



City of Sunnyvale

Notice and Agenda Housing and Human Services Commission

Wednesday, November 18, 2015

7:00 PM

West Conference Room, City Hall, 456 W.
Olive Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Special Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

This category provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the commission on items not listed on the agenda and is limited to 15 minutes (may be extended or continued after the public hearings/general business section of the agenda at the discretion of the Chair) with a maximum of up to three minutes per speaker. Please note the Brown Act (Open Meeting Law) does not allow commissioners to take action on an item not listed on the agenda. If you wish to address the commission, please complete a speaker card and give it to the Recording Secretary. Individuals are limited to one appearance during this section.

CONSENT CALENDAR

- 1A. [15-1015](#) Draft Minutes of the Housing and Human Services
Commission Meeting of October 28, 2015.

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

- 2 [15-1014](#) Review and Rank Study Issues
- 3 [15-1044](#) Nominate a Housing and Human Services Commissioner to
the El Camino Real Specific Plan Advisory Committee

STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES

NON-AGENDA ITEMS & COMMENTS

-Commissioner Comments

-Staff Comments

ADJOURNMENT

Notice to the Public:

Any agenda related writings or documents distributed to members of this meeting body regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the originating department or can be accessed through the Office of the City Clerk located at 603 All America Way, Sunnyvale, CA. during normal business hours and at the meeting location on the evening of the board or commission meeting, pursuant to Government Code §54957.5.

Agenda information is available by contacting Edith Alanis at (408) 730-7254. Agendas and associated reports are also available on the City's web site at <http://sunnyvale.ca.gov> or at the Sunnyvale Public Library, 665 W. Olive Ave., Sunnyvale, 72 hours before the meeting.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance in this meeting, please contact Edith Alanis at (408) 730-7254. Notification of 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (29 CFR 35.106 ADA Title II)



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

15-1015

Agenda Date: 11/18/2015

Draft Minutes of the Housing and Human Services Commission Meeting of October 28, 2015.



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes - Draft

Housing and Human Services Commission

Wednesday, October 28, 2015

7:00 PM

Council Chambers, City Hall, 456 W. Olive
Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Special Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Evans called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Chair Evans led the salute to the flag.

ROLL CALL

Present: 6 - Chair Patti Evans
Vice Chair Barbara Schmidt
Commissioner Dennis Chiu
Commissioner Diana Gilbert
Commissioner Younil Jeong
Commissioner Chrichelle McCloud

Council Liaison Meyering (absent)

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1.A [15-0933](#) Draft Minutes of the Housing and Human Services
Commission Meeting of September 23, 2015

Commissioner Gilbert moved and Commissioner Jeong seconded the motion to approve the Consent Calendar which was comprised of the Draft Minutes of the Housing and Human Services Commission meeting of September 23, 2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Evans
Vice Chair Schmidt
Commissioner Chiu
Commissioner Gilbert
Commissioner Jeong
Commissioner McCloud

No: 0

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

- 2** [15-0760](#) Make Required Findings and Recommendation Regarding
Conversion Impact Report for Nick's Trailer Court, Located at
1008 E. El Camino Real in Sunnyvale

Chair Evans noted that the meeting was being translated into two languages and asked speakers to be mindful of that and speak slowly when presenting.

Housing Officer Suzanne Isé gave a brief overview of the City's mobile home park conversion requirements. She explained that the City has policies that provide certain protections to residents of mobile home parks. Municipal Code Chapter 19.72 regulates mobile home park closures or conversions. It was updated in 2012 to improve the relocation assistance provisions for the residents, and to improve the overall process for all parties involved. The City also has policies in its General Plan to maintain at least 400 acres of mobile home park zoning or land use designations. The proposed closure of Nick's Trailer Park would not reduce the total current park acreage below that number.

She summarized the main requirements of Chapter 19.72, which include: giving notice to the residents of the intent to close or convert the mobile home park; the option for the residents to negotiate during the first 90 days to purchase the park from the owner (this option was not pursued by Nick's residents); preparing and distributing the draft Conversion Impact Report (CIR) to all the park residents, and providing relocation assistance to the residents.

Once the draft CIR is complete, the Housing and Human Services Commission holds a public hearing on the adequacy of the CIR and relocation plan. After the public hearing, the Commission makes a recommendation to Council regarding its findings on the CIR.

