



Memorandum

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR
AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: Jacky Morales-Ferrand

SUBJECT: SEE BELOW

DATE: August 10, 2020

Approved

Date

8/10/2020

SUPPLEMENTAL

**SUBJECT: ACTIONS RELATED TO THE 2020-25 CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND
FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN**

REASON FOR SUPPLEMENTAL

This supplemental memorandum includes an updated list of comments received from the public following a community-wide virtual meeting conducted on the evening of August 6, 2020. Comments are included in an Amended Attachment C to the main memorandum.

ANALYSIS

When new five-year funding priorities are created for Consolidated Plans, they are based on needs data, public input, local studies, the City's priorities, and the eligible uses of these funds.

All these inputs confirm that this draft 2020-25 Consolidated Plan and FY 2020-21 Annual Action Plan should keep the first three of the previous Consolidated Plan's priorities the same – homelessness, affordable housing, and fair housing. San José clearly needs significant additional resources for all three of these program areas.

This Plan's fourth priority – to Strengthen and Stabilize Communities – is a proposed change from the previous Plan. It reflects the City's shifted priorities to a people-first frame through the inclusion of services such as childcare, community WiFi, and small business supports. These activities address the other side of providing affordable housing – enabling people to afford housing and improve their opportunities because they can make enough to live here.

HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

August 10, 2020

Subject: Supplemental Memo - Actions Related to the 2020-25 Consolidated Plan and FY 2020-21 Annual Action Plan

Page 2

The proposed 2020-25 Consolidated Plan priority needs, goals, and potential programs were presented at the virtual community meeting held at 6:00 p.m. on August 6, 2020. The Attachment to this memorandum captures public comment at this meeting, as well as comments made at the City Council public hearing on August 4, 2020. Comments from the City Council and the public were supportive of all four of these priority areas and the spending plans presented.

CONCLUSION

In total, the public comments supported and reinforced the City's four selected priority areas. Therefore, there are no proposed changes to the final Consolidated Plan's priorities.

All comments received through community engagement efforts, public workshops, Committee and Commission meetings, and public hearings before the City Council will be included in the final version of the Consolidated Plan to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

/s/

JACKY MORALES-FERRAND
Director, Housing Department

For questions, please contact Ragan Henninger, Deputy Director, at (408) 535-3854.

Attachment:

Amended Attachment C: Updated Summary of Public Comments

AMENDED ATTACHMENT C
UPDATED SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Neighborhood Services and Education Committee Meeting, March 12, 2020

Commissioner Comments	Response
The Housing Department should provide information on priorities identified by the public, and describe how public input contributed to Plan development	Comment noted; this information has been provided in the Council memo.
The Department should receive input on the Consolidated Plan from Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE).	Comment noted; this information has been provided in the Council memo.
The extent to which families are being served should be highlighted.	Comment noted; this information has been provided in the Council memo.

General Public Comments	Response
N/A	

Housing & Community Development Commission Meeting, March 12, 2020

Commissioner Comments	Response
The outreach done for this Plan was great.	Comment noted.
The Plan was a little too incremental.	Comment noted.
Preservation of affordable housing needs to be a higher priority; wanted to see more specific strategies for Preservation.	Comment noted.
We need to ensure that communities are maintained while they gentrify. The City should fund Preservation and tenant Protection strategies.	Comment noted.
Homelessness prevention is a cost-effective solution; residents should be provided educational resources on what is available for housing.	Comment noted.
Affordable housing should be located in all parts of the City, especially if it's smaller-scale to fit into less dense areas.	Comment noted.
The City should support advocacy for affordable housing.	Comment noted.
Staff's analysis of policies that are consistent with these priorities was helpful and appreciated.	Comment noted.
Leadership development should not be a function of government funding.	Comment noted.
The City should fund grassroots outreach throughout the City to represent their voices in decision making, and support community-based development entities that could help with strategies around ADUs and duplexes.	Comment noted.
Goals for contracts should be outcome based and it's difficult to do that for leadership development and outreach contracts.	Comment noted.
All goals related to grassroots outreach skills development and neighborhood leadership development be quantitatively related to housing development, preservation, and protection issues.	Comment noted.
Government should reach out to hear residents' concerns directly.	Comment noted.
I support community land trusts working with community development corporations.	Comment noted.
The City should fund capacity building for community-based development organizations.	Comment noted.

Service-enriched affordable housing, asset building, and childcare are all very important. People in shelters say they need these things - they cannot afford rent and childcare at the same time.	Comment noted.
It is extremely important to do grassroots outreach to hear residents' concerns directly.	Comment noted.
Contracts should measure results with outcome measures.	Comment noted. Staff agrees and uses outcome measures, and invites commissioners to advise on measures.
Organizations need to hire people who look like the community, so that the community's voices are heard in community development issues and the City's opinion does not prevail.	Comment noted.
I support the City's support of grassroots organizations especially related to community development issues.	Comment noted. The City agrees and capable nonprofits to help with effective outreach.

