the City Council and City Staff as you commence your efforts to consider and outline a proposed 2018 Bond Measure for Affordable Housing.

BIA's position is that all funds secured through the proposed bond measure must achieve the greatest number of new housing units possible. Silicon Valley's under supply of housing is at a critical level considering the region's past, current and expected job growth. Bond measure implementation criteria that will maximize the region's supply of new housing will be most effective at reducing housing costs.

With this in mind BIA Bay Area recommends the following for consideration under a proposed "Spending Plan Framework" for the proposed 2018 bond measure:

- Cost containment: To compete for Bond funds, require developers to include evaluation/scoring points that require cost containment criteria of City funded affordable units. The goal being to "contain" the cost of producing affordable units so as to insure the greatest amount of housing is built with the limited funds available.
- Gap Funding: To make sure that Bond funds provide the best bang for the buck, set criteria for the Bond funds to provide gap financing rather than complete funding for affordable housing projects.
- The Missing Middle, Workforce Housing, etc.: Individuals and families looking for workforce housing often do not qualify within existing affordable housing programs but still struggle to find housing. Target a substantial portion of the Bond to address the "missing middle" of working families that earn too much to qualify for low income housing, up to 150% of median income, but not enough to afford market rate housing.
- Down Payment Assistance: It is important that many of our moderate-income workers i.e., teachers, public safety personnel, medical assistants be able to buy a new or existing home in

their communities. Therefore, the Measure should set aside at least 10% of the Bond for a Down Payment Assistance Program for qualified homebuyers similar to Napa County's "Proximity Housing Homebuyers Assistance Program" that has been integrated into Santa Clara County's Measure A Affordable Housing Bond.

- Market Rate Units: Make sure that the financing subsidy on each City funding proposal does not have the unintended consequence of increasing inclusionary housing fees on market rate housing. Impact fees have become a huge percentage of overall costs with often detrimental effect to the ability of the market rate project to meet financial goals.

Housing affordability has become a crisis due to many factors: the lack of housing supply, recent explosive regional job growth, the termination of redevelopment by the state legislature and other economic, political and social factors that should be addressed by society at large, not solely allocated to builders of market-rate housing through inclusionary housing policies or affordable impact fees.

BIA respectfully provides these comments in the spirit of collaboration with the City on the very complex challenge of addressing housing supply and affordability. BIA offers our availability to participate in working group sessions, stakeholder outreach efforts and other opportunities to help shape the Bond Measure in the near future.

Yours truly,

Dennis Martin
BIA Government Affairs

From: Jerry Mungai
Sent: Monday, August 6, 2018 11:25 AM
To: District1; District 6; District9; District 10; District4; District5; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District3; District2; District7; District8; City Clerk
Subject: Aug 7 City Council Meeting, Item 3.4: $950M General Obligation Bond Proposal. VOTE NO!

This proposal is ill defined and meant to be all things to all voters; and will result in making small dents in many of the city's problems.

There are zero funds to restore our parks, a core city function, from the ravages of the drought years; and to help modernize them to reduce water consumption.

According to a 2017 Transportation Dept. estimate, the City needed $109M annually for FIVE YEARS to achieve a citywide 70 PCI (Pavement Condition Index) for city streeets. This bond only provides $300M. Transportation is a core city service. Why not have a bond issue that addresses one problem completely rather than one that only puts a small dent into a long-festering problem?

Affordable housing funding is like an after-Christmas sale: market rate housing on sale. It will only increase demand for below-market housing with resulting higher housing prices and expand demand for well-compensated city employees to manage the plethora of housing programs.

Let's put pressure on surrounding cities to create their "fair share" of affordable housing for the homeless and low-income people who wish to live here but cannot without taxpayer help. In reality, taxpayers ultimately pay for "affordable" housing.

There is already a plethora of tax increases on the November ballot; we don't need to add this poorly prepared bond proposal to the ballot!

I urge you to vote NO on this proposal.

Jerry Mungai
San Jose

From: Craig Ash
Sent: Monday, August 6, 2018 6:57 PM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <>; District1 >; District2 < >; District3 <>; District4 <>; District5 <D>; District7 <>; District8 <>; District 6 <>; District9 <>; Khamis, Johnny <>
Subject: The $950 Million Omni Bond

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Council Members,

The $950 million 30 year Omni Bond Issue and vote comes before the council tomorrow. In reviewing it, I have major concerns as a lifelong San Jose resident and fiscally concerned citizen.

This pending bond issue really started out as a much smaller attempt to get some badly needed funding for our parks very large unfunded infrastructure needs, especially for parks in our lower income impacted areas (a core service).

Next, we saw an amount added to the bond proposal to help cover unfunded road repairs since the city has not been able to cut into that backlog very fast (another core service).

That first bond proposal phase was around $300 million. However, the badly needed parks repairs were dropped.