Council will also hold a public hearing and make findings to either approve the report as presented, or to approve it with modifications or conditions. After Council approves the CIR, the park owner must give the residents at least 6 months' notice

to move out, and provide the relocation assistance no less than 35 days before residents have to move.

Ms. Isé also summarized the types of relocation assistance required by Chapter 19.72, which include:

- 1) Advisory assistance provided by the City's relocation specialist;
- 2) Payment of moving costs (personal property);
- 3) Security deposit, first and last month's rent at the new unit;
- 4) For low-income, senior or disabled households: a two-year rent subsidy; and
- 5) Payment of the appraised value of the home, or the cost to move it to another park (for mobile home owners).

Representatives of the park owner, Ardie Zahedani and Jay Coles of Sunnyvale Park LLC, gave a brief presentation to the Commission to explain the relocation plan in more detail, and progress thus far in sharing the plan with the residents.

After some clarifying questions of staff and the applicant, Chair Evans opened the public hearing at 8:19 p.m.

The following speakers addressed the Commission with the assistance of an interpreter:

The Mother of Yu Zhou noted that the calculation of relocation assistance for her daughter's household appeared to be based on one person rather than the four people that currently live there. She asked if there is a solution for that.

Staff explained that the relocation payment consists of two items: the appraised value of the home, and a rent subsidy based on the number of bedrooms in the mobile home. The rent subsidy is not based on the number of people that live in the unit, but the size of the unit. [Note: Although not discussed at the meeting, staff would like to clarify that any residents who select the "Fully Verified" rent subsidy option may choose to rent a larger unit than their home in the park, and in that case, the rent subsidy would be based on the size of the new unit that they rent (see pp. 39-41 of CIR)].

Xiaoting Sun asked what the mobile home purchase price [appraised value] is based on. He stated that the payment being offered is only half of the market price to buy a similar home in another park. He also noted that the increasing rents represent a problem when calculating a subsidy two years out, how will the rent subsidy keep up with market increases?

The park representatives clarified that the mobile home appraisals are done by an appraiser selected from a list of qualified appraisers provided by the City. If a home owner is dissatisfied with the appraisal, he/she can get a second appraisal, and the park owner would pay the average of the two appraisals, consistent with Chapter 19.72.

Yiwei Zeng stated that he feels that the appraisal of his home is too low, since he is not able to buy another home with the payment that he is being offered based on the appraisal. He also noted that he is being forced to move out, he is not vacating voluntarily, so he doesn't have a choice but to sell his home to the park. In his opinion, the payment for his home should be sufficient for him to purchase another unit [in cash] or at least to require only some savings to be used and still be affordable. He also mentioned that if they chose to rent in the current market, the new rent would eventually not be affordable, making the rent subsidy only a short-term solution. He added that he is low-income and lives with his son who goes to school. This is truly a difficult situation and he hopes that the park owner takes that into consideration and helps them get over this hurdle.

The following speakers also addressed the Commission (without an interpreter):

Elio commented that he also was not satisfied with the appraisal of his home. He noted that he would not be able to buy another home with that amount, and that renting a place seems even more difficult considering the size of the families that live in these mobile homes. He added that often the number of people that live in these mobile homes exceeds the number of occupants allowed in apartments.

Salome Garcia, the on-site property manager at Nick's, spoke in favor of the options that he and other residents have been offered. He asked, on behalf of other residents, when would the relocation assistance funds be available to residents who choose the lump sum option?

The park owner representative explained that they can deliver a check within 3-5 days after the agreement outlining the terms of assistance is signed.

The Father of Yu Zhou noted, through the interpreter, that he doesn't think that the rent subsidy is being calculated correctly, since the mobile home park space rent includes some utilities (a \$50 gas charge), and the rent at another park or at an apartment complex may not include gas. Therefore, in his opinion, the utility portion [this gas charge] needs to be deducted from the base rent being used to calculate the rent subsidy.

After some clarification from staff, the park owner's representatives, and the relocation specialist regarding some of the questions and concerns raised by the speakers, Chair Evans closed the public hearing at 9:00 p.m.

The commissioners asked additional questions of staff, the park owner, and the relocation specialist and then had a lengthy discussion about certain details, before Chair Evans asked for a motion.