General Public Comments	Response
N/A	

City Council Hearing, August 4, 2020

Councilmember Comments	Response
it's been a long road in gathering data – congratulations, almost there. But people can still be heard by submitting comments.	Comment noted.
I really appreciate that you recognized who in terms of groups are being most impacted (race/ethnicity). How did you connect those dots to the Plan's strategies?	Requests for Proposals ask responders the best way to target most impacted communities; in addition, the City conducted targeted outreach to impacted segments of the community.
In terms of the “strengthen and stabilize” priority, will the City need additional staff? Development and services are very different, can't pull staff in two directions.	The Housing Department partners with OED and PATH currently on those types of strategies; and will add one additional staff to support with the extra funds. Also, the Department will add one Fiscal and one homeless staff to help.
What about RVs parked in the street?	Part of the ESG CARES Act funding will assist with issues pertaining to RV parking.
The fourth priority to strengthen and stabilize communities seems farther away than housing. Can you use funds to hire staff for this work?	No. There is a limit on administration funds and they cannot be used to supplant City funds for staffing.
Since 45% of residents are rent-burdened, wages that people earn are therefore very important. Could we use ESG CARES funds to plug holes?	City staff will review the requirements of this funding and provide an update.
Are we spending only \$2M on homelessness prevention for Rapid Re-housing out of all these funds including rental assistance?	This figure does not include an additional \$2.7 million in HOME funds for tenant-based rental assistance.
Can we spend more for homelessness prevention?	Homelessness prevention is not an eligible activity for ESG CARES funds. HUD wants funding to go directly to people experiencing homelessness, rather than those currently housed.
Very happy to see new outreach positions in the proposal – mental health, outreach, drug & alcohol counselors – how are we working with County Behavioral Health?	Staff will return to the City Council on 8/25 with more information on the County Plan to End Homelessness and the system of care.

General Public Comments	Response
I like mixed-income housing; community sustainability / energy and policing.	Comments noted.
Mixed-income housing – you are stratifying society. That's what SV means. Stockholm – everyone takes transit. 43,000 families on par to be evicted. What are we doing about that?	Comments noted.
If you haven't been homeless, you don't understand the issue. People who need addiction treatment – San Diego houses people in tents. We are spending too much money, not housing enough people.	Comments noted.
I needed drug rehab to get off streets. Skid row over on Spring St. Need to clean the area. Have infrastructure to hook ups - could do solar panels.	Comments noted.
I know you've reached out to some advocates but the City could do better. Concerned about the Bridge Housing Community in District 2. I have asked if I could speak with residents to see if it's working.	Comments noted.
I live in my van in the county parking lot, away from meth addicts, clean living. A lot of people out here who want to raise their families, steer clear of trouble. You have to help, have to do more to help people like us.	Comments noted.
We need a committee of unhoused people or a representative from the community to be involved. Without this, we won't get as far as we could otherwise, and we will keep having the same conversation.	Comments noted.
People on the street are very different than in the shelters – they either can't or won't follow rules. The only thing that will help them is more transitional housing. The City should listen to homeless people.	Comments noted.

Virtual Public Meeting, August 6, 2020

General Public Comments	Response
Will the fiscal budget run according to the federal fiscal year of Oct through Sept?	No, it runs according to the City's fiscal year, which runs July 1 to June 30.
Will rental assistance funding be ready in July?	The City amended last year's Annual Action Plan to use millions in HOME funds for tenant-based rental assistance for COVID relief. Contracts are signed; those programs are going into place right now. TBRA is generally for formerly homeless residents, but the COVID contracts are for the general population that can income qualify.
Can you give an example of programs that will allow people to grow their assets?	This would include programs that train people for jobs/professional development, which can lead to higher incomes. Wealth building is the flip-side of making housing more affordable.
How is Rapid Rehousing working? It doesn't seem visible in the neighborhoods.	The rapid rehousing program is working well, but cannot keep up with the rate at which people are becoming unhoused. Even before the pandemic, for every one person that was housed, an estimated three more become unhoused.
Surprised that only 25% of Latinx spend more than 50% of housing – thought it would be higher.	This figure represents only severe cost burden, which means people who spend over 50% of their income on housing costs. An additional statistic is the number of people who are cost burdened, spending between 30% and 50% of their income on housing. Also, these figures are outdated, as this was the most recent info provided by HUD (ACS 2011-2015 five-year data) and does not reflect San Jose's current market conditions.
There does not seem to be enough housing for ELI households.	Comment noted. Last year, the City Council directed the Housing Department to spend 45% of funding for affordable housing on ELI apartments.