County of Santa Clara
Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation
Committee (HLUET)
Supervisor Mike Wasserman, Chairperson. Supervisor S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson.
By Virtual Teleconference Only

DATE: October 15, 2020, Regular Meeting
TIME: 10:00 AM
PLACE: **By Virtual Teleconference Only**

Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20, issued on March 17, 2020, this meeting will be held by teleconference only. No physical location will be available for this meeting; however, members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting as noted below, and online streaming will continue as normal via the County Agenda Portal, YouTube Channel, and Live Audio Stream.

To address the Committee in public comment, please review the Public Comment Instructions below, then access the teleconference at https://sccgov-org.zoom.us/j/98630060975 (recommended) or (669) 900-6833, meeting ID 98630060975# (participant ID not required).

Further instructions for accessing the teleconference will be posted online at: www.sccgov.org/bosmeeting.

AGENDA

-- The recommended actions appearing on the agenda are those recommended by staff. The Committee may take other actions relating to the issues as may be determined following consideration of the matter and discussion of the recommended actions.

-- Items that will require action by the Board of Supervisors may be forwarded to a future Board of Supervisors meeting for consideration.

-- Language interpretation services are available. Please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001 no less than three business days prior to the meeting to request an interpreter.

-- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Brown Act, those requiring accommodations in this meeting should notify the Clerk of the Board's Office 24 hours prior to the meeting at (408) 299-5001, or TDD (408) 993-8272.

-- To obtain a copy of any supporting document that is available, contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001.

-- Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to all or a majority of the Board of Supervisors (or any other commission, board, or committee) less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the Board, 70 West Hedding Street, 10th Floor, during normal business hours.

Public Comment Instructions

Members of the Public may provide public comments at this meeting as follows:

- Written public comments may be submitted by email to hluetagenda@cob.sccgov.org. Written comments will be distributed to the Committee as quickly as possible, however, please note that documents may take up to 24 hours to be posted to the agenda outline.
• Spoken public comments will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Committee, click on the link above for the appropriate meeting to access the Zoom-based meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully.

1. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting in-browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.

2. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. The Clerk requests that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.

3. When the Chairperson calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click on “raise hand.” The Clerk will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak. (Call in attendees press *9 to request to speak, and *6 to unmute when prompted.)

4. When called to speak, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted.

**Opening**

1. Call to Order.

2. Public Comment.

   This item is reserved for persons desiring to address the Committee on any matter not on this agenda. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on any item not listed on the agenda should request to speak at this time. The Chairperson will call individuals in turn.

   Speakers are limited to the following: three minutes if the Chairperson or designee determines that five or fewer persons wish to address the Committee; two minutes if the Chairperson or designee determines that between six and fourteen persons wish to address the Committee; and one minute if the Chairperson or designee determines that fifteen or more person wish to address the Committee.

   The law does not permit Committee action or extended discussion on any items not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Committee action is requested, the Committee may place the matter on a future agenda. Statements that require a response may be referred to staff for reply in writing.

3. Approve Consent Calendar and changes to the Committee's Agenda.

   Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be considered at the end of the regular agenda for discussion. The Committee may also add items on the regular agenda to the Consent Calendar.

   Notice to the public: there is no separate discussion of Consent Calendar items, and the recommended actions are voted on in one motion. If an item is approved on the consent vote, the specific action recommended by staff is adopted. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on Consent Calendar items should comment under this item. Each speaker is limited to two minutes total.

**Regular Agenda - Items for Discussion**

4. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive relating to the County Web Portal Transformation Initiative. (Referral from February 11, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 15) (ID# 103223)

5. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive and the Department of Planning and Development relating to the Stanford University Community Plan update. (ID# 103192)
6. Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development relating to the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Housing Element Update process. (ID# 103229)

**Consent Calendar**

7. Receive report relating to Fiscal Year 2020-2021 annual work plans for the following Commissions supported by the Office of the Clerk of the Board, and forward to the Board of Supervisors for approval: (ID# 103094)
   a. Airport Land Use Commission
   b. Animal Advisory Commission
   c. Fish and Game Commission
   d. Historical Heritage Commission
   e. Parks and Recreation Commission
   f. Planning Commission

8. Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to outreach and protests for the September 1, 2020 GreenTeam of San Jose customer rate increase for unincorporated County District West. (Referral from August 25, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 8a) (ID# 103057)

9. Receive report from the Parks and Recreation Department relating to natural resources management on the Coyote Canyon Property. (ID# 102985)

10. Consider recommendations from the Office of Supportive Housing relating to Supportive Housing System of Care reports. (ID# 103224)
    **Possible action:**
    a. Receive monthly report relating to Supportive Housing System Dashboard.
    b. Receive semi-annual report relating to Rapid Rehousing Programs.

11. Receive annual report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the Weed Abatement Program for inspection and abatement of privately and government-owned parcels that do not meet minimum fire safety standards. (ID# 103140)

12. Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the construction and funding of a new County Animal Services Center. (ID# 103236)

13. Approve Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee meeting schedule for Calendar Year 2021. (ID# 103270)

15. Adjourn to the next regular meeting on Thursday, November 19, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California, or by virtual teleconference.
DATE: October 15, 2020

TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)

FROM: Sylvia Gallegos, Deputy County Executive
       Imre Kabai, Acting Chief Information Officer

SUBJECT: Report on the County's Web Portal Transformation Initiative

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Office of the County Executive relating to the County Web Portal Transformation Initiative. (Referral from February 11, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 15)

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no impact to the General Fund resulting from the approval of the recommended action.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At the February 11, 2020 Board meeting (Item No. 15), the Board approved a referral from Board President Chavez directing the Administration to report back to the Board on March 10, 2020 with the status of the Administration’s work on a new County logo, website and social media channels branding and other related County branding efforts including adoption of a brand management structure. The Administration reported to the Board on September 22, 2020 (Item No. 33) with an update on the Administration’s work on the County Web Portal Transformation Initiative.

Executive Summary
While the purpose of this report is to present how the new County web portal will align with the County’s overall branding efforts, it is also important to make the Committee aware of the fact that there is a County Web Portal Transformation Initiative underway. It is a labor-intensive, multi-year project to migrate from the County’s existing public-facing website to a modern digital services website platform that will enable us to achieve our strategy of Digital First, Improved Access, and Enhanced Digital Identity. This initiative is prompted, in part,
by the fact that Microsoft will no longer support our current web platform (SharePoint 2010) with security patches in April 2021, and that this presents an opportunity to achieve the purposes identified above.

The transformation is being implemented in three phases:

- **Phase 1**: Moves all current public-facing County websites from an in-house, end-of-life platform to a secure cloud-based portal. Over 100 public-facing websites will go live on the new portal by April 1, 2021.

- **Phase 2**: Reorganizes and updates the design of the County Home Page and most websites to improve site navigation and accessibility. Hospital sites at www.scvmc.org were recently redesigned and do not require a design update. While most department websites will move to the new platform by April 2021, the redesign of the County website will go live during the first calendar quarter of 2022.

- **Phase 3**: Continues the evolution of the County website with the addition of new digital services and features for departments and County clients. Prioritization of the development of new digital services and the evolution of the County’s web identity will be guided by an executive-level Digital Services Steering Committee.

Technology Services and Solutions (TSS) has engaged Rolling Orange, an interactive design and website development consultant, and its design partner, Randle Design, to develop a County website digital identity, which would include a digital logomark and an affiliated brand identity system including the use of color palette, typography, imagery, and voice that would make up the “look and feel” of the public web portal.

The County Web Portal Transformation Initiative moves the County website to a secure, resilient cloud environment, improves the website design and creates a digital identity for the County, and creates a platform of innovation to support the development of new and enhanced digital services for departments and clients.

**Driving Factors for Initiative**

The phasing and timetable for this Initiative are driven by four factors:

1. **Support for SharePoint 2010 ends on April 13, 2021.**
The County’s public-facing website currently runs on SharePoint 2010. If a new security problem surfaces after April 13, 2021, Microsoft will not provide a patch to fix the problem. Websites running on SharePoint 2010 after the end of support are vulnerable to any new security problems. Phase 1 keeps the County’s websites safe by moving them to a secure, cloud-based portal.

2. The use of modern cloud-based web technologies will significantly improve the security, accessibility, and availability of County websites.

The Initiative moves the County’s website to Drupal, an open source technology specifically designed to support advanced web capabilities. The website will be hosted on a secure, cloud platform with 24-by-7 availability and automatic disaster recovery. This new environment will keep the County website online despite regional disruptions caused by events, such as, wide-area power outages, earthquakes, or floods.

3. The Drupal open source platform allows the County to create dynamic web experiences, tailored for various user populations, that can easily evolve to meet new needs.

During Phase 2, the County will implement a new website design to improve our user interface and update the website “look and feel.” It will use a new user-centric design that functions with equal ease on desktops, laptops, tablets and phones. It will provide dynamic content that is responsive to user requests. The platform also allows the County to provide accessible information that can be made available in multiple languages.

The Drupal platform separates the presentation of data (the website’s look and feel) from the data or content that is displayed. This allows the look and feel of the website to evolve easily, without modification of the underlying data. For example,

- Data about County events will be stored in a single place, in a standard format. Event information can then be presented in a wide range of formats (calendars, dedicated event pages, searches, lists, etc.) on many pages across the website. Revised event data will automatically appear wherever the data is used.

- Changes that affect the entire website, such as, a new logo or standard image, can be implemented once and be automatically updated throughout the website.
These features allow the website look and feel to evolve seamlessly, without conversions or large-scale migrations, and would allow for seamless integration of a County logo or any other branding components.

TSS engaged Rolling Orange, an interactive design and website development consultant, and its design partner, Randle Design, to assist in the development of the County’s website’s digital identity that would serve as the basis for all website design and strategic messaging featured prominently on the home page and propagated throughout the enterprise website. This work would include developing a digital logomark (separate from the seal) and an affiliated brand identity system including the use of color palette, typography, imagery, and voice that would make up the “look and feel” of the public web portal.

4. The Drupal open source platform allows new digital services and web site features to be developed quickly to meet changing County needs.

Drupal is the largest open source project in the world. It provides access to over 40,000 Drupal modules that can be used or modified to meet the County’s needs. If a desired capability is not available as a Drupal module, the County could create its own module to fill the need and contribute the module to the open source community. Drupal allows the County to add new technologies, features, and Digital Services to the County website in a responsive, timely fashion.

County Web Strategy

The Web Portal Transformation Initiative supports three County web strategy elements:

**Digital First:** When creating new or revising existing County Services, our goal is to provide a digital service option, wherever possible. Digital services provide around the clock access to County services, directly on the customer’s device.

**Increase Access:** The new platform includes support for a wide range of accessibility features, including multiple language support and the ability to test web content against specific accessibility guidelines. It is compliant with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 Level A.

**Enhance Our Digital Identity:** The new platform allows the County to progressively enhance its digital identity, at its own pace. During Phase 1, public-facing County websites move to the new platform with their current look and feel.
During Phase 2, any new County logo and other branding components could be incorporated into an updated look and feel and consistently implemented across the entire website.

Project Structure

The Initiative is currently organized into the following components:

### Web Platform and Hosting Vendor (Acquia)
- Contracted: Mar 2020
- World’s largest supplier of Drupal web hosting services.
- Responsible for web platform construction and Phase 1 migration of County web sites to the cloud-based portal.
- Supported by TSS Web Portal Transformation Core Team.
- Focused on platform testing and web site migration support.

### TSS Web Portal Transformation Core Team
- Active since Aug 2018
- Responsible for all Web Portal Transformation activities.
- Supports the Web Portal Design Vendor, Web Platform and Hosting Vendor, Design Workgroup and the Steering Committee.
- Focused on platform testing, Phase 1 web site migration and design of Phase 2 web site architecture.

### Web Portal Design Vendor (Rolling Orange)
- Contracted: Dec 2019
- 10 years’ experience in City and County website design
- Responsible for web site strategy and Phase 2 redesign.
- Supported by TSS Web Portal Transformation Core Team and Design Workgroup.
- Focused on design of Phase 2 web site architecture.

### Web Portal Design Workgroup
- Active since Jan 2020
- Supports all aspects of Phase 2 website redesign
- Seven members from Public Affairs, CEPA, Parks, CEO and VHP.
- Inactive until web site architecture design is complete. Next area of focus will be web site structure and navigation.