Commissioner Chiu moved and Commissioner Gilbert seconded the motion to recommend to Council Alternative 2: Conditionally approve the CIR with the following modifications, which, if incorporated into the CIR, would allow Council to make the required findings as stated in Alternative 1: Find that preparation, noticing, and distribution of the CIR has been done in compliance with SMC Chapter 19.72, that the CIR includes adequate information and options, and that it takes adequate measures to address the adverse social and economic impacts on displaced residents and mobile home owners of a mobile home park conversion; and approve the CIR. The modifications recommended included:

- 1) That the applicant clarify the details about any utilities included in the rent subsidy calculation, and to make appropriate adjustments to the calculation, if necessary, to ensure an "apples to apples" comparison;
- 2) That any release agreement to be signed by park residents who choose the "lump sum" option should not include any clauses involving releases unrelated to the city's relocation assistance requirements;
- 3) That the park owner shall notify the park residents of available legal and financial advisory services [e.g., Project Sentinel].

Commissioner Gilbert offered a friendly amendment to add to the motion.

Encourage the park owner to consider voluntarily doing the following:

- 4) offer any interested homeowners reimbursement for the cost of a second appraisal of their homes;
- 5) offer to update the appraisals closer to the date of residents' moves; and
- 6) increase the payments for the mobile homes to the mid-point between the appraised value of the home and the anticipated cost [to buy another mobile home].

Commissioner Chiu accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Chair Evans
Vice Chair Schmidt
Commissioner Chiu
Commissioner Gilbert
Commissioner Jeong

No: 1 - Commissioner McCloud

Commissioner McCloud stated that she voted against the motion because she considered it unreasonable to ask the park owner to provide a replacement cost for households based on number of people in the home, and also didn't think that updated appraisals were needed, since the market didn't seem that volatile for mobile homes, and an updated appraisal would not necessarily be in favor of the mobile home owner.

3 [15-0973](#) Recommend that Council Approve Mortgage Credit Certificate Program (MCC) Cooperative Agreement between the County of Santa Clara and the City of Sunnyvale

Housing Officer Isé gave a brief report, explaining that the County has implemented an MCC program locally since the early 1990's, and the program had recently run out of funding authority. The County is now applying for a new allocation of funding authority from the State, and this new application presented a good opportunity to update and renew the old agreement between the City and the County that allows the County to administer the program within the City. The MCC's have benefitted many Sunnyvale first-time home buyers, many of whom have used MCC's to buy a Below Market Rate home.

Chair Evans opened and closed the public hearing at 9:56 p.m.

Commissioner McCloud moved and Commissioner Chiu seconded the motion to Recommend that Council approve the MCC Cooperative Agreement with the County of Santa Clara as shown in Attachment 2 and authorize the City Manager or designee to sign the Agreement in final form as approved by the City Attorney. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Evans
Vice Chair Schmidt
Commissioner Chiu
Commissioner Gilbert
Commissioner Jeong
Commissioner McCloud

No: 0

STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES

Chair Evans asked if anyone wanted to recommend any new study issues.

Commissioner Gilbert moved, and Commissioner McCloud seconded the motion to consider recommending to Council a future study issue to revisit the mobile home park conversion ordinance, to assess whether it should: use a measurement other than appraised value of the homes, such as replacement cost; revise the definition of comparable housing to take into account the occupancy of the unit; and to require the appraisals and rent subsidy calculations to be updated prior to the park closure date, to maximize benefit and minimize negative impact on the residents.

After some discussion, the motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Evans
Vice Chair Schmidt
Commissioner Chiu
Commissioner Gilbert
Commissioner Jeong
Commissioner McCloud

No: 0

NON-AGENDA ITEMS & COMMENTS

-Commissioner Comments

None.

-Staff Comments

Staff reminded the commissioners that they were invited to attend the MidPen's Open House for the proposed affordable housing development at 460 Persian Drive. The outreach meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 29, 2015, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at Daesung Presbyterian Church, located at 425 Tasman Dr.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Evans adjourned the meeting at 10:37 p.m.



