
FW: Opposition to Proposed IHO Changes Not Targeting 50% AMI and Below

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Wed 1/28/2026 10:34 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Dora Gurrola <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 9:44 AM
To: Housing Choices <communications@housingchoices.org>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; Campos, Pamela <Pamela.Campos@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Proposed IHO Changes Not Targeting 50% AMI and Below

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Mahan, Vice Mayor Pam Foley, and Members of the City Council,

My name is Dora Gurrola and I am a housing coordinator at Housing Choices. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO) changes that target households at 60%–110% AMI rather than very low-income and extremely low-income residents, because these changes will reduce access to deeply affordable housing for San José's most vulnerable residents.

While I oppose the current IHO proposal, I support Councilmember Candelas' memo to defer this item and direct staff to return with alternative policy options, development impact analysis, and further stakeholder input. This memo is the strongest option before Council, but the IHO should not be continuously delayed and any changes must ultimately prioritize extremely low-income households, particularly those at 50% AMI and below.

First, the proposed AMI changes do not reflect the reality of San José's renters. Units created under this framework will remain out of reach for many low-income households, weakening one of the City's last remaining tools for producing deeply affordable housing.

Second, these changes will disproportionately harm people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. If housing is not built at income levels accessible to people with disabilities, many will be pushed into homelessness or institutional settings. This contradicts fair housing principles and the Lanterman Act's guarantee that people with disabilities have the right to live in the least restrictive, community-based environment with appropriate supports. San Jose should not violate disability-inclusive frameworks by using IHO to support AMIs that are not reflective of those who need it most.

I urge the City Council to adopt an alternative, research-backed, IHO approach that meaningfully serves extremely low-income households, especially those at or below 50% AMI.

Sincerely,

Dora Gurrola

Housing Coordinator

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Your Constituency Says NO to "Housing Day" (Agenda Item Nos. 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.6)

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Thu 2/12/2026 9:18 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Sorry! I just found this in the Junk email.

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Raiyan Seede [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2026 4:00 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Your Constituency Says NO to "Housing Day" (Agenda Item Nos. 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.6)

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

City Clerk Toni Taber,

Dear City Clerk, Mayor Mahan, and Members of the San José City Council,

I am writing to voice my public comment regarding the agenda items for consideration on the upcoming "Housing Day" (San Jose City Council agenda item nos. 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.6 respectively for the official records - please include my comments under each of the relevant agenda items). My specific reasons for asking for your opposition and adjustments are outlined below.

On the same day that you consider a vote to extend the Local Emergency for the Homeless Shelter Crisis; at a time when San Jose residents have listed affordability as the single most important issue; when homelessness has risen 4% since 2023 despite the city's investment into emergency shelters; the measures for your consideration prioritize market-rate incentives and regulatory rollbacks while failing to require permanent, deeply affordable housing,

deepening San Jose's homelessness, housing, and shelter crises. These measures undermine long-term housing stability and directly contribute to the very crises they claim to address. Please use common sense with your votes.

Ask: Alter Incentive Programs (Downtown Commercial to Residential and Multi-family Housing) So Public Investment Receives Public Benefit (Agenda Item Nos. 8.2 and 8.3)
I urge the Council to oppose the extension and expansion of San José's housing incentive programs as written, which continues to provide substantial public subsidies—fee waivers, tax reductions, and relaxed inclusionary requirements—while producing little to no permanent affordable housing. While adaptive reuse and increased housing production are the right direction, these programs overwhelmingly subsidize market-rate development at 80–100% AMI, often above current market rents; failing to serve the residents most impacted by displacement, homelessness, and housing insecurity. The outcomes of existing incentives demonstrate this flaw: projects cited as successes produced no deed-restricted affordable units, while higher-cost units continue to sit vacant and do not meaningfully reduce rents or homelessness. If the City is going to waive public revenue, it must require real public benefit—deep (30–60% AMI) and permanent affordability, community or nonprofit participation, and outcomes that reduce homelessness rather than expand reliance on emergency shelter.

Ask: Delay Vote & Direct Housing Department re: IHO. (Agenda Item No. 8.4)
I urge the Council to delay the proposed changes to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and require staff to provide data, modeling, and meaningful stakeholder engagement before proceeding. The proposal lacks analysis of how shifting inclusionary units to higher AMIs will affect affordability, feasibility, vacancy, or the City's ability to serve extremely low-, very low-, and low-income residents, and would likely result in units priced above market with little public benefit. These changes depart from the collaborative, evidence-based process used to create the current IHO and instead stem from limited direction in the Mayor's budget message, raising serious concerns about transparency and accountability.

Ask: Oppose Discretionary Changes to MRO. (Agenda Item No. 8.6)
I strongly urge you to oppose the proposed discretionary changes to San José's Mobilehome Rent Ordinance, which would undermine long-term affordability and increase displacement risk for some of the city's most vulnerable residents. Allowing a 10% rent increase upon vacancy or in-place sale—along with new capital improvement pass-throughs and an expanded appeal process—would destabilize mobilehome parks, one of the region's last pathways to entry-level homeownership, while shifting landowner costs onto residents and reducing home resale values. Mobilehome park ownership is widely recognized as one of the most profitable and recession-resistant forms of housing investment, with existing fair-return mechanisms already in place, yet the proposal offers no evidence that additional rent increases or pass-throughs are necessary. These changes contradict the City's housing stabilization goals, were rejected by the Housing and Community Development Commission in a 9–4 vote, and should not move forward.

We cannot continue to pretend that the direction the city is taking on housing is working, not when the data says otherwise. Unsheltered housing might be down, but without permanent, affordable solutions, our investment into temporary shelters becomes the last stop on the train because there is nowhere for these folks to progress to, all while the affordability crisis, unhoused crisis, and shelter crisis worsens. Please take a stand on "Housing Day" and demand we do better for our city.

Raiyan Seede



San Jose, California 95136

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.