Since March 2020, the project has been supported by an Executive Steering Committee with eight members of the Office of the County Executive (CEO), Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA), Public Affairs, Social Services Agency (SSA), TSS, Assessor, and Santa Clara Valley (SCV) Health and Hospitals System. The committee provides guidance, oversight, and approvals for all aspects of the Web Portal Transformation Initiative.

**CHILD IMPACT**

The recommended action would have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

**SENIOR IMPACT**

The recommended action would have no/neutral impact on seniors.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

The recommended action would have no/neutral sustainability implications.
**BACKGROUND**

At the February 11, 2020 meeting of the Board of Supervisors (Item No. 15), the Board approved a referral from Board President Chavez directing the Administration to report back to the Board on March 10, 2020 relating to the status of the Administration’s work on a new County logo, website and social media channels branding and other related County branding efforts including adoption of a branding management structure. The Administration reported to the Board on September 22, 2020 (Item No. 33) with an update on the Administration’s work on the County Web Portal Transformation Initiative.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The Committee would not receive the report on the County Web Portal Transformation Initiative.

**LINKS:**

- References: 100328 : 100328
- References: 102267 : 102267
DATE: October 15, 2020

TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)

FROM: Jacqueline R. Onciano, Director, Dept. of Planning and Development
       Sylvia Gallegos, Deputy County Executive

SUBJECT: Stanford Community Plan Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Office of the County Executive and the Department of Planning and Development relating to the Stanford University Community Plan update.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no direct impact to the County General Fund as a result of receiving this report. On September 1, 2020, the Board of Supervisors approved an increase in funding to support the Stanford Community Plan (SCP) Update.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At the direction of the Board of Supervisors at its February 11, 2020 meeting (Item No. 19), and as the first phase of planned work to update the County General Plan, the Administration is proposing updates to the Stanford University Community Plan (SCP), adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2000, and most recently amended in 2015.

The Administration proposed updates to the SCP, which were originally considered by the Board in tandem with the proposed adoption of a new General Use Permit (GUP) for Stanford in Fall 2019. The GUP application was withdrawn by Stanford University on November 1, 2019 and the SCP updates were not adopted by the Board.

On February 11, 2020, the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved a Referral (linked Legislative File 100343, Referral by Supervisors Chavez and Simitian) to the Administration requesting to proceed with updates to the SCP and the 1985 Land Use Agreement (BOS Packet Pg. 11)
referred), with regular updates to HLUET. The Board directed staff to consider the following areas within the SCP update:

- Relocation of the “possible future school site” designation;
- Extension of the Academic Growth Boundary for 99 years, subject to the four-fifths vote required to modify; and
- Other changes suggested by staff, including policies based on graduate student housing affordability, municipal services, and childcare.

On June 18, 2020, the Administration reported to HLUET to summarize the scope of work for the SCP update, including the proposed community outreach and stakeholder strategy, and the expected timeline to complete the proposed updates (linked Legislative File 101649). The Administration will continue to provide updates to the HLUET Committee and the Planning Commission during the SCP update process. The Administration will provide an update to the Planning Commission in November 2020 and will return to HLUET to provide a project update in February 2021.

This report to the HLUET Committee, which is the first of several upcoming reports at key milestones, summarizes the progress on the update to the SCP to date, with information regarding the Special Studies (Graduate Student Housing Affordability Study, Municipal Services Study, and Childcare Study), and community outreach.

**Graduate Student Housing Affordability Study**

The Planning Department has executed an amended contract with Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. to conduct the Graduate Student Housing Affordability Study. The objectives of the Graduate Student Housing Affordability Study will be, to the extent possible:

- Provide background regarding how graduate students finance tuition and living expenses, including housing.
- Review information regarding the cost of housing for graduate students, focusing primarily on housing provided by Stanford, but also off-campus housing.
- Identify how the cost of housing aligns with resources graduate students have available to cover these costs, addressing to the extent possible, the range of household incomes and household sizes that graduate students have.
- Evaluate whether there is evidence of a gap between resources available to graduate students and the cost of housing consistent with concerns raised during consideration
of Stanford’s proposed General Use Permit; and, to document such evidence to the extent identified.

The Graduate Student Housing Affordability Study is expected to be completed in first quarter 2021.

**Municipal Services Study**

The Administration, through the project consultant M-Group, finalized the subconsultant selection process for the Municipal Services Study. The Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued on July 24, 2020 to seventeen consultants recommended by the County. Of the seventeen consultants, three submitted proposals. The Administration has selected Management Partners as the Municipal Services Study consultant.

The Municipal Services Study methodology includes the following:

- Provide information about municipal services provided in the cities surrounding the Stanford Community Plan area with a particular focus on the City of Palo Alto.
- Comprehensive evaluation of the provision of municipal services by Stanford and surrounding municipalities.
- Evaluation of the service delivery level provided by the municipalities surrounding the Stanford Community Plan area.
- Identification of appropriate and adequate service levels comparable with municipal services provided by the City of Palo Alto or other nearby municipalities if Palo Alto does not provide the service, for the population on the Stanford campus and community that has a need for services, which includes, at a minimum, Stanford residents, students, faculty, staff, and visitors.
- Compare the service needs of the studied Stanford community and campus to the service needs of a community within a nearby municipality, such as Palo Alto. Information about the municipal services Stanford currently provides and if the level and method of service delivery is adequate, in comparison with services provided within the surrounding jurisdictions.
- Evaluate any municipal services Stanford currently does not provide with recommendations on provisions of these services, based on the comparison with surrounding jurisdictions, and at what service delivery level.
- Recommendations on service delivery model or mechanism for each municipal service; including identification of which entities could provide that service, such as by contract to public or private entities, or directly by Stanford.
• Recommend actions, as necessary, to include in the proposed SCP update, to promote the efficient provision of the services.

Attachment 1 sets forth the minimum municipal services to be evaluated in this Study.

The Municipal Services Study is expected to be completed in first quarter 2021. This will include the development of draft recommendations on services and policy and preparation of a final report.

**Law Enforcement**

At the August 25, 2020 and September 1, 2020 Board of Supervisors meetings, the Board received public testimony from numerous Stanford University students who requested the County evaluate matters concerning campus policing at Stanford University. The Administration is returning to the Board at the October 20, 2020 meeting to respond to the Board referral on policing issues at Stanford University.

**Childcare Study**

The Administration is coordinating with an existing County consultant on a childcare study scope of work and budget in support of the SCP update and is targeting the October 20, 2020 Board meeting to request funding to pay for the study. The Childcare Study will include the following:

• Surveys, interviews, and focus groups to gather employee and student data.

• Research and assessment of the accessibility, affordability, and location of childcare services provided by Stanford University for faculty, staff, post-doctorates, and students.

• Research and comparison to other university-sponsored childcare services.

• Childcare needs assessment of Stanford University faculty, staff, post-doctorates, and students.

The consultant will provide preliminary findings, methodologies, and reports. The consultant will provide final conclusions to the County in a written report and will be required to present the final report at one or more public meetings of the Board of Supervisors, and at one community meeting. The Childcare Study is expected to be completed in 2021. When the consultant is under contract, a timeline for the Study will be prepared.

**Stakeholder Engagement and Outreach Strategies**

The Administration had previously recommended on June 18, 2020 to the HLUET Committee that the existing Community Resources Group (CRG) serve as the advisory body
to the County throughout the SCP update process. The CRG was formed through Board approval during the 2000 GUP to advise staff on Stanford-related matters. It includes representatives from various stakeholder groups including neighboring cities. The SCP update was discussed with the CRG at its June 4, 2020 and September 3, 2020 meetings, giving the CRG a general update on the project scope and timeline.

A website with information about the SCP Update, with sign-up options for notifications of updates, submittal of comments, and information about upcoming or past meetings is being utilized as part of the Administration’s outreach tools. The project website, stanfordcommunityplanupdate.org, was launched on August 21, 2020 and widely publicized at the CRG, through communications with stakeholder groups, and an email to the Stanford GUP interested parties list maintained by the County.

Municipalities surrounding the Stanford Community Plan area were also individually notified of the update effort in a letter and email sent on September 15, 2020.

Separately, tribal notifications as required under Senate Bill 18 for general plan updates and Assembly Bill 52 for tribal consultation were mailed on September 9, 2020.

The Administration will continue to conduct outreach with surrounding jurisdictions and stakeholder groups through scheduled stakeholder meetings, when possible. Stakeholders have been organized into the following groups:

- Stanford University,
- Students,
- Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders (San Juan District),
- Neighborhood Groups,
- Historical Interest Groups,
- Multi-Jurisdictional Group (surrounding cities and counties),
- School Districts and PTAs,
- Environmental Groups.

These groups will require a modified outreach approach due to the number and variety of interests represented:

- San Mateo County Public Agencies (other than city or county),
On September 22, 2020, the project team held a stakeholder meeting with the student groups. The team gave a general overview of the project including project scope, timeline, and how to submit comments. Most of the meeting was allotted to the student stakeholders to voice any questions or comments to the project team. Questions included those regarding project logistics, such as, most effective ways to submit comments and the relationships between the project studies, SCP chapters, and General Use Permit. Issues the students raised included the following:

- Public Safety reform and law enforcement,
- Student food insecurity,
- Postdoctoral researchers as a forgotten campus population,
- Health care (especially for dependents),
- Inclusion of temporary, contingent, and subcontracted workers on Stanford campus in SCP update studies and chapters, and
- Availability and accuracy of campus data.

On October 1, 2020, the project team presented at the Conservation Council group meeting, which often hosts presentations from local agencies on land use issues of interest to the group. The Conservation Council includes groups, such as, the Sierra Club, Audubon, California Native Plant Society, Greenbelt Alliance, and Green Foothills. The team gave a general overview of the project including project scope, timeline, and how to submit comments, and heard from the Council on the following:

- Policies regarding the Academic Growth Boundary,
- Draft SCP chapter language from the 2018 GUP process, and if this would be the starting point of drafting in the current SCP Update process,
- Protection of oak trees on campus, not just those in the open space,
- Bird-safe design,
- Protection of wetlands, and
- Reduction of commuting and construction of new buildings through limitation of students and employees on campus.
An updated list of project stakeholders is identified in Attachment 2. Additionally, the Administration will hold a community meeting accessible to the general public in January 2021. There will be additional community meetings later in the process, that will correspond to the preparation of a draft SCP. In accordance with the County’s Health Order, the Administration will use online tools including webinars and video conferencing to conduct community outreach and explore methods to provide computer stations to individuals needing internet access to allow participation in the outreach process. The Administration will provide an update to the Planning Commission on November 19, 2020 and will return to HLUET to provide a project update in February 2021.

On May 29, 2020, the Administration met with Stanford University representatives to discuss the proposed updates and receive feedback, and will continue to engage with Stanford University representatives, incorporating regular meetings, throughout the Update process. Stanford was also updated on the status of the SCP on August 21, 2020.

**Timeline**

The Administration estimates that the SCP update will take approximately 18 to 24 months to complete, with a target completion date of Fall 2022. The proposed tentative schedule incorporates the preparation of an environmental document. The Department will provide updates to the HLUET Committee and the Planning Commission during the process, including discussion of the Draft SCP Amendments, proposed to be completed towards the end of 2021, or early 2022.

**Next Steps**

The Administration will provide an update to the Planning Commission on November 19, 2020. The Administration will conduct the first phase of the community outreach in January 2021. The Special Studies will be completed in the first part of 2021. Drafting of the SCP chapters will begin in of the beginning of 2021. The Administration will return to HLUET with an update in February 2021 with outreach results.

**CHILD IMPACT**

The recommended action will have a positive impact on children and youth as the proposed updates would include a Childcare Study and would recommend policies based on that study.

**SENIOR IMPACT**

The recommended action could have a positive impact on seniors as the proposed updates would involve a Municipal Services Study, which may include senior services.
SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

The recommended action will have positive sustainability implications as the proposed updates would involve open space conservation, green infrastructure, low-impact development, automobile trip reductions, and alternative modes of transportation.

BACKGROUND

Stanford lands within unincorporated Santa Clara County, also considered the Stanford Community Plan area, are subject to policies in the SCP. The development within the Stanford Community Plan area is currently regulated under the 2000 General Use Permit. For more information on the Stanford University Community Plan and General Use Permit, visit https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/Programs/Stanford/Pages/Stanford.aspx.

