



CED Committee: 11/18/2019
ITEM: (d)2

Memorandum

TO: Community and Economic
Development Committee

FROM: Councilmember Maya Esparza

SUBJECT: SEE BELOW

DATE: November, 15, 2019

Approved

Maya Esparza

Date

11/15/2019

AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SITING POLICY

RECOMMENDATION

1. Accept staff's verbal status report.
2. Direct staff to consider the distribution of both the number of deed-restricted affordable units and the level of affordability of units as they continue developing an Affordable Housing Development Siting Policy.

DISCUSSION

As we continue the important work of developing more deed-restricted affordable housing in our City, we must ensure that the metrics we are utilizing to develop an equitable siting policy are comprehensive, and provide a full and accurate reflection of the full range of affordability. Looking at the number of units, as well as the level of affordability of those units, can give us a very different understanding of the facts on the ground than simply comparing the number of affordable developments in geographic areas.

To illustrate this, we can look at our own data on affordable housing developments from 2017. Figure 1 shows the breakdown of affordable housing developments by Council District. We see that District 3 has the most with 51 developments, District 6 has the second most with 38 developments, District 5 is third with 21 developments, and Districts 2 and 7 have 18 developments each.

Figure 1: Restricted Affordable Apartments in San José - June 2017

CD1	CD2	CD3	CD4	CD5
12	18	51	18	26
CD6	CD7	CD8	CD9	CD10
38	18	2	21	11

Source: City of San José

However, when we take a more granular approach that includes the number of units and level of affordability, as shown in Table 1 below, a different picture emerges. Looking at the total number of units per Council District, we see that District 3 still has the most with 3,746 units, followed by District 7 with 3,210 units, District 6 with 2,912 units, and District 5 with 2,005 units. Furthermore, if we look at the number of ELI units, we see that District 7 has the highest with 696 units, followed by District 3 with 413 units, and District 6 with 390 units. This means that District 7 has over thirty percent of the total ELI units in the City.

This distinction is significant in considering our siting policy, as communities with large numbers of ELI units have significantly different needs for resources and additional challenges, a reality we miss by through looking only at the numbers of developments without regard to level of affordability.

Table 1: Existing Affordable Housing as a Percentage of the City's Housing Stock, by Council District

Council District	2010 Housing Units	ELI Units	ELI % of Total	VLI Units	VLI % of Total	LI Units	LI % of Total	Add'l HUD Units	Total Affordable Units	Afford. % of Total
1	36,182	141	0.4%	220	0.6%	492	1%	322	1,175	3%
2	28,681	130	0.5%	750	2.6%	433	2%	0	1,313	5%
3	34,021	413	1.2%	2,224	6.5%	994	3%	115	3,746	11%
4	33,039	49	0.1%	671	2.0%	394	1%	161	1,275	4%
5	22,533	221	1.0%	944	4.2%	351	2%	489	2,005	9%
6	39,181	390	1.0%	937	2.4%	1,367	3%	218	2,912	7%
7	26,793	696	2.6%	1,288	4.8%	1,012	4%	214	3,210	12%
8	27,363	0	0.0%	24	0.1%	163	1%	0	187	1%
9	34,212	184	0.5%	808	2.4%	336	1%	158	1,486	4%
10	32,033	0	0.0%	470	1.5%	146	0%	0	616	2%
TOTAL	314,038	2,224	0.7%	8,336	2.7%	5,688	1.8%	1,677	17,925	6%

Source: City of San José, Update on Homelessness Response Initiatives, June 2017

As we continue this critical work, I implore my colleagues to join me in advocating for a comprehensive, data-driven approach to craft our Affordable Housing Development Siting Policy to ensure an equitable distribution of affordable housing throughout our communities.