Then, the bond measure was amended to add another $450 million for more street repairs, and included money for new police and fire training facilities. (Core services, but at what cost to taxpayers over 30 years).

Finally, another $250 million was added for more low cost housing, funds to help the arts, a downtown light tower, funds to renovate the municipal stadium and funds for more items. (none of these are core services and the city training facilities should be covered by existing capital funding plans not this bond.

So, we end up with $950 million Omni Bond proposal which doesn't cover our neglected parks, puts a lot more money into streets and a couple of safety facilities, and throws in another ton of money for non essential non-core items which should have private support, not taxpayer support. The low cost housing subsidy issue has been covered by a number of prior tax and other state, county and city funding measures and should not be included in this bond proposal at all.

This bond will hit all Taxpayer's and renters with an ongoing property assessment likely $300 or much more per year for 30 years. This means that the $950 million bond will likely cost taxpayers close to $2,000,000,000 when it matures. It is regressive and is No bargain.

So I ask:

1. why doesn't the city go back to a more reasonable bond amount of $200-$350 million for underfunded park and city street repairs, and list all the work to be done specifically in the bond measure. Get that needed work under some control.

2. Delay this bond until 2019 when there will be more time for city residents to clearly understand the full spending projects covered and the full 30 year costs to be applied.

3. Insure that there is tight audit-able cost and time scheduling for the projects covered and to be completed.

4. Remove all other items from you spending plan. Look for other more fiscally efficient ways to free up funds through better city operations like installing a new delayed accounting system.

As a voter, in good conscious, I could not vote for a $2,000,000,000 additional 30 year cost to our taxpayers and my family. With many many more taxes and fees coming on the November ballot I have to be concerned about our personal fiscal health in these times.

Thank you for letting me express my opinion.

Sincerely,

Craig Ash
San Jose, CA

Item 3.4

From: Rich Giammona []
Sent: Monday, August 6, 2018 2:11 PM
Subject: Proposed 950 Million Omni bond

Honorable Mayor & City Council ~

On August 7th, it is my understanding that you will be discussing the future of the proposed 950 Million Omni bond. In my previous emails, I had concerns about the use of oversight committee to get a measure passed by the public. My hope is that you'll do the right thing. The following are my concerns about the language of this bond.

Bond Measure Concern Homeless:

City already has money of which goes to the homeless. We just passed a bond measure for the homeless. The state has money of which they will be using for the homeless. Measure B 1/4 Sales Tax is providing money for the homeless.

Bond Measure Concern Transportation:

In my opinion this Bond Measure should be used for the sole purpose of fixing the streets of the City of San Jose. According to DOT it will take many, many, many, many, many years to fix the current streets. Each year that goes by the city goes deeper and deeper in the hole in regards to getting them fixed.

Bond Measure Concern:

I will be a definite no vote on the current makeup of the bond. I might be wrong and if so would appreciate being corrected. Will this bond be re-paid via property taxes? Firehouse 37 is attached to this bond measure, as was it recently for the 2016-2017 Measure B, and I believe so in the 2018-2019 budget.

Recently a citizen informed me, "It doesn’t resolve the accountability issue around a $950 million bond that doesn’t specify defined amounts to be spent on specific areas of focus (e.g. $300 million street repairs & resurfacing, $100 million public safety infrastructure, etc). You could spend $1 on streets and say “we spent money on streets, as promised”

Lastly, I've read Councilman Jimenez Memo regarding this Bond. He brought up a lot of points. One that I specifically agree with is for this bond idea; to be basically put on hold. The people should have the ability to give direct input. Not just homeless advocates, or other groups that are sitting in on the current session. An example: The bond should be a 1 billion dollar Repave City of San Jose Roads. This bond has flaws all through it from the oversight committee use, all the way through. I applaud CM Jimenez for his stance on getting the peoples input.

Regards,

Rich Giammona

Community Member / Fiscally Responsible

For Agenda Item 3.4

From: George & Phyllis Prior []
Sent: Monday, August 6, 2018 12:33 PM
To: District 10 < >
Subject: URGENT!!! :: The OMNI-BOND ($950 Million) ...
Importance: High

We DO NOT support the Bond Measure as written.

We VOTE “NO” to this ridiculous measure by the City of San Jose.

George & Phyllis Prior

From: Mathew Reed <>
Sent: Tuesday, August 7, 2018 11:17 AM
To: Jones, Chappie; Jimenez, Sergio; Peralez, Raul; Diep, Lan; Carrasco, Magdalena; Davis, Dev; Nguyen, Tam; Arenas, Sylvia; Rocha, Donald; Khamis, Johnny; Liccardo, Sam
Cc: Ferguson, Jerad; Sandoval, Vanessa; Ramos, Christina M; District4; Herbert, Frances; Groen, Mary Anne; Moua, Louansee; McGarrity, Patrick; Hamilton, Peter; Connolly, Shane Patrick; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; City Clerk; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky; Kazantzis, Kyra
Subject: RE: Item 3.4 – Potential General Obligation Bond Ballot Measure

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Carrasco, and Councilmembers, Arenas, Davis, Diep, Jimenez, Jones, Khamis, Nguyen, Peralez and Rocha.