In November 2016, Stanford University submitted a General Use Permit application requesting 3,500,000 net new square feet of academic development and student housing, 550 net new faculty/staff housing units, 40,000 square feet of trip-reducing facilities, and 50,000 square feet of temporary construction space. The County published a draft EIR and proceeded with recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors regarding the application. However, Stanford withdrew the GUP application on November 1, 2019.

As part of the application review, several public hearings were held. Issues discussed at these public hearings are related to the SCP. These issues were publicly discussed, and the County received comments from the public, the Board, and the University. Consequently, County staff made recommendations to the Board for the SCP. These recommendations can now be incorporated into this new effort. With the withdrawal of the GUP application, the County can conduct additional research to address the issues raised during the public hearings, including a Municipal Services Study, a Childcare Study, and a Graduate Student Housing Affordability Study. It is appropriate to move forward with a County-initiated update to the SCP and it is the first phase of planned work to update the overall County General Plan. The Department is in the process of pre-planning for other General Plan and Housing Element updates.

Other Planning Collaborations

The County is also participating in a housing collaborative with other cities in the region to address the housing crisis and has several efforts underway for promoting affordable housing development within the region.
CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION
If the HLUET Committee does not accept the report, the Department will revise the report as directed by HLUET.

STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL
The Department requests no follow-up steps with the Clerk of the Board.

LINKS:
- Linked To: 100343 : 100343
- Linked To: 101649 : 101649

ATTACHMENTS:
- Attachment 1 Municipal Services to be Analyzed in the Municipal Services Study (PDF)
- Attachment 2 SCP Stakeholder Mtg Groups (PDF)
This table outlines the minimum municipal services to be reviewed in the Municipal Services Study. The table shows the municipal services reviewed by LAFCO (LAFCO Review, Stanford, pg. 287), as well as the municipal services that were included in the Stanford General Use Permit (GUP) Conditions of Approval (COA) Draft document recommended by County staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Primary Service Provider</th>
<th>Non-University Service Provider(s) if applicable</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAFCO-Reviewed (LAFCO Review, Stanford, pg. 287)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Services that were covered in both the COA Draft and LAFCO Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control*</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Crane Pest Control (rodents and wild animals)</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara (all other animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Parking Enforcement*</td>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara, Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara, Sheriff’s Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 library facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>1 golf course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 swimming pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation*</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Building</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water*</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste*</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Peninsula Sanitary Services Inc.</td>
<td>CY 2012: 7,900 tons solid waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2013: 66% landfill diversion rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets*</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 street miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,000 trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 trash capture unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In conformance with NPEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities – Electricity</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power Systems Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities – Gas</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities – Telephone, High-speed Internet</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater*</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Resources and Civil Infrastructure Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA Draft – Services already provided by Stanford at some level (not LAFCO-Reviewed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (includes recycled water)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA Draft – determine if these are provided by Stanford (not LAFCO-Reviewed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Nutrition (and other senior services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant is a partnership agreement among several public agencies. The City of Palo Alto is the owner and operator of the Regional Water Quality Control Plant. The cities of Mountain View, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills along with Stanford University and East Palo Alto Sanitary District have agreements to use a portion of the plant’s capacity. Through this partnership agreement, all six agencies proportionally share in the costs of building and maintaining the facility.
Attachment 2
Project Stakeholders – Stanford Community Plan Update

Stanford University
- Stanford University

Students
- Stanford Graduate Student Council
- Stanford University Postdoctoral Association (SURPAS)
- Stanford Coalition for Planning an Equitable (SCOPE) 2035
- Stanford Solidarity Network
- Stanford Student-Parent Alliance
- Students for Workers’ Rights (SWR)

Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders (San Juan Neighborhood)
- Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders

Neighborhood Groups
- College Terrace Residents Association
- Southgate Neighborhood Committee

Historical Interests
- Stanford Historical Society
- Palo Alto Historical Association
- Palo Alto Stanford Heritage

Multi-Jurisdictional Group
- City of East Palo Alto
- City of Los Altos
- City of Menlo Park
- City of Mountain View
- City of Palo Alto
- City of Redwood City
- County of San Mateo
- County of Santa Clara
- Town of Atherton
- Town of Los Altos Hills
- Town of Portola Valley
- Town of Woodside
School Districts and PTAs
- Las Lomitas School District
- Menlo Park City School District
- Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD)
- Palo Alto Council of PTAs
- Ravenswood City School District
- Redwood City School District
- Sequoia Union High School District

Environmental Groups
- Green Foothills
- Greenbelt Alliance
- Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society
- Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
- Tuolumne River Trust

San Mateo County Public Agencies
- Caltrain
- Menlo Park Fire Protections District
- Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
- Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
- San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission

Santa Clara County Public Agencies
- San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
- Santa Clara Valley Water District

Other Private Organizations
- Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design
- Menlo Spark
- Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce
- Palo Alto Forward, Board of Directors
- Redwood City Forward, Steering Committee
- Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 2007
- Silicon Valley at Home
- Silicon Valley Leadership Group
DATE: October 15, 2020

TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)

FROM: Jacqueline R. Onciano, Director, Dept. of Planning and Development

SUBJECT: Update on RHNA and Housing Element

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development relating to the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Housing Element Update process.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

There is no impact to the County General Fund as a result of receiving this report. Preparation of the 2023-2031 Housing Element may require consultant assistance, which will be an additional cost. If consultant assistance is required, the Department will return to the Board with a request for funds.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

This report provides an update to the HLUET Committee regarding the current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (“RHNA”) process, the County’s (unincorporated) preliminary RHNA, and initial actions taken by the Department of Planning and Development to address the RHNA and prepare for the next Housing Element update.

Executive Summary

The recommended RHNA Methodology that is currently being considered for adoption by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) will result in a RHNA of 4,137 units assigned to the County unincorporated areas, representing a 1.393% increase in comparison with the previous 2015 RHNA. As the majority of land within the County’s unincorporated jurisdiction is rural, a RHNA of this size, unless modified, will likely require the County to take actions through its Housing Element Update to increase housing development in the rural areas, which conflicts with County General Plan policies that designate the County’s rural areas for resource conservation. Steps going forward to potentially modify the
County’s RHNA and future steps the Department is taking to prepare for the Housing Element update are described below.

RHNA & Housing Element Update Process

Under State law, all jurisdictions within the State must adopt a Housing Element as part of their General Plan that identifies how the jurisdiction will provide sufficient housing supply at a variety of income levels to meet housing demand. The Housing Element is required to be updated every eight years and must meet adoption schedules identified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (“HCD”). As a precursor to the preparation of the Housing Element update, HCD and each respective Metropolitan Council of Governments (“COG”) identify the RHNA for each jurisdiction. This RHNA identifies how much housing the jurisdiction must build to satisfy demand, within different income categories (from very low to above moderate). The COG for the San Francisco Bay area is the Association of Bay Area of Governments (“ABAG”) that encompasses nine counties and 101 cities. Under the RHNA process, HCD first provides ABAG with a Regional Housing Needs Determination (“RHND”) for the region as a whole, and then ABAG, in consultation with HCD, identifies the RHNA for each city and county. Once the final RHNA is determined, each jurisdiction must prepare and adopt an update to their Housing Element demonstrating what actions they will take (such as rezoning identified properties) to allow the development of housing and affordable housing to meet the RHNA.

County 2015-2023 Housing Element

The County’s current Housing Element (“2015 Housing Element”) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 10, 2014 and certified by HCD on July 25, 2014. The Housing Element spans the eight-year period from 2015 to 2023 and identifies housing strategies and actions for providing housing and affordable housing within the unincorporated areas. The Housing Element includes specific programs and actions to support the development of Farmworker housing and Accessory Dwelling Units. The County’s RHNA for the 2015 Housing Element was 277 units, reflecting the rural nature of the County and the County’s land use planning policies that prevent urban development in rural areas. The County’s RHNA for the 2010-2015 Housing Element Cycle was 1,090 units.

Current RHNA Preparation Process

Due to California’s ongoing housing crisis and projected population growth, HCD has increased the RHNA for each COG within California as part of this RHNA / Housing Element cycle. HCD’s identified RHND for ABAG for this cycle (2023-2031), published on June 9, 2020, is 441,176 housing units, which represents a 130% increase in comparison with the previous 2015 RHNA cycle.

ABAG is currently considering adoption of the methodology that will distribute the 441,176 units as RHNA to the 101 cities and 9 counties within ABAG. In order to support this
process, ABAG created a Housing Methodology Committee (“HMC”), which is comprised of representatives (elected officials, planning staff, and stakeholders) from the nine-county Bay Area region. On September 18, 2020, the HMC completed its recommendation regarding the methodology used to distribute RHNA across jurisdictions. The HMC recommended that the ABAG Executive Board adopt Option 8a – identified as a High Opportunity Areas Emphasis & Job Proximity Option. On October 1, 2020, ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee also forwarded a recommendation to the ABAG Executive Board to adopt Option 8a (Attachment 3). The ABAG Executive Board will meet on October 15th to consider the recommended RHNA distribution methodology. The ABAG Executive Board can then approve the release of the proposed RHNA methodology for a 30-day public comment period. The ABAG Executive Board will then consider approval of the RHNA methodology to send to HCD by December 2020. Subsequently, the preliminary RHNA for each ABAG jurisdiction will be distributed in Spring 2021 and adopted by ABAG at the end of 2021 (Attachment 1).

Plan Bay Area 2050 and RHNA
ABAG’s preparation of the RHNA coincides with the preparation of Plan Bay Area 2050 (“PBA 2050”) by ABAG and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which is the San Francisco Bay Area’s Sustainable Communities Strategy. A Sustainable Communities Strategy is required under SB 375—a State law requiring cities and counties to develop regional plans to achieve State adopted greenhouse gas reduction targets. PBA 2050 serves as an update to Plan Bay Area 2040, adopted by ABAG in 2017. By law, the RHNA distribution methodology must be consistent with PBA 2050. During the preparation of the RHNA methodology, the HMC considered to what extent population estimates, growth projections, and draft policies within PBA 2050 should be formally recognized within the RHNA methodology. The HMC recommended that the identified 2050 households within PBA 2050 be incorporated into the RHNA methodology (Attachment 4). Incorporating the projected number of households for 2050 results in a potential higher RHNA for jurisdictions where PBA 2050 has identified projected population growth.

The RHNA distribution methodology recommended by the HMC on September 18, 2020 includes Option 8a (High Opportunity Areas Emphasis & Job Proximity Option), incorporating the 2050 households from PBA 2050. Under this recommended RHNA distribution methodology, the County of Santa Clara unincorporated areas receive a RHNA of 4,137 units.

County Unincorporated RHNA
The identified RHNA of 4,137 units for the County unincorporated area represents a 1,393% increase in comparison with the County’s previous 2015 RHNA allocation of 277 units. The significance of this increase is highlighted when compared with the overall increase in RHNA for the ABAG region as whole and other cities in the county. In comparison with the previous 2015 RHNA cycle, ABAG total housing unit allocation (RHD) increased by 134%, and the cities within Santa Clara County have an identified RHNA increase by between 100 and 500% (ex. San Jose = 98% increase, Cupertino = 498% increase).
The identified Option 8a RHNA methodology also results in a significant increase in RHNA for most of the nine county unincorporated areas in ABAG. For example, the unincorporated areas of Marin and Solano received a 2000% and 900% increase in RHNA, respectively (Attachment 5).

**Implications of Increased RHNA**

The Department identifies that adoption of a RHNA of 4,137 units for the unincorporated areas likely creates a policy conflict with the regional growth policies within the County’s General Plan. The majority of the County unincorporated areas are rural, and the County’s 1994 General Plan has foundational land use policies that identify that all urban growth should occur within urban incorporated areas. The majority of the County’s rural zoning districts are identified as resource conservation areas in the General Plan and do not contain any municipal services to support urban development. In the past several years, the Board has adopted additional plans and programs, such as the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan and the Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan, that identify the County’s rural areas for habitat conservation and agricultural preservation.

For the urban unincorporated areas, the County’s policies encourage annexation into the Cities, and the County’s General Plan defers to each City’s respective general plan in establishing land use planning goals for these areas. An exception to these policies is Stanford University, which is designated to remain in the County urban unincorporated areas per a land use agreement between the County, Palo Alto, and Stanford University.