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

15-1014

Agenda Date: 11/18/2015

SUBJECT

Review and Rank Study Issues

Background

In the 1970's, the City of Sunnyvale developed a process for prioritizing local policy concerns that became known as the "study issues process". A study issue is a topic of concern that may result in a new or revised City policy. The study issues process provides both City Council and City staff with a valuable planning and management tool, by providing a method for identifying, prioritizing and analyzing policy issues in an efficient and effective way. It provides a structured approach for addressing the large number of policy issues that are raised each year.

Council reviews all study issues once a year at the Council Study Issues Workshop. The process allows Council to rank the issues, separating those issues that may have seemed important when they were first raised from the truly critical issues. It also allows the City Manager and department directors to set and schedule the examination of issues so the workload does not interfere with the day to day delivery of City services at levels set by Council.

After a study issue is sponsored by Council, a commission, or staff, staff prepares and submits study issue papers to the city manager for review and approval. The study issue paper describes the topic of concern proposed to be studied, identifies how the issue relates to the General Plan, the origin of the issue, expected public outreach, staff hours, any additional resources required for study, and a staff recommendation regarding whether or not to study the issue. Papers are then routed to the appropriate board and commission for ranking in October/November. Study issue papers not under the purview of a board or commission are routed directly to Council for the annual Study Issues Public Hearing and Council Study Issues Workshop.

Roles in the Process

The study issues process includes participation by Councilmembers, City staff, board and commission members, and the public. A brief explanation of each of their roles follows:

Council - Council's role is to set policy. Regarding the study issues process, policy-related responsibilities include generating (or sponsoring) study issue topics; taking public input; prioritizing or "ranking" issues at the Council Study Issues Workshop in January; and approving target completion dates for each study.

City staff - City staff manage the annual study issues administrative process; generate study issue topics; prepare the study issue papers; following Council ranking of issues, determine how many issues available operating resources will support (issues are begun, and studied, in priority order); and propose target completion dates for studies able to be completed.

Boards and commissions - In their advisory capacity to Council, boards and commissions generate

study issue papers for Council's consideration, and provide a recommended ranking of the issues relevant to their areas of authority. Boards and commissions also provide a forum for public input and, with majority support, can sponsor issues brought to them by members of the public.

Members of the Public - Members of the public may suggest study issue topics to staff, boards and commissions, or directly to Council. In order for a study issue topic to get to the Council Study Issues Workshop it must be "sponsored" by staff, Council or a board or commission. Members of the public also provide input to Council on the relative importance or priorities of individual studies at the annual Study Issues Public Hearing, which is held a week or two prior to Council's Study Issues Workshop.

Discussion

Attached for your review is the description of the Board/Commission process for ranking study issues. The approved study issues referred to the Housing and Human Services commissions for ranking are also attached. These study issues must be ranked by the commission at this meeting in order to meet the deadline for inclusion in the Council Study Issues Workshop materials.

Staff will provide assistance with tallying the votes as needed.

Recommended Actions:

Following any technical questions for staff, hold a public hearing, open the floor for discussion and/or questions by commissioners, and then begin the ranking process consistent with the instructions in Attachment 1. Once the ranking process has been completed, staff will forward the results to Council.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Board/Commission Process for Ranking Study Issues
2. CDD 16-01: Feasibility of A Plan to Seek Voter Approval for A New Bond Financing Measure to Generate Additional Funds for Affordable Housing Development in Sunnyvale
3. CDD 16-11: Consider Methods to Encourage Alternative, Non-traditional Housing in High-density Residential Areas

Board/Commission Process for Ranking Study Issues

The Study Issues process is designed to assist City Council with setting policy study priorities for the coming calendar year. Board and commission members have two roles in this process:

- To advise Council regarding the identification of policy issues to study (i.e., the generation of study issue ideas for Council's consideration); and
- To advise Council on those issues Council has decided to study.

All procedures must comply with Council Policies [7.2.19 Boards and Commissions](#), [7.3.26 Study Issues Process](#), and Administrative Policy [Chapter 1, Article 15 Boards and Commissions](#). All board and commission members shall adhere to those operational practices and procedures as contained in the *Board and Commission Handbook* prepared by the Office of the City Clerk.

To ensure consistency in approach and practice, all boards/commissions shall use the same ranking process as Council for all proposed Study Issues (described below and captured in Council Policy [7.3.26 Study Issues Process](#)).