On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we enthusiastically submit the attached letter in support of placing an Affordable Housing Bond on the November ballot. The resources generated by this bond will provide affordable housing opportunities for thousands of households in San Jose.

Mathew Reed
Policy Manager
SV@Home
Office: (669) 254-1009

sv@home
350 W Julian St. #5, San Jose, CA 95110
Website I Facebook I Twitter I Newsletter I ***Become a Member!***

Check out our **Resource Hub** for all your housing data needs

sv@home

Board of Directors

Ron Gonzales, Chair
Hispanic Foundation of Silicon Valley

Janice Jensen, Vice Chair
Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley

Kevin Zwick, Treasurer
Housing Trust Silicon Valley

Kathy Thibodeaux, Secretary
KM Thibodeaux Consulting LLC

Shiloh Ballard
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition

Bob Brownstein
Working Partnerships USA

Christine Carr

Katie Ferrick
LinkedIn

Amie Fishman
Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California

Javier Gonzalez
Google

Poncho Guevara
Sacred Heart Community Service

Jan Lindenthal
MidPen Housing

Jennifer Loving
Destination: Home

Mary Murtagh
EAH Housing

Chris Neale
The Core Companies

Andrea Osgood
Eden Housing

Kelly Snider
Kelly Snider Consulting

Jennifer Van Every
The Van Every Group

Staff

Leslye Corsiglia
Executive Director

TRANSMITTED VIA EMAIL

August 7, 2018

City of San Jose
200 East Santa Clara Street, 18th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Carrasco, and Councilmembers, Arenas, Davis, Diep, Jimenez, Jones, Khamis, Nguyen, Peralez and Rocha.

RE: Item 3.4 – Potential General Obligation Bond Ballot Measure

On behalf of our members and the undersigned organizations, we strongly support the recommendation to place a city sponsored general obligation bond including significant new resources for affordable housing on the November ballot.

As our housing crisis grows, we have reached consensus on the need for significantly more affordable housing in San Jose. These are critically needed resources, and this is an exciting opportunity that should not be allowed to pass us by. City Staff has estimated that the shortfall in reaching the goal of 10,000 affordable units is well over $500 million. This bond measure can offer the promise of real progress towards meeting these goals, and we urge council to consider this a primary tool in bridging this gap.

We are heartened that the polling data show that the residents of San Jose recognize the challenge of housing affordability in our city, and would strongly support a bond measure that included resources for more affordable housing.

The affordable housing challenges we face, and will face in the future, are complex and will require a range of solutions. We support the proposed flexibility of the measure to fund land acquisition, construction, and acquisition and rehabilitation of existing properties.

As we know our work will require a diversity of tools, we also know we need to continue to develop a diversity of permanent funding sources, and we will continue to work with this administration and council to develop long term solutions that recognize the long term needs we face.

Placing the measure on the ballot is only the first step in the process, and we each stand committed to helping to share the value of stable affordable housing with the voters of San Jose.

Thank you in advance for your courage and leadership.

350 W. Julian Street, Building 5, San José, CA 95110
408.780.2261 • www.svathome.org • info@siliconvalleyathome.org

Sincerely,

Leslye Corsiglia – Executive Director
SV@Home

Enrique Arguello – Business Manager
LIUNA Laborers – Local 270

Alison Brunner – Chief Executive Officer
Law Foundation of Silicon Valley

Aime Fishman – Executive Director
Non Profit Housing of Northern California

Matt Franklin – President
MidPen Housing Corporation

Susan Friedland – Executive Director
Satellite Affordable Housing Associates

Brian Hanlon – Executive Director
California YIMBY

Janice Jensen – President and Chief Executive Officer
Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley

Jennifer Loving – Chief Executive Officer
Destination: Home

Linda Mandolini - President
Eden Housing

Geoffrey Morgan - President and CEO
First Community Housing

Mary Murtagh – Executive Director
EAH Housing

Chris Neale - Executive Vice President
Core Affordable Housing

People Acting in Community Together

Jim Silverwood – President and Chief Executive Officer
Affirmed Housing

South Bay YIMBY

Andrea Urton – Chief Executive Officer
Home First

Dan Wu – Executive Director
Charities Housing

Kevin Zwick – Chief Executive Officer
Housing Trust of Silicon Valley

350 W. Julian Street, Building 5, San José, CA 95110
408.780.2261 • www.svathome.org • info@siliconvalleyathome.org