The Board of Supervisors has taken a strong leadership position in supporting housing production within Santa Clara County to meet the ongoing housing crisis and has taken actions such as the sponsorship of Measure A to fund housing development. However, these actions have supported housing production within urban incorporated areas, supported by municipal services, transit, and access to jobs. As the County has limited land use jurisdiction over urban areas, and the majority of unincorporated area is rural, adoption of a RHNA of 4,137 for the unincorporated areas could force the County to designate rural areas for urban housing production, conflicting with the resource conservation goals in the General Plan.

Under the current Housing Element cycle (2015 – 2023), the County has produced 2,902 housing units in the unincorporated area, far in excess of the RHNA allocation of 277. The vast majority of these units (2,597 units) are associated with the construction of the Escondido Village Graduate housing project at Stanford University. The Escondido Village Graduate housing project does not symbolize the typical pace of housing construction at Stanford or in the unincorporated areas, and is the only housing project of its size to occur at Stanford within the last 20 years.

During the County’s processing of Stanford’s proposed 2018 General Use Permit (GUP), which was withdrawn by Stanford University on November 1, 2019, the Administration identified the production of 2,100 housing units by Stanford. While the Administration’s housing proposal for Stanford University GUP was directly linked to the housing demand Stanford would generate as a result of its proposed development under the 2018 GUP, the work demonstrated a capacity to construct between 1,500 and 2,500 unit within County urban
unincorporated areas as a result of future development proposed by Stanford. The Department is also evaluating new strategies to develop more housing within the large unincorporated areas of San Jose that are unlikely to annex in the near term.

Consultation with ABAG Staff

Upon being notified of the significant increase in RHNA, Department of Planning and Development (“DPD”) Staff contacted ABAG staff to discuss and understand why the County was receiving the significant increase in RHNA. On September 18, 2020, DPD Staff, together with City of San José Planning and LAFCO staff, met with ABAG representatives to discuss the RHNA identified in the PBA 2050 documents.

In describing the factors associated with the Option 8a RHNA distribution methodology recommended by the HMC, ABAG staff also identified that the future growth projections under PBA 2050 that were incorporated into the RHNA distribution model (2050 households) included assumptions for future City growth into rural unincorporated areas. Specifically, where a City’s adopted General Plans identifies future city development into rural unincorporated areas, this resulted in a corresponding increase in 2050 households, ultimately affecting the unincorporated area RHNA. ABAG staff identified that the majority of RHNA associated with the County’s rural unincorporated areas is related to projected growth of the City of San José and Morgan Hill into the rural unincorporated areas, up to identified Urban Growth Boundaries.

ABAG staff proposed an option for addressing the County unincorporated RHNA by modifying the methodology of how RHNA is distributed with respect to urban unincorporated areas and rural areas within the Sphere of Influence of the cities (“Rural SOI areas”). ABAG staff suggested that RHNA located within urban unincorporated areas or the Rural SOI areas could alternatively be allocated to the cities instead of the county. ABAG staff provided preliminary data tables (Attachment 6) showing how the RHNA would be redistributed under this approach. A shifting of the urban unincorporated areas to the cities would result in RHNA of 2,090 units for the county and a shifting of the Rural SOI areas to the cities would result in a RHNA of 600 units for the county.

On September 24, 2020, County DPD staff met together with planning officials from the other Santa Clara County cities as part of a Planning Collaborative, to discuss the current RHNA and the two options identified by ABAG staff for modifying and redistributing the County unincorporated RHNA. There was general consensus among the planning officials to work together on a solution to the County unincorporated RHNA issue. Separately, DPD staff has begun consultation with other Bay Area county planning officials to discuss options for collectively addressing ABAG to consider a modification to the recommended RHNA Methodology (Option 8a as forwarded by the HMC and Regional Planning Committee), as this Methodology is increasing RHNA in most County unincorporated areas within ABAG. DPD staff has also begun to consult individually with the planning officials of Santa Clara County cities on redistribution options, including Morgan Hill, Gilroy, and Palo Alto.
Options going forward –

On October 15, 2020, the ABAG Executive Board will consider the recommended RHNA distribution methodology – Option 8a and decide to publish the methodology for a 30-day public comment period before final adoption by December 2020. In forwarding its recommendations concerning the RHNA distribution methodology to the Executive Board, the Regional Planning Committee acknowledged that alternative methodologies may also be considered by the Executive Board.

The County may advocate, either individually, or with other partner Counties, that the ABAG Executive Board consider adoption of another RHNA distribution methodology that reduces the RHNA for the County unincorporated areas. County DPD staff is currently evaluating the other potential RHNA distribution methodologies considered by HMP that may address this issue.

Alternatively, the County may jointly work with the cities within Santa Clara County on an agreement to re-distribute the RHNA from the County unincorporated areas into the cities, as recommended by ABAG staff. This approach would require a collective agreement between the County and the cities. ABAG staff is consulting with HCD regarding this approach, and the Department is working with ABAG staff on determining when in the RHNA distribution process this action could occur.

Housing Element Update

Once the final RHNA distribution has been assigned to the County, the County must update its Housing Element to identify how it will provide capacity to allow housing development within the unincorporated areas to meet the RHNA.

Recent State Legislation

In addition to potentially higher RHNA, recent State legislation has tightened the rules for jurisdictions in demonstrating how the RHNA will be accomplished within a Housing Element update. The following three bills, which have been signed into law, increase focus on fair housing and provide greater specificity on how inventory sites are identified for housing uses to satisfy the Housing Element update incorporating RHNA.

- **SB 166 (2017)**: This bill has been referred to as the “no net loss” provision for housing element site inventories. If, during the 6th Housing Element Planning Cycle, the County finds that there is a shortfall of sites to accommodate the remaining RHNA, then the County must take immediate action to correct the shortfall by amending the Housing Element Sites Inventory in the Housing Element update.

---

1 SB166, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB166
• **AB 1397 (2017)**
  This bill increases eligibility requirements for housing element inventory sites. Sites in the inventory must be both suitable and available. Sites smaller than half-acre or larger than 10 acres are not considered adequate for lower income housing with some exceptions. Developed sites must have realistic and demonstrated potential for redevelopment. Vacant sites cannot be used for more than two consecutive planning periods, and non-vacant sites for consecutive planning periods, unless the site is rezoned to allow at least 30 units per acre and by-right development if at least 20% of the units are affordable to lower income households.

• **AB 686 (2018)**
  This bill adds a fair housing requirement for housing elements that include a summary of fair housing issues with an assessment of the jurisdiction’s fair housing enforcement, fair housing outreach capacity, analysis of available federal, state, and local data identifying integration and segregation patterns and trends as well as other disparities to access to housing needs, including displacement risk.

The adoption of these new state laws will result in the detail and scope of the County’s 2023-2031 Housing Element Update being notably greater compared with past Housing Element updates.

**Fire Safety Element**

Per the passage of SB 1241 in 2012 the County is required to update its Safety Element to specifically address fire hazards associated with State Response Areas and very high fire hazard areas. DPD staff will prepare this update in parallel with the Housing Element update, to be adopted by the Board of Supervisors by the end of 2022, in line with the deadline to adopt the Housing Element update. It is anticipated that this Fire Safety update would focus on housing development that interfaces with identified high fire risk areas and identifying strategies to minimizing exposure of new and existing housing development to fire risk.

**SB2 and LEAP Grant Funding**

In preparation for the 2023-2031 Housing Element update and to further facilitate the construction of housing to meet the ongoing housing crisis, the County has applied for and obtained State grant funding to support planning efforts around housing production.

In 2019, the County applied for and obtained approximately $300,000 in SB2 Grant Funding to fund development of a Housing Prioritization Assessment Tool that will allow the County to determine the suitability of county-owned property for housing. The tool will also be used to identify suitable geographic areas for the development of farmworker housing and to identify properties in the urban unincorporated areas suitable for housing development. The results of this analysis will help inform decisions on future use of County property and to
develop planning tools, such as zoning overlays or other actions to facilitate housing production.

DPD staff has also started initial work on preparing an application for LEAP grant funding to support planning efforts for housing production. The LEAP Grant, similar to the SB2 Grant, provides non-competitive grant funding to jurisdictions to support Housing planning actions. The County of Santa Clara (Unincorporated) is allocated approximately $300,000 and the submittal deadline is January 31, 2021. DPD staff is currently working on the scope of the grant, to potentially fund software improvements to streamline housing production and updates to the County’s urban road and parking standards, to implement complete streets principals to better facilitate housing development within urban areas.

Planning Collaborative

The County also continues to participate in the Cities Association Planning Collaborative. This Collaboration between the 15 cities and the County entails a shared use of a housing consultant to advise and support each jurisdiction in preparing their Housing Elements updates. The Planning Collaborative is an outgrowth of the RHNA Sub-region effort that was initiated by the County and the Cities Association in 2018 to create a collaboration between the 16 jurisdictions to focus on housing issues and production, with a shared oversight of RHNA allocation within Santa Clara County. Although the RHNA Sub region was not able to go forward due to timing challenges, the Cities Association and County subsequently agreed to form a Planning Collaborative with a shared focus on housing issues and the preparation of Housing Elements. The County signed an MOU in 2019 joining the Planning Collaborative.

Housing Element Update Scope of Work

Due to previously low RHNA distribution, County staff had prepared past Housing Element updates using in-house staff resources and did not hire outside consultants. Because the RHNA for the County unincorporated area will be likely higher for this Housing Element cycle, combined with stricter rules concerning the identification of properties and actions by the County to facilitate housing production, the Department anticipates the need to hire outside consultants to support the Housing Element update effort. The additional need to update the Safety Element to address fire hazards will also likely require consultant support. The Department will separately return to the Board as part of its annual budget cycle or separately, if needed, with any request for funding to support identified consultant costs.

CHILD IMPACT

The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT

Board of Supervisors: Mike Wasserman, Cindy Chavez, Dave Cortese, Susan Ellenberg, S. Joseph Simitian
County Executive: Jeffrey V. Smith
Agenda Date: October 15, 2020
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.
BACKGROUND

County 2015-2023 Housing Element

The County’s current Housing Element (“2015 Housing Element”) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 10, 2014 and certified by HCD on July 25, 2014. The Housing Element spans the eight-year period from 2015 to 2023 and identifies housing strategies and actions for providing housing and affordable housing within the unincorporated areas. The Housing Element includes specific programs and actions to support the development of Farmworker housing and Accessory Dwelling Units.

The County’s RHNA allocation for the 2015 Housing Element is 272 units, reflecting the rural nature of the County. The County has produced 2,902 housing units in the unincorporated area, far in excess of the RHNA allocation of 277. The vast majority of these units (2,597 units) are associated with the construction of the Escondido Village Graduate housing project at Stanford University.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

If the HLUET Committee does not accept the report, the Department will revise the report as directed by HLUET.

STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL

The Department requests no follow-up steps with the Clerk of the Board.

LINKS:

- References: 100724 : 100724

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment 1 - RHNA adoption timeline (PDF)
- Attachment 2 - County 2019 Housing Element Report Staff Report- (PDF)
- Attachment 3 - ABAG Staff Presentation to Regional Planning Committee on RHNA Methodology (PDF)
- Attachment 4 - Summary Sheet RHNA - Proposed Methodology (PDF)
- Attachment 5 - ABAG RHNA _Maps (PDF)
- Attachment 6 - ABAG Identified options to modify County RHNA (PDF)
### ABAG 2023-2031 RHNA and Plan Bay Area 2050 Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Methodology Committee kick-off</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregions form¹</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD Regional Housing Need Determination²</td>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Draft Blueprint</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed RHNA methodology,³ draft subregion shares</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final subregion shares⁴</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft RHNA methodology to HCD for review⁵</td>
<td>Winter 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RHNA methodology,⁶ draft allocation⁷</td>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA appeals⁸</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plan Bay Area 2050</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RHNA allocation⁹</td>
<td>End of 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Element due date¹⁰</td>
<td>January 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dates are tentative and subject to change.*

To learn more, visit the [ABAG RHNA website](#) or [Plan Bay Area 2050 website](#).

### Glossary of Acronyms

- **ABAG** – Association of Bay Area Governments
- **HCD** – California Department of Housing and Community Development
- **RHNA** – Regional Housing Needs Allocation

---

¹ GC §65584.03(a).
² GC §65584.01(b)(1).
³ GC §65584.04. ABAG/Subregion must conduct at least one public hearing prior to releasing draft methodology.
⁴ GC §65584.03(c).
⁵ GC §65584.04(h).
⁶ GC §65584.04(i). HCD has up to 90 days to review final methodology.
⁷ GC §65584.05(a).
⁸ GC §65584.05.
⁹ GC §65584.05(g).
¹⁰ GC §65588(e)(3)(A). Housing Element Due Date is 18 months after adoption of the RTP/SCS.
DATE: May 12, 2020
TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Jacqueline R. Onciano, Director, Dept. of Planning and Development
SUBJECT: 2019 Annual Progress Report for the County's Housing Element, 2015-2022

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development relating to the 2019 Annual Progress Report from the County of Santa Clara Housing Element, 2015-2022.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
No recommendations or activities covered in this report impact Departmental fees or revenues.