Ranking Process

Step 1: Review issues

Staff provides a brief summary of each proposed Study Issue. Any Study Issue ranked by a Board/Commission, must be signed/approved by the City Manager prior to ranking. Boards and commissions shall review and take action on only those issues under their purview, as determined by the City Manager. Items not under the specific purview of a board or commission may be presented to them for "information only".

Step 2: Questions of Staff.

Staff will address questions Commissioners may have regarding each study issue.

Step 3: Public Hearing.

Chairperson opens Public Hearing for public input on any of the issues under consideration. (Note: the Commission may not take action on, or rank any new issue raised by the public for which there is not already a study issue paper developed. Those seeking to raise new issues at this point in the process should be informed that their options are to seek Council sponsorship of their issue or submit it to the Board/Commission for the following year's process.) Chairperson will close the Public Hearing.

Step 4: Determine which issues, if any, will be dropped.

Commissioners may make motions to drop issues from consideration. After the motion is seconded, discussion on each item may ensue. If the motion passes by a simple majority of those present, the Board/Commission will drop the issue. Such action suggests that there is no need to study the issue.

If the Board/Commission votes to drop an issue that was initiated by the Commission that same year, the issue will not be forwarded to City Council for the Council's consideration. If, however, the Commission votes to drop an issue that was not initiated by the Commission - meaning that it was initiated by staff, Council or another Commission - or that had been deferred or fell below the line in the previous year, the issue would be forwarded to Council with a notation that the Commission recommended it be dropped from consideration.

Step 5: Determine which issues, if any, will be deferred.

Commissioners may make motions to defer issues from consideration to a later year. After the motion is seconded, discussion on each item may ensue. If the motion passes by a simple majority of those present, the Commission will not rank the issue. Such action suggests only that the issue is not currently a priority and/or it is not the appropriate time to study the issue.

If the Commission votes to defer an issue that was initiated by the Commission that year, the issue will not be forwarded to City Council for the Council's consideration. . If the Commission votes to defer an issue

that was not initiated by the Commission - meaning that it was initiated by staff, Council or another Commission - or that had been deferred or fell below the line in the previous year, the issue would be forwarded to Council with a notation that the Commission recommended it be deferred from consideration.

Step 6: Commission discussion on issues to be ranked.

Commissioners have the opportunity to speak to the remaining issues to be ranked and to discuss merits and priorities before ranking the remaining issues. No motion is required.

Step 7: Commissioners rank issues individually.

Depending on the number of issues left to rank, the Board/Commission shall utilize one of the following ranking methods:

Simple Majority/Borda Count (for ranking ten or fewer issues) – Commissioners individually and simultaneously rank each of the remaining issues. Rankings are from 1 to the total number of issues, with “1” representing the issue with the highest priority for study. Each number can be used only once (no ties) and each issue must receive a ranking.

Choice Ranking (for ranking eleven or more issues) – the number of items to be ranked is divided by three and each Commissioner is given that many votes. Each Commissioner allocates his or her votes, one each, to different issues. Some issues will receive votes, others may not, depending on the total number of issues and the number targeted for selection. A tally is made for each issue selected. Two-way ties between issues are resolved by quick votes of the group. Multiple ties are resolved in the same manner as before: dividing by three (if four items are tied, for example, each member gets one vote to assign to one of those issues). The issues that receive the most votes are thereby prioritized. If necessary and desired, the process is repeated for the remaining issues (the ones that didn’t get votes the first time).

Regardless of ranking method, all individual Commissioner ranking votes and final Board/Commission rank recommendations will become a part of the official record and shall be made available to the public.

Step 8: Combined ranking determined.

A combined Commission ranking is determined when staff totals the individual ranking from all Commissioners for each issue.

Simple Majority/Borda Count: The issue with the lowest total becomes the Commission’s Priority 1 issue; the next lowest total is Priority 2, etc.

Choice Ranking: The issues that receive the most votes becomes the Commission’s Priority 1 issue; the next lowest total is Priority 2, etc.

Step 9: Tie Breaks

Two-way ties should be resolved by quick hand votes of the Board/Commission.

Three-way (or more) ties should be resolved using a tie break ranking sheet (image at right). The sheet lists all tied issues and the Board/Commission ranks in order, first to last choice. The issues receiving the most votes get the higher priority. This step is repeated if there are multiple ties.

TIE BREAK RANKING SHEET
Board/Commission Member: _____

FIRST TIE BREAK
Please print the study issue number of all that are tied, ranked in order of first to last choice.

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| First Choice: | |
| Second Choice: | |
| Third Choice: | |
| Fourth Choice: | |
| Fifth Choice: | |
| Sixth Choice: | |
| Seventh Choice: | |

Step 10: Acceptance of rankings.

A motion is then made to accept, reject or modify the overall Commission rankings for issues. After the motion is seconded, discussion may ensue. Simple majority is required for passage.

After the Commission Ranking:

B/C liaisons are responsible for inputting the commission's rankings in the B/C Ranking Spreadsheet provided by OCM. The completed sheet is due to OCM in early December.

Council will hold a Public Hearing on Study Issues in early January. The Chair or his/her appointee is encouraged to speak before Council and share the Board/Commission's recommended rankings.

Issues Sponsored AFTER Commission Ranking:

If a study issue is sponsored after the Commission has held its ranking meeting, the issue will identify the paper as "too late to rank" for the B/C. In this instance, Commissioners are able to attend the January Public Hearing, identify themselves as Commissioners, and testify on how they would have voted (as an individual) had this item gone before the Commission (I would have voted to [drop, defer, rank] this item).

Key Dates: Key dates for each year are available on Sunspot at <http://ocm/pams/default.aspx>

Note: There is no proxy ranking: Commissioners must be present to rank study issues.



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

15-0457
Agenda Date: 1/29/2016

2016 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER

CDD 16-01

TITLE

Feasibility of A Plan to Seek Voter Approval for A New Bond Financing Measure to Generate Additional Funds for Affordable Housing Development in Sunnyvale

BACKGROUND

Lead Department: Community Development

Support Department(s): Finance, City Attorney, City Clerk (OCM)

Sponsor(s):

Councilmembers: Davis, Whittum

History:

1 year ago: N/A

2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

What are the key elements of the study?

Study the feasibility of developing a local housing bond measure for the next available Sunnyvale general election ballot after the study is completed in 2017 (2018 or later). The study cannot be completed in time for the 2016 general election due to the timing of the study issues process. The measure would seek voter approval for the City to issue municipal bonds backed by a City-wide parcel tax and/or projected future housing impact fee revenues. For this type of ballot measure, California law requires approval by two-thirds of the local electorate in a general election. The bonds would be sized adequately to finance the development of at least 100-200 additional affordable rental units (i.e., in addition to the number of units that could be developed in the next several years without the bond, using current funds and projected Housing revenues). A possible further objective of the bond measure is to obtain voter endorsement of affordable housing projects at specific locations in the City by listing the sites to be acquired with the funds in the language of the bond measure. The study would analyze the following:

- A brief summary of the existence and/or success of other local bond measures for affordable housing in recent years (post-2008);
- Possible ways to structure the bond that could be successful from a financing perspective and maximize the City's resources for affordable housing. This would include examining potential revenue streams to pay back the bond, likely interest rates, sizing and terms of the bond, legal requirements, insurance, method of issuance, whether to issue taxable or tax-exempt bonds, etc.;

15-0457

Agenda Date: 1/29/2016

- Possible ways to structure the measure itself, such as defining the proposed uses of the bond proceeds, the amount of any proposed parcel tax, and related details;
- The likelihood of such a bond measure passing with the required majority vote, based on an exploratory level of public opinion polling of registered Sunnyvale voters on this issue; and
- An evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of this approach compared to other possible approaches for funding an equal number of additional affordable housing units.

What precipitated this study?

This study was proposed shortly after the hearings on the proposed new rental housing impact fee in early 2015, during which a number of stakeholders noted the need for more affordable housing in the City, and some stakeholders suggested use of a parcel tax as a mechanism for funding affordable housing.

Planned Completion Year: 2017**FISCAL IMPACT****Cost to Conduct Study**

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: \$50,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:

The additional funding would be used for the services of a public opinion researcher and any direct costs for the necessary polling, and for initial assistance anticipated to be required from bond counsel and debt consultants that specialize in advising local agencies on municipal bond issuance.

In addition to the additional funding needed for consultants, completing this study in a thorough, professional manner would impact staff workload in Community Development (primarily Housing Division), Finance Department, Office of the City Attorney, and the City Clerk.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Some cost to implement.

Explanation of Cost:

If the study resulted in Council deciding to issue a bond for affordable housing, there would be the costs to put the measure on the ballot, which the City Clerk recently estimated at approximately \$45,000, in addition to the \$50,000 noted above to complete the study itself.

If the measure were passed by two-thirds of the voters, there would also be significant costs to issuing the bonds, as well as long-term operating costs to administer the bond proceeds and monitor compliance with state and federal regulations, as well as any terms associated with the bond (such as ensuring tax-exempt uses of the proceeds). Some of these operating costs could potentially be covered by the bond proceeds as administrative expenses. Additional

15-0457

Agenda Date: 1/29/2016

analysis will be included if this Study Issue advances in the process.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No

Council Study Session: Yes

Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Housing and Human Services Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: There will be significant costs to complete the study and implement the proposed ballot measure, and a two-thirds voter approval rate is a very challenging level to obtain. There are other mechanisms available to fund the development of affordable housing, such as the new housing impact fees recently approved by Council. In addition, there are efforts in progress at the state and federal levels to establish a “permanent source” of funding for affordable housing. Currently such a bill, AB 1335, is pending in the State legislature; the City has taken an active support position of this measure.

One of the stated goals of the proposal is to seek voter approval of an affordable housing bond to establish a community-wide priority, which would help counter local opposition to proposed affordable housing projects that would be financed by the bond. However, passage of a ballot measure (if successful) is unlikely to deter or eliminate local opposition to the siting of an affordable housing project by residents living in the vicinity of the site.

Prepared By: Suzanne Isé, Housing Officer

Reviewed By: Hanson Hom, Director, Community Development Department

Reviewed By: Grace K. Leung, Director, Finance Department

Reviewed By: Robert A. Walker, Assistant City Manager

Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

See p. 5 of the LAO report at this link: <http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2014/finance/local-taxes/voter-approval-032014.pdf>



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

15-0936
Agenda Date: 1/29/2016

2016 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER

CDD 16-11

TITLE Consider Methods to Encourage Alternative, Non-traditional Housing in High-density Residential Areas

BACKGROUND

Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): None

Sponsor(s):

Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:

1 year ago: N/A

2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

What are the key elements of the study?

The study would explore how the City can encourage alternative, non-traditional types of housing (e.g. live-work or micro units) to further the goal of the Sunnyvale vision and General Plan to encourage diversity and affordability in housing types near shopping, retail and employment.

The study could include:

- Review of alternative and non-traditional housing types, such as live-work or micro-units
- Review Building and Fire Code requirements for these types of units
- Review parking standards for non-traditional housing types
- Discuss the feasibility with area developers and marketing experts
- Survey the standards from other cities
- Community outreach

What precipitated this study?

The Planning Commission has considered recent high density residential projects, and is interested in determining the feasibility and potential regulations necessary to consider the type of housing not now seen in the City.

Planned Completion Year: 2016

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

15-0936

Agenda Date: 1/29/2016

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: \$0

Funding Source: N/A

Explanation of Cost: N/A

Cost to Implement Study Results

No cost to implement.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No

Council Study Session: No

Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Housing and Human Services Commission; Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: The recently adopted Housing Element includes a variety of programs and services to support the development of and increase the supply of affordable housing in the City. The housing staff works with a number of affordable housing developers who are knowledgeable about the needs of the community. Staff finds that these organizations consider a range of housing types and will propose non-traditional housing types when they find that this is in the best interests of their clients. There is a chapter of the zoning code devoted to Single-room occupancy facilities that allow 150 s.f. minimum sized units. Although there are not specific policies to encourage alternative housing, there are no City policies that would prohibit alternative housing types. Due to the lack of significant constraints to consider different housing types in the City, staff does not see a strong need for this study at this time.

Prepared By: Andrew Miner, Principal Planner

Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer

Reviewed By: Hanson Hom, Director, Community Development

Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager

Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

15-1044

Agenda Date: 11/18/2015

SUBJECT

Nominate a Housing and Human Services Commissioner to the El Camino Real Specific Plan Advisory Committee