CONTRACT HISTORY
Not applicable.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
Government Code Section 65400 requires that a local planning agency (i.e., the Department of Planning and Development; “Department”) provide by April 1 of each year an annual housing report to the Board of Supervisors, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), and the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Due to the COVID-19 emergency, HCD has allowed an extension of 60 days after the April 1 deadline (i.e., June 1) to submit the annual report. The Department will file the report with OPR and HCD by May 25, 2020. Any revisions the Board makes to the report at the May 12, 2020 meeting will be incorporated into the report.

The 2019 Annual Progress Report (“Report;” all attachments to this Legislative File inclusive) provides data to HCD on housing unit construction activity, Housing Element program status, and the County’s progress on the implementation of the General Plan in 2019. The information presented in this year’s Report was compiled with staff assistance from other departments and agencies responsible for the programs for which data and outcomes are available.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no impact on children and youth.
SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
Purpose of the Report
HCD requires each jurisdiction to prepare an annual report on the General Plan and Housing Element implementation status in order to increase awareness of the jurisdiction’s progress on implementation, and to facilitate program tracking and record keeping that would be useful in preparing the jurisdiction’s subsequent General Plan and Housing Element updates. It also prompts each jurisdiction to comprehensively evaluate housing programs on an ongoing basis, instead of once every eight years when the Housing Element is required to be updated.

History and Timing of the Report
Government Code Section 65400 requires each local jurisdiction to provide an annual report on the status of the jurisdiction’s Housing Element and implementation of the County’s General Plan by April 1 of each year to the Board, OPR and HCD. After receiving from HCD a 60-day extension due to the COVID-19 emergency, the Department will provide the Report to OPR and HCD by May 25, 2020. Any revisions made by the Board at the May 12, 2020 meeting will be incorporated into the Report.

Types of Data in Report
The Report contains data and program information on the County’s Housing Element Update 2015-2022 (“2015-2022 Housing Element”). Specifically, this 2019 Report covers development activity, housing activity, and program status for Calendar Year 2019. Assembly Bill (AB) 879 and Senate Bill (SB) 35 of the 2017 Housing Package amended Government Code Section 65400 to include additional data requirements for the Housing Element Annual Progress Reports (APRs). These changes are reflected in the new APR form, which includes three types of data: 1) the number of planning applications received with corresponding site details; 2) itemized list of all building permits issued for housing; and 3) the status of programs referenced in the 2015 Housing Element with quantifiable objectives, defined outcomes or deliverables.

Building permit data is compared against the County’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), which applies to the County’s unincorporated areas for the current 2015-2022 Housing Element cycle. The report template has a column for each year of the Housing Element cycle. The intent is that each year’s report will fill in the respective column for the cycle, supplementing the data input from the previous year and incorporating cumulative units permitted. This mechanism is intended to facilitate comparison between the RHNA target and actual housing production for the jurisdiction. This mechanism can also reveal trends in housing unit production over the course of a Housing Element cycle.
Data on program implementation reflects either current program status or cumulative results from the previous Housing Element cycle, consistent with the objectives stated in the 2015-2022 Housing Element.

For improved readability, the Department has attached each of the Report’s required Tables individually. The Department has additionally compiled and attached a General Plan Annual Progress Report, which includes projects and programs—initiated or continued in Calendar Year 2019—that implement the County General Plan Policies.

**Summary of Data and Information in Report**

The data on building permits issued for housing, found in Tables A and A2, show that the number of permits issued for housing of all types continues at the rates from the previous housing element cycle. In 2019, building permits were issued for 2,597 total new units, 50 of which were outside of the Stanford University campus. The County’s total RHNA is 277 units for the 2015-2022 Housing Element cycle. The 2019 housing production, combined with housing production in the preceding three reporting years of the 2015-2022 cycle, demonstrate that the County has either met or is on track for meeting RHNA targets as indicated by Table B.

**Detailed Data by Table**

Table A reports the number of housing units and developments for which a building site approval application was submitted (and deemed complete) during the reporting year. A ministerial building permit will still be needed for development of these units once a land-use approval is obtained. During the 2019 reporting period, the County received 13 building site approval applications that were deemed complete and approved for the Above Moderate-Income households.

Table A2 reports on progress toward commitments to meet a portion of the RHNA through net new housing units and developments that have received either: 1) an entitlement; 2) a building permit; or 3) a Certificate of Occupancy. Starting in 2019, reported data must now include an itemized list of each individual building permit issued, the date the permit was applied for, and the affordability of each unit. Table A2 also includes secondary dwelling units.

Table A2 also includes the affordability of units by income types. The affordability of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) is allocated as either Very Low (75%) or Above Moderate (25%), based on staff’s most recent survey of ADU rents. A total of 32 permits were issued for ADUs in unincorporated areas, of which 8 were considered Above-Moderate and 24 were considered Very-Low Income.

Table B shows the County’s progress in issuing permits for housing in unincorporated areas during the 2015-2022 Housing Element cycle and compares that progress to the County’s RHNA for that period. The projected need for the County’s unincorporated areas is 277 units as indicated by its RHNA for 2015-2022. Within the first four reporting year cycles for 2015 and 2019, 2,597 total permits were issued for housing in the unincorporated areas of the County, substantially exceeding the projected housing need.
The County experienced a decrease in permits issued, from 22 to 16, for housing considered affordable to Very Low-Income households from the previous Housing Element 2018 reporting cycle. Notably, in 2019 a significant increase in Moderate income units resulted from permits issued for development on the Stanford University campus, between Escondido Village graduate housing and multi-family dwelling housing units.

In addition to providing planning and permit services for housing construction, the County contributes to the countywide construction of affordable housing for Extremely Low-Income households through the County Office of Supportive Housing (OSH). The County has made funding available through the Stanford Affordable Housing Fund, which funds housing affordable to Extremely Low-Income households either within the Stanford campus or by paying an in-lieu fee to assist development near the campus. Furthermore, the County administers the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnership (HOME) programs, which fund housing affordable to households with low, very low, and extremely low incomes.

Additionally, in November 2016, Santa Clara County voters approved a $950 million Affordable Housing Bond (Measure A). The Housing Bond provides the means for OSH to provide the community’s poorest and most vulnerable residents a fresh start. It is projected that the Housing Bond will fund 120 new affordable housing developments over 10 years, including 4,800 new units dedicated to Extremely Low-Income and Very Low-Income households. Additionally, the County will establish rental and ownership opportunities for Moderate Income households by leveraging these funds.

Table C includes sites identified or re-zoned to accommodate shortfall housing needs. The County does not have a shortfall in RHNA housing units; therefore, no data is provided for this table.

Table D includes data on Program Implementation for the programs and activities included in the 2015 Housing Element that have a quantifiable objective, or a defined outcome or deliverable. There are 73 such programs in the Housing Element. These programs and activities are managed by numerous housing-related agencies and service providers within Santa Clara County. The services and outcomes of these programs often apply to the entire County and its cities, not just to County unincorporated areas. Table D indicates that most programs are ongoing, a few others have been discontinued, and several new major programs and activities were to be implemented or undertaken. Most programs are meeting their yearly goals and are progressing toward their longer-term goals. Some of the key program highlights from 2019 include:

**Agricultural Employee Housing & ADUs**

1. 4.09.03 Explore options for allowing agricultural employee housing to be occupied by agricultural workers that are not employees of the housing facility operator/owner. The Department has prepared zoning ordinance amendments implementing this action, which are scheduled to be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board in late spring/early Summer 2020.
2. **4.09.07 Reduce Permit Requirements for Long-Term Agricultural Worker Housing.** This work item is ongoing; in addition to reducing the permit requirements for long-term agricultural employee housing, the Department is also proposing to allow new forms of agricultural employee housing and to reduce permit requirements for temporary and seasonal agricultural employee housing. The Department will be proposing this action item in late spring/early summer 2020.

3. **4.09.04 and .05 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).** At the end of 2019, staff began work on codifying reduced restrictions for ADU requirements, including allowing them on all lots, streamlining their processing, and a reduction of development standards, in accordance with Government Code Sections 65852.2 and 65852.22. The Board adopted the new State ADU regulations on March 10, 2020.

4. **4.09.06 Owner Occupancy Requirements.** Concurrent with the above, staff worked on adopting the removal of owner occupancy deed restrictions for ADUs. This provision was also adopted by the Board on March 10, 2020.

**Miscellaneous**

5. **4.09.17 Rent Price Monitoring Program.** The County is required to present data on rent as part of this Report, and to include evaluations and actions as appropriate. A brief overview of rent in the Bay Area and across the county is included herein. This information includes rent prices from cities.

The average rent in 2019 in Santa Clara County (including incorporated areas) for all unit types was $3,646,¹ while the national average was reported to be approximately $1,474.² Average rents in Santa Clara County (including incorporated areas) for a one-bedroom unit were $2,583.³

California has the fifth highest rental market nationally with an average fair market rent for a two-bedroom home of $1,337 in 2019.⁴ Moreover, Santa Clara County has the fourth highest rental market in the state behind San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties.⁵

The average fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment in the entire County is $2,712,⁶ representing an 8% increase from the 2018 reporting period. The average rent in Santa Clara County (including incorporated areas) increased 21% between 2018 to

---

⁴ Rent Data. 2019 Rent Data By State. [https://www.rentdata.org/states/2019](https://www.rentdata.org/states/2019) Accessed April 8, 2020. Note: Average fair market rents for homes include more rural parts of the state where rental housing tends to be comparatively less expensive.
2019 for all units ranging from one-bedroom to four-bedroom—an eight-percentage point rise over last year’s increase.

Table E requires reporting of approved commercial density bonus projects within the reporting period. The County does not have any such projects to report.

Table F is reserved for the reporting of units that have been substantially rehabilitated, converted from non-affordable by acquisition, and preserved consistent with the standards set forth in Government Code Section 65583.1, Subdivision (c)(2). This section is used for informational purposes only and does not count towards the RHNA. The County does not have any applicable units or reporting to include during this reporting period.

Table G is reserved to report County-owned lands included in the Housing Element Sites Inventory that were sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of, pursuant to Government Code Section 65400.1. This table is only required for the year 2019 and later. As shown in Table G of the Annual Progress Report, no County-owned lands that were included in the Housing Element Sites Inventory were sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of in 2019.

Table Summary summarizes the number of building permits issued, housing applications approvals, and units constructed in 2019.

County of Santa Clara General Plan Annual Progress Report is a compilation of all the projects and programs that the County has initiated or continued, which help implement the County’s General Plan policies and programs. The report lists all such projects and programs for the period January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

Submitting the Annual Progress Report to the Board is required pursuant to Government Code Section 65400.

STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL

The Clerk of the Board shall notify Valerie Negrete, Bharat Singh, and Manira Sandhir in the Department of Planning and Development.

---

ATTACHMENTS:

- HCD Table Sheet A  (PDF)
- HCD Table Sheet A2 (PDF)
- HCD Table Sheet B  (PDF)
- HCD Table Sheet C  (PDF)
- HCD Table Sheet D  (PDF)
- HCD Table Sheet E  (PDF)
- HCD Table Sheet F  (PDF)
- HCD Table Sheet G  (PDF)
- HCD Table Summary (PDF)
- SCC 2019 General Plan Annual Progress Report  (PDF)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior APN</th>
<th>Current APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Project Name*</th>
<th>Local Jurisdiction Tracking ID</th>
<th>Unit Category [SFA,SFD,2 to 4,SF4,ADU,MH]</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Date Application Submitted</th>
<th>Very Low-Income Non-Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Total PROPOSED Units by Project</th>
<th>Total APPROVED Units by Project</th>
<th>Total DISAPPROVED Units by Project</th>
<th>Streamlining Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61461011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bella Madiera</td>
<td>Nihadco</td>
<td>PLN17-106704</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>6/16/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51373011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanskot</td>
<td>Kupin</td>
<td>PLN18-13220</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>7/10/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32120000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>PLN18-11100</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>7/31/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77631000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richwood Ranch Rd</td>
<td>Elmshk</td>
<td>PLN18-13172</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>8/15/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77620202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richwood Ranch Rd</td>
<td>Ulwein</td>
<td>PLN18-13173</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>10/16/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78620004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bushell</td>
<td>Harvett</td>
<td>PLN18-13474</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70135004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coatico Avenue</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>PLN18-12013</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62520202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lava Way</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>PLN18-11973</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>3/1/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77725002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore Ave</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>PLN18-11873</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>2/24/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82507019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seymour Ave</td>
<td>Estaban</td>
<td>PLN19-00615</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>3/15/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33120506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winding Way</td>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>PLN19-11493</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33104099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country Club</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>PLN19-0094</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>3/25/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- "Very Low-Income Non-Deed Restricted" refers to units that are restricted to very low-income households and do not qualify for non-deed restrictions.
- "Total PROPOSED Units by Project" represents the total number of proposed units for each project.
- "Total APPROVED Units by Project" indicates the total number of approved units.
- "Total DISAPPROVED Units by Project" shows the total number of disapproved units.
- Streamlining Notes: P64, P66, P68 indicate the approval status of each project as per specific criteria.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Project Name*</th>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Tracking ID</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
<th>Entitlement Type</th>
<th>Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Moderate Deed Restricted</th>
<th>Building Permits</th>
<th>Fatal Units Issued</th>
<th>Fatal Units Issued</th>
<th>Fatal Units Issued</th>
<th>Fatal Units Issued</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-46840</td>
<td>UVAS RD, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-46840</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-63929</td>
<td>PARKER DR, Los Gatos, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-63929</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-46961</td>
<td>HICKORY CT, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-46961</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-47570</td>
<td>LINDY CT, San Jose, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-47570</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-47583</td>
<td>WINTERBURN RD, Sunny, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-47583</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310816</td>
<td>PHALOCH ST, CUPERTINO, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310816</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310815</td>
<td>MILL AVE, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310815</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310814</td>
<td>HICKORY ST, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310814</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310813</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD RANCH RD, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310813</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310812</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD RANCH RD, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310812</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310811</td>
<td>STONEBRIDGE AVE, San Jose, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310811</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310810</td>
<td>LAMB RD, San Jose, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310810</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310809</td>
<td>BURLINGTON ST, MORGAN HILL, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310809</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310808</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD RANCH RD, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310808</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310807</td>
<td>BURLINGTON ST, MORGAN HILL, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310807</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310806</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD RANCH RD, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310806</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310805</td>
<td>BURLINGTON ST, MORGAN HILL, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310805</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310804</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD RANCH RD, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310804</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310803</td>
<td>BURLINGTON ST, MORGAN HILL, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310803</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310802</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD RANCH RD, Morgan Hill, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310802</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310801</td>
<td>BURLINGTON ST, MORGAN HILL, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3310801</td>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B

**Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>RHNA Allocation by Income Level</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Total Units to Date (all years)</th>
<th>Total Remaining RHNA by Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RHNA</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2902</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: units serving extremely low-income households are included in the very low-income permitted units totals

Cells in grey contain auto-calculation formulas.

This table is auto-populated once you enter your jurisdiction name and current year data. Past year information comes from previous APRs.

Please contact HCD if your data is different than the material supplied here.
# ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT
## Housing Element Implementation
### Santa Clara County - Unincorporated

#### Reporting Year
2019 (Jan. 1 - Dec. 31)

#### Housing Element Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Rezone</th>
<th>Type of Shortfall</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Acres)</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Minimum Density Allowed</th>
<th>Maximum Density Allowed</th>
<th>Realistic Capacity</th>
<th>Vacant/Nonvacant</th>
<th>Description of Existing Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very Low-Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate-Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Above Moderate-Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "*" indicates an optional field

Cells in grey contain auto-calculation formulas

CCR Title 25 §6202

Summary Row: Start Data Entry Below

---

**Table C**

Sites Identified or Rezoned to Accommodate Shortfall Housing Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identifier</th>
<th>Sites Identified or Rezoned</th>
<th>RHNA Shortfall by Household Income Category</th>
<th>Type of Shortfall</th>
<th>Sites Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sites Identified or Rezoned to Accommodate Shortfall Housing Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Sites Identified or Rezoned to Accommodate Shortfall Housing Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Attachment: Attachment 2 - County 2019 Housing Element Report Staff Report - (103229 : Update on Packet Pg. 45)
### Housing Programs Progress Report

Describe progress of all programs including local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing as identified in the housing element.

#### Table D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Timeframe in H.E</th>
<th>Status of Program Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.03.01: Urban County Housing Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>6 Projects per Year</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Two (2) single family grant projects were completed in 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03.02: Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program</td>
<td>Rehabilitate 500 low income housing and extend 55 years of affordability</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>To date, a total of 190 units in 2 affordable housing development projects (Stevenson House and Don de Dios Apartments) have received 4% LIHTC for rehabilitation. In 2017, the Board approved funding for the acquisition and rehabilitation of 3 existing affordable housing developments consisting of a total of 203. The affordability periods for each was extended by 55 years. In 2018, the Board approved funding for the construction of new units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03.03: Fair Housing Retrofit Fund</td>
<td>Expend anticipated balance of $80,000</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>These program funds have been fully expended. No additional funding is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03.04 Rebuilding Together Silicon Valley</td>
<td>Complete repairs on 22 homes per reporting period.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Repairs were completed on 54 homes during the current reporting period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03.05 Housing Conditions Survey</td>
<td>Complete one survey between 2015-2022</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>The housing conditions survey will completed in a different reporting period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03.06 CDBG Public Infrastructure Improvements/Public Benefits</td>
<td>Complete two CIP projects per year for each of the participating jurisdictions.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Los Gatos is one of the five participating Urban County cities. In 2019, one CIP project was completed in Los Gatos (the Bachman Park Project for $200,321.74).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.01: Mortgage Credit Certificate Program</td>
<td>Issue approximately 60 MCCs annually</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>In April 2019, the County was informed it was awarded $12,951,000 in Mortgage Certificate Credit Program (MCC) credits that will be distributed over the next two reporting periods. During the current reporting period 8 Mortgage Certificate Credit Program (MCC)s were issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.02: County Housing Bond Fund</td>
<td>Funds were identified to be at an all time low so unlikely that additional grant funds will be provided.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>The County does not intend to provide additional funding into the Housing Bond Fund. In November 2016 the Santa Clara County approved the 2016 Measure A Affordable Housing Bond resulting in $950M in General Obligation Bonds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.03: Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program</td>
<td>Maintain full lease-up</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>As of 12/31/2019, the baseline allocation of vouchers is 16,775, including project based vouchers, maintaining approximately 90% lease-up. Note the baseline number includes both Moving to Work (MTW) and non-Moving to Work (MTW) vouchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.04: Moderate Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>79 units anticipated to expire without renewal in 2015-2022</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>As of 12/31/2019, currently administering 12 contracts with 74 units authorized under the Annual Contributions Contract (ACC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.05: Project Based (Section 8) Voucher Program</td>
<td>Project based 565 vouchers from 2014 through 2017</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>As of 12/31/2019, project based vouchers for 2,058 units have been issued. Of these, 2001 regular Project-Based Vouchers (PBV) and 57 The HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Project-Based Vouchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.06: Conventional Public Housing</td>
<td>Transition 20 public housing units to non-public housing</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>The Santa Clara County Housing Authority (SCCHA), formerly known as the Housing Authority of Santa Clara County, has 4 units of conventional public housing. There is no plan to transition the 4 units to non-public housing at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.07: Section 8 Homeownership Program</td>
<td>Perform mortgage assistance to enrolled families</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>5 current participants. SCCHA no longer accepts applications or issues vouchers for homeownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.08: Family Self-Sufficiency Program</td>
<td>Develop and build Focus Forward</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>331 program participants are currently enrolled in the traditional Family Self-Sufficiency Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.09: Moving To Work Program (MTW)</td>
<td>Serve max. # of families based on funding</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Also known as Project Based (section 8) Voucher Program. See 4.04.08 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.10: Office of Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Continue with its mission</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>In 2015 the Housing and Community Development (HCD) Division of the newly formed Office of Supportive Housing has assumed the program objectives outlined in the H.E. timeframe. The HCD Division continues to administer the CDBG and HOME programs and is working collectively with the Permanent Supportive Housing team on developing new housing for special needs groups. In 2017, the HCD Division has taken the lead in the implementation of the 2016 Measure A Affordable Housing Bond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.11: SCC 40T Down payment Assistance Program</td>
<td>6 loans / year expected</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>This program is no longer active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.12: Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund</td>
<td>Final Payment and transfer of balance to Affordable Housing Fund within three years of the 2015 update.</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
<td>OSH is working on transferring the balance in this fund to the Affordable Housing Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.15: SCC Mental Health Department Evans Lane Wellness and Recovery Center</td>
<td>Program provides residential and outpatient services to qualifying adults</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04.17: Emergency Assistance Network</td>
<td>Assist individuals and families with eviction, utility disconnection and hunger.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.01: Community Development Block Grant Program</td>
<td>Objectives per 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide housing subsidies and related services to HIV/AIDS afflicted households.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing. The program operates on a fiscal year basis. Approximately $2,566,174.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was expended during Fiscal Year 2018/19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.02: Affordable Housing Fund</td>
<td>Continue lobbying for future funding for Affordable Housing Fund</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>During the reporting period the Board of Supervisors (BoS) has allocated new funding towards the production of permanent supportive housing. In addition, the Santa Clara County voters approved the 2016 Measure A - $950 M Affordable Housing Bond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.03: Stanford Affordable Housing Fund</td>
<td>Release of NOFA expected in 2014, issue subsequent NOFAs as funds accumulate, approximately every three years</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>In 2017 the Board Authorized the allocation of $14.5M in Stanford Funds towards the acquisition and improvement of Buena Vista Mobile Home Park. Request for funds will come through the County's over the counter Supportive Housing Development Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.04: Home Investment Partnership Act (HOME)</td>
<td>Objectives per 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>During the reporting period 4 projects that have been funded with HOME funds were completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.05: Housing Trust Silicon Valley</td>
<td>Meet Program Objectives 2013-2017</td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>In 2019, 14 first-time homebuyers received down payment assistance loans to purchase or preserve their home. 2,518 prospective homebuyers attended homebuyer workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.06: Santa Clara County Housing Authority (SCCHA)</td>
<td>Develop additional units of affordable housing. One additional project was planned at Housing Element adoption.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Laurel Grove Apartments, with a total of 82 units (with 81 affordable units, 20 of which will be Permanent Supportive Housing units), was completed in 2019. This project is located in San Jose. Park Avenue Senior Apartments, in San Jose, is under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.07: County Surplus Land Program</td>
<td>Complete 660 South Fair Oaks Avenue project; Sale of 2500 Senter Rd</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>The County decided to retain the property at 2500 Senter Rd and lease it back to Charities Housing for the development of up to 160 units of permanent supportive housing. Charities Housing started construction in December 2017, and construction is expected to be completed by February 15, 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.08: Mental Health Services Act Housing Program</td>
<td>Funds were anticipated to be exhausted Feb 2015.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>As a whole the program has helped create 116 Mental Health Services Act units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.09: Permanent Supportive Housing Fund</td>
<td>Use Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) funds for programs.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>On-going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.10: Department of Alcohol and Drug Services</td>
<td>Provide beds for eligible clients</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>At the State level, the decision was made to end funding for the Parole Services Network, known in the Bay Area as BASN effective June 30, 2014. The County now maintain the 13.5 residential beds, the 16.5 transitional housing unit (THU) beds, and the 114 outpatient slots that would otherwise have been lost when the BASN funding terminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Program Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05.11</td>
<td>Mental Health Department</td>
<td>Provide State MHSA funds for housing.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06.01</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Fair Housing Consortium</td>
<td>Continue to provide resources</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06.02</td>
<td>San Andreas Regional Center</td>
<td>Continue to provide resources.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06.03</td>
<td>Mental Health Advocacy Project (MHAP)</td>
<td>The Law Foundation and Project Sentinel, provides legal and advocacy services to over 4000 clients per year. Also respond to 12 requests for short-term housing assistance, provide consultations to 8 clients, and conduct 5 educational workshops, on an annual basis.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06.04</td>
<td>Fair Housing Audit and Education Program</td>
<td>Through Fair Housing Consortium, continue to audit housing providers and hold trainings for housing providers found non-compliant during audits.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06.05</td>
<td>Fair Housing Law Project (FHLP)</td>
<td>Serve approximately 100 individuals.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06.06</td>
<td>Dispute Resolution Program</td>
<td>Implement a sliding fee for service, implement a web-based case management system, expand outreach to high risk and vulnerable populations and maintain the program.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06.07</td>
<td>Project Sentinel</td>
<td>Continue to provide resources for Fair Housing Services.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.07.01</td>
<td>Housing Action Coalition (HAC)</td>
<td>Continue to facilitate and advocate for affordable housing</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.07.05</td>
<td>Seniors' Agenda</td>
<td>County Planning Office to participate in Seniors Agenda process, and continue to improve availability of Affordable Housing for seniors.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.01: Santa Clara County Homeless Census and Surveys</td>
<td>Conduct 2015 and subsequent biennial homeless census/surveys. Link to HMIS.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>In January of 2019, the County of Santa Clara, the City of San Jose, other cities in Santa Clara County, and the Continuum of Care worked in conjunction with a consultant to conduct the Santa Clara County Homeless Census and Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.03: Keys to Housing: A 10 year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Reach targets as outlined in the objectives of this program.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing. In addition, in 2019 the County’s Continuum of Care embarked on a community process to update the Community Plan to End Homelessness, which is a five-year, community-wide roadmap that guides the County, cities, nonprofits, and other community members as they make decisions about funding, programs, priorities and needs related to ending homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.04: Shelter Plus Care (S+C)</td>
<td>Provide subsidies for 174 homeless individuals annually</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>In calendar year 2019, 179 households were served in programs receiving Continuum of Care (formerly Shelter Plus Care) funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.05: Santa Clara County Collaborative on Affordable Housing and Homeless Issues</td>
<td>Apply for McKinney-Vento funds annually</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>See 4.08.06 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.06: McKinney-Vento Act Homeless Program</td>
<td>Apply for McKinney-Vento funding annually.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>The Santa Clara County Continuum of Care (CoC) was awarded $26,061,937 for renewal and new projects through HUD’s 2018 CoC Program competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.07: Community Technology Alliance</td>
<td>Provide technology support for housing programs</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.09: Arturo Ochoa Migrant Center</td>
<td>Preservation of 100 units of seasonal housing</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing operation of 100 units of seasonal migrant worker housing. Management by EAH since 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.10: Office of Affordable Housing and Homeless Support Services</td>
<td>Continue to co-produce the bi-annual homeless census and survey. Achieve development of Parkside Studios and Onizuka Crossing (formerly Armory Family Housing project).</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>In 2015 the Housing and Homeless Support Services were integrated into the Office of Supportive Housing. The Continuum of Care Quality Division has assumed the bi-annual homeless census and survey. The HCD Division has assumed the development role in the Parkside Studios and Onizuka Crossings project. Both of these developments were completed in 2015/2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.12: UPLIFT Program</td>
<td>Provides quarterly transit pass program for the homeless.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>9,834 passes were issued in 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.13: Finally Home?</td>
<td>Continue program.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Housing Trust continued program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.14: County Homeless Facilities-Emergency Shelters, Traditional Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing.</td>
<td>Continue to work towards ending homelessness by increasing permanent supportive housing opportunities in the County.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Implementation of the 2016 Measure A Affordable Housing Bond began in 2017. In 2017, the Board approved program guidelines for the Supportive Housing Development Funds and approved $44,830,000 towards the construction of 352 new affordable apartments including 233 supportive housing units. In 2019, the Board approved $160,200,000 towards the construction of 1,085 new affordable apartments including 512 supportive housing units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Target Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08.16</td>
<td>Identify and house 1000 chronically homeless by 2015.</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>The Housing 1000 Campaign officially ended on 12/31/14 and housed 839 households. Of those clients participating in the Care Coordination Project, 83% remain stably housed after 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.03</td>
<td>Agricultural Employee Housing for non-employees of facility operator/property owners</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>This program is anticipated to be completed by Q3 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.04</td>
<td>Detached Secondary Units</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>The program was completed in Q2, 2016 with final Board approval May 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.05</td>
<td>Increase Maximum allowable size of Secondary Units on Small Lots 1-2.5 acres rural zones</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>this program is anticipated to be completed by Q3 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.06</td>
<td>Secondary Dwelling Owner Occupancy Requirements</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Completed as part of 4.09.05 in Q2, 2016. Final approval by the Board was May 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.07</td>
<td>Reduce permit requirements for long term agricultural worker housing</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Will be implemented after the Farmworker Housing Needs Assessment and overall assessment of sustainable agricultural policies. Anticipated to be completed by Q3 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.08</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Association of Planning Officials</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.10</td>
<td>Stanford General Use Permit</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>No building permits for individual units were issued for Stanford in 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.11</td>
<td>Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.12</td>
<td>Consideration for allowing use of In-Lieu fees to qualify for Density Bonuses</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09.13</td>
<td>Water and Sewer Service Priority (SB 1087)</td>
<td>2015-2022</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work item was completed in 2018 through a focus group meeting with farm owners and the two south County cities held in January 2018. A survey effort was also completed in 2018 to evaluate the need for agricultural employee housing. This survey and outreach effort informed the amendments and streamlining that would be forthcoming in 2019.

Rent pricing trends in the region are presented in the BOS Staff Report.
### Table E
Commercial Development Bonus Approved pursuant to GC Section 65915.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identifier</th>
<th>Units Constructed as Part of Agreement</th>
<th>Description of Commercial Development Bonus</th>
<th>Commercial Development Bonus Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Project Name*</td>
<td>Local Jurisdiction Tracking ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description of Commercial Development Bonus</td>
<td>Commercial Development Bonus Date Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "*" indicates an optional field

Cells in grey contain auto-calculation formulas
### Annual Progress Report

**Jurisdiction**: Santa Clara County - Unincorporated

**Reporting Period**: 2019 (Jan. 1 - Dec. 31)

---

#### Table F

Units Rehabilitated, Preserved and Acquired for Alternative Adequate Sites pursuant to Government Code section 65583.1(c)(2)

This table is optional. Jurisdictions may list (for informational purposes only) units that do not count toward RHNA, but were substantially rehabilitated, acquired or preserved. To enter units in this table as progress toward RHNA, please contact HCD at APR@hcd.ca.gov. HCD will provide a password to unlock the grey fields. Units may only be credited to the table below when a jurisdiction has included a program in its housing element to rehabilitate, preserve or acquire units to accommodate a portion of its RHNA which meet the specific criteria as outlined in Government Code section 65583.1(c)(2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Units that Do Not Count Towards RHNA*</th>
<th>Units that Count Towards RHNA*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed for Informational Purposes Only</td>
<td>Note - Because the statutory requirements severely limit what can be counted, please contact HCD to receive the password that will enable you to populate these fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Low-Income*</td>
<td>Very Low-Income*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Units At-Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units by Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The description should adequately document how each unit complies with subsection (c)(7) of Government Code Section 65583.1*.
### Table G

Locally Owned Lands Included in the Housing Element Sites Inventory that have been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identifier</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Project Name*</th>
<th>Local Jurisdiction Tracking ID*</th>
<th>Realistic Capacity Identified in the Housing Element</th>
<th>Entity to whom the site transferred</th>
<th>Intended Use for Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Row: Start Data Entry Below

Note: This table must only be filled out if the housing element sites inventory contains a site which is or was owned by the reporting jurisdiction, and has been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of during the reporting year.

CCR Title 25 §6202

Packet Pg. 55
### Building Permits Issued by Affordability Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>2597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Units serving extremely low-income households are included in the very low-income permitted units totals

### Housing Applications Summary

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Applications Submitted:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Proposed Units in All Applications Received:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Approved:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Disapproved:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use of SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applications for Streamlining</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Streamlining Applications Approved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developments Approved with Streamlining</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units Constructed with Streamlining</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Units Constructed - SB 35 Streamlining Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cells in grey contain auto-calculation formulas
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Introduction

The County’s General Plan has been the blueprint for the future physical, economic, and social development of the County since its adoption in December 1994. The General Plan is required by the State of California to protect resources, plan an orderly distribution of land uses and apply fair and equitable regulations for new development. The General Plan provides policies for planning land uses and development in the unincorporated area and establishes a vision for the protection and management of its resources including agriculture; and natural resources such as air, water, and plant and animal habitats. As mandated by the State, the Plan is required to address eight elements’ that are Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Environmental Justice, and Air Quality. This report reviews the activities that took place to implement the County’s 1994 General Plan between January 1, 2019, and December 31, 2019. This report fulfills a state requirement to measure progress in implementing the General Plan.

The County General Plan

The County’s General has been organized into two volumes – Book A & Book B. Book A focuses on countywide issues and polices, addressing the different elements that include both incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County, while Book B focuses on issues and polices impacting the unincorporated County area. The state mandated elements are organized into different chapters under five parts distributed between the two books. The County General Plan prescribes a regional growth management strategy that advocates compact urban development and the prioritization for urban unincorporated area within a Cities Urban Service Areas (USA) to be annexed. New development in the USAs must conform with the corresponding City’s General Plan and are subject to annexation.

Since its adoption in 1994, several new elements and major amendments to the General Plan, have been adopted. Table 1 listed all the amendments and element updates to the County’s General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amendments, Updates, and Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Eliminated East Foothills Policy (R-LU 153, 162, (i) 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Adopted policy R-LU-11, Intensifications of land uses in San Martin and possibility of sewer connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>San Martin Area Land Use Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Revision and update of the County Plan and Trails map and Trails section of the “Parks &amp; Recreation” chapters of the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>West Valley Hillsides Preservation Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>San Martin Area Land Use Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mineral Resource Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Housing Element Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Deleted Policies R-LU 94 through 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Update of Growth and Development Chapter for County Viewshed analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Update of Housing, Land Use, Conservation and Safety Chapters of General Plan (AB162 for Flood Hazards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Updated policy alternatives to policies U-LM-6 through 10 regarding General Plan Use &amp; Densities within Urban Service Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Housing Element Update (2009-2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Creation of Health Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Housing Element Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation actions between January 1, 2019 and December 31, 2019

Listed below are actions taken by the County of Santa Clara towards implementation of the General Plan between January 1, 2019 and December 31, 2019.

The County General Plan contains broader categories as chapters wherein each of the required elements is contained within these chapters. Table 2 provides a list of actions taken, organized by the General Plan chapters, (or element update sections), with the relevant policy number identified for each action. The pages numbers and relevant Book is listed in the headed for each section. Certain chapters, particularly related to county-wide development and Economic Well-being have not been populated as many of the projects and programs under the other elements and chapters would be duplicated.

Table 2. Implementation Action Taken between January 1 and December 31, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth and Development Chapter, Book A &amp; B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple policies listed under the following sections cover the policies listed under this chapter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGE URBAN EXPANSION (Book A – Pages B-5 – B-15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Annexation of 25 parcels from Urban Service Areas to the City of Los Gatos. Policies C-DG-7 through C-GD-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Well Being Chapter Book A &amp; B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple policies listed under the following sections cover the policies listed under this chapter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Element Independent Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH CONDITIONS, EQUITY, AND ACCESS (Pages 5 -16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Public Health has established initiatives under the Healthy Aging Program, initiated in Jan 2019. Projects focused on older adults include Safe Routes for Seniors, Falls Prevention Taskforce, older women’s health and financial wellbeing, social isolation among immigrant communities review and recommendations. Policy HE-A.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ In progress - data collection, action planning and community engagement related to older women’s financial literacy. Policy HE-A.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ History and lingering impact of residential housing discrimination presentations - Futuro de Alum Rock Project. Policy HE-A.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Public Health and the County are active participants in the Government Alliance on Race and Health Equity (GARE) cohorts and promoting participation of cities (e.g. San Jose). Policy HE -A.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Funding received through the Healthy Brain Initiative for 2020-2022 - includes support for caregivers of those living with Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Dementias. Policy HE-A.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Healthy Aging Program promotes falls prevention education, caregiver support and programs to reduce social isolation. Additionally, SCC Fire sits on the Falls Prevention of SCC Steering Committee and plays an active role in sharing information with first responders. Policy HE-A.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL HEALTH (Pages 17 -25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Reference HE-A.5. Public Health has established initiatives under the Healthy Aging Program,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
initiated in Jan 2019. Projects focused on older adults include addressing social isolation among immigrant communities. **Policy HE-B.7**
- In progress - data collection, action planning and community engagement related to older women's financial literacy. **Policy HE-A.13**
- The Public Health Department’s Tobacco-Free Communities program has engaged County Departments and cities to increase adoption and enforcement of policies to reduce density of tobacco retailers across the County, and to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke in public places. These efforts continued in cities across the County in 2019. **Policies HE-B.18 through HE-B.26**

**LAND USE AND URBAN DESIGN (Pages 26 - 33)**

- Public Health has met informally and formally with cities in the process of updating their general plans in 2019, and presented to city stakeholders, to promote consideration of health policies in general plans. **Policy HE-C.5.**
- The County Public Health Department informed and participated in a countywide alliance (the Food Systems Alliance) to research and report on best practices in conserving agricultural lands, specifically for small-scale farming (the Small Farms, Big Potential Report). **Policy HE-C.6.**
- Provide input on Countywide Age-Friendly Action Plan. Provide ongoing guidance to City of San Jose through participation in SJ Age-Friendly Advisory Council. **Policy HE.C.14.**

**ACTIVE AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION (Pages 34 - 40)**

- Cities across the County have been adopting Complete Streets plans (independent of efforts of the County), but the Public Health Department has also been actively promoting the implementation of Complete Streets policies through its Healthy Cities Program. **Policy HE-D.1**
- Public Health and other County Departments supported efforts by the City of San Jose to update its Vision Zero plan (and plans to calm traffic and reduce conflict between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles). **Policy HE-D.5**
- In 2019 the Public Health Department continued partnership with the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition to engage with local city staff and policymakers, representing jurisdictions across the County, in promoting bike safety and infrastructure improvements through "infrastructure rides." **Policy HE-D.8**
- The Public Health Department worked with schools and community partners to assess the barriers to utilizing active transportation. **Policy HE-D.9**
- The Public Health Department and Office of Supervisor Wasserman co-coordinate the Traffic Safe Communities Network, which continues to meet in an effort to prevent traffic-related injuries and fatalities. **Policy HE-D.10**
- Public Health worked to promote way-finding signage in South County, at city parks, and signage is currently being installed. **Policy HE-D.13**
- The Public Health Department educated and provided encouragement to youth through Safe Routes to School programs in partnership with schools. **Policy HE-D.14**
- Support West Valley RYDE pilot, comment on VTA next network changes, provide recommendations for volunteer drive programs and provide input on San Jose Vision Zero through the Area Agency on Aging Transportation Committee. **Policy HE-D.21**
- Fleet and Facilities initiated a TDM study in 2019, results to be presented to BOS in 2020. **Policy HE-D.22**

**RECREATION AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY (Pages 41 - 46)**

- Public Health worked with Santa Clara County Parks to advocate for park information to be posted and available in multiple languages, including in park guides, on the County Parks webpage, and in programming. **Policy HE-E.7**
- The Tobacco-Free Communities Program worked with cities across the County to adopt and implement policies to prohibit the use of tobacco products, including e-cigarettes, in parks and recreational areas, as well as other outdoor public spaces. **Policy HE-E.9**
The Public Health Department promoted use of parks by underserved communities and people with health issues through the Parks Rx Program, and the Let's All Go to the Park Initiative in South County. Policy HE-E.13

The Public Health Department's CalFresh Healthy Living Program provided physical activity and nutrition education to students, teachers, parents, and school staff. Policy HE-E.14

HEALTHY EATING, FOOD ACCESS, AND SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS (Pages 47-53)

- The County Public Health Department informed and participated in a countywide alliance (the Food Systems Alliance) to research and report on best practices in conserving agricultural lands, specifically for small-scale farming (e.g. the Small Farms, Big Potential Report). Policies HE-F.1 through HE-F.9
- The Public Health Department encourages cities to support community garden programs as a way to provide food access to low-income and underserved neighborhoods. Policy HE-F.10
- Public Health promoted the use of Double Up Food Bucks, Market Match, and the Nutrition Pantry Program, to support healthy food access. Policy HE-F.12
- CalFresh Healthy Living promoted healthier food options and assessed local food establishments to encourage healthier food environments. Policy HE-F.13
- The Public Health Department collaborated with the Cut the Sugar Coalition, Child Nutrition Action Partners, Food Systems Alliance, to support access to healthy food and beverages. Policy HE-F.14
- Public Health and other County departments promoted use of CalFresh, food banks, and other food assistance. Policy HE-F.16
- The County and Healthy Cities Program offered resources to cities in support of the adoption of healthy food and beverage procurement standards. Policy HE-F.20
- The Public Health Department's CalFresh Healthy Living program provided nutrition and physical activity education to community partners and schools, helped schools to implement smart lunchrooms, and worked with schools to increase consumption of healthy foods and decrease food waste. Policy HE-F.21
- The Public Health Department's CalFresh Healthy Living program provided support to schools in implementing their wellness policies and to support efforts to provide more nutritious food offerings. Policy HE-F.22

AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE (Pages 54-64)

- Fleet and Facilities is in the process of upgrading the County's fleet of vehicles, and installing charging stations at County facilities, as part of its commitment to being "diesel-free by 2033." Policy HE-G.3
- The County Public Health Department encourages cities to adopt more rigorous Transportation Demand Management policies through its Healthy Cities Program, and also supports participation in "Bike to Work Day" events among County employees. Policy HE-G.5
- The Office of Sustainability promotes energy efficiency in its work in collaboration with the Bay Area Regional Energy Network. Policy HE-G.10
- Public Health encouraged cities to adopt and update climate action plans in 2019 through its Healthy Cities Program. Policy HE-G.23
- Public Health Preparedness worked with other County departments, PG&E, and other state agencies to prepare for Public Safety Power Shutoffs. Policy HE-G.27
- The Office of Supportive Housing has expanded access to housing in partnership with cities and agencies across the region. Policy HE-G.29

HEALTHY HOUSING (Pages 65-69)

- The Tobacco-Free Communities Program worked with cities across the County to support their efforts to adopt and implement comprehensive smoke-free multiunit housing policies. Policy HE-GH.3
- The Office of Supportive Housing has expanded access to housing in partnership with cities and agencies across the region. Policies HE-H.13 through HE-H.15
The Public Health Department’s Violence Prevention Program continued efforts to promote healthy relationships, reduce domestic violence, and to empower communities and address racial and health inequities. *Policies HE-I.1 through HE-I.21*

### Housing Element Independent Document

**PLAN FOR A BALANCED HOUSING SUPPLY (Pages 31 - 34)**

- Under the County Surplus Land Program, the County decided to retain the property at 2500 Senter Rd and lease it back to Charities Housing for the development of up to 160 units of permanent supportive housing. Charities Housing started construction in December 2017, and construction is expected to be completed by February 15, 2020. *Policies HG-1 through HG-3*
- Santa Clara County Housing Authority (SCCHA) funded the development of Laurel Grove Apartments, with a total of 82 units (with 81 affordable units, 20 of which will be Permanent Supportive Housing units), was completed in 2019. This project is located in San Jose. *Policies HG-1 through HG-3*
- Santa Clara County Housing Authority (SCCHA) funded the development of Park Avenue Senior Apartments, in San Jose, is under construction. *Policies HG-1 through HG-3*

**PROMOTE COOPERATION & COLLABORATION ON HOUSING DEVELOPMENT (Pages 35 - 37)**

- Under the CDBG Public Infrastructure Improvements/Public Benefits program one CIP project was completed in Los Gatos (the Bachman Park Project for $200,321.74). *Policies HG-4 and HG-5*

**PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME HOUSING (Pages 38 - 39)**

- Under the Housing Trust Silicon Valley Program, 14 first-time homebuyers received down payment assistance loans to purchase or preserve their home. 2,518 prospective homebuyers attended homebuyer workshops. *Policy HG-6*

**REMOVE UNNECESSARY BARRIERS TO HOUSING (Pages 40 - 41)**

- Staff began work on codifying less restrictions on the requirements for ADU’s including allowing them on all lots, streamlining their processing and reduction of development standards, in accordance with State Law Section 65852.2 & 65852.22. Adoption of new ADU regulations were adopted Board of Supervisors (BOS) in March 2020. *Policies HG-8 and HG-9*
- Staff worked on adopting the removal of owner occupancy deed restrictions for ADU’s. This provision was ultimately adopted by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) March 2020. *Policies HG-8 and HG-9*

**ENSURE SUPPORT FOR FAIR LAWS AND PRACTICES (Pages 42 - 44)**

- The Fair Housing Law Project (FHLP) program continued to serve the community and prioritizes housing discrimination, illegal mortgage lending, gentrification and displacement of low-income and diverse communities leading to segregation, and predatory slum conditions cases in Silicon Valley. *Policies HG-10 through HG-12*
- Under Fair Housing Audit and Education Program, Office of Supportive Housing continued audits of housing providers and hold trainings for housing providers found non-compliant during audits. *Policies HG-10 through HG-12*
- Santa Clara County Fair Housing Consortium funded $85,613 in FY19 to the Law Foundation, which applies for funds on behalf of the Fair Housing Consortium. *Policies HG-10 through HG-12*

**PROVIDE FOR SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSEHOLDS (Pages 45 - 48)**

- Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) is implementing a program to achieve "Age Friendly Cities/County" certification. *Policy HG-15*

**REDUCE HOMELESSNESS CONSISTENT WITH HOUSING FIRST PRINCIPLES (Pages 49 - 51)**

- Staff began exploring options for allowing agricultural employee housing to be occupied by agricultural workers that are not employees of the housing facility operator/owner. This work item is ongoing, and the Department will be proposing zoning ordinance amendments implementing
As an ongoing effort, the County Planning department is working to reducing the permit requirements for long-term agricultural employee housing. The Department is also proposing to allow new forms of agricultural employee housing, and to reduce permit requirements for temporary and seasonal agricultural employee housing. The Department will be proposing this action item in 2020. Polices HG-19 and HG-20

Preservation of 100 units of seasonal housing Ongoing operation of 100 units of seasonal migrant worker housing at the Arturo Ochoa Migrant Center. Policy HG-20

CONSERVE THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK (Pages 54 - 56)

Repairs were completed on 54 homes during the current reporting period. Policy HG-21

Under the Rebuilding Together Silicon Valley program, completed repairs on 22 homes per reporting period. Policy HG-21

Transportation Chapter Book A & B

TRANSPORTATION AND ENERGY CONSERVATION (Book A, Page F10)

Development of policy(s) in compliance with Senate Bill 743. Policy C-TR-1

DEVELOP URBAN LAND USE PATTERNS THAT SUPPORT TRAVEL ALTERNATIVES (Book A, Pages F11 – F20)

Joint Partnership with Cities of Sunnyvale and Santa Clara for Lawrence Station Area Plan. Policies C-TR-6 through C-TR-8

Joint Partnership with VTA for Montague BART Station Pedestrian Overcrossing Project. Policies C-TR-6 through C-TR-8, C-TR-15

Joint Partnership with VTA for Eastridge to BART Regional Connector/Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project. Policies C-TR-6 through C-TR-8, C-TR-15

Joint Partnership with City of Mountain View for Mountain View Transit Center and Central Expressway Pedestrian Undercrossing Project. Policies C-TR-6 through C-TR-8, C-TR-15

Continued work Santa Teresa Hale Extension Project (Main to Dewitt - City of Morgan Hill), Part of Santa Teresa Official Plan Line. Policy C-TR 5

MANAGE TRAVEL DEMAND, SYSTEM EFFICIENCY, AND CONGESTION (Book A, Pages F14 – F20)

Capitol Expressway Fiber Communications Installation between Quimby to Silver Creek. Policies C-TR-3, C-TR-10, C-TR-42, C-TR-43

EXPAND SYSTEM CAPACITY AND IMPROVE SYSTEM INTEGRATION (Book A, Pages F20 – F30)

Continued work on Countywide Bike Plan (VTA). Policies C-TR1, C-TR-16 through C-TR-18, C-TR-33 through C-TR-37

Continued work on Measure B Expressway Implementation Plan. Policies CTR-3, C-TR-11-12, C-TR 15-19, C-TR 30, C-TR 31

Continued work San Tomas Expressway Widening and Trail Extension Project between El Camino Real to Homestead (project received Federal grant funds). Policies C-TR-3, C-TR-15, C-TR-35 through C-TR-37


Staff the Joint VTA/County Bicycle Policy Advisory Committee (VTA/County BPAC). Policies CTR-30, C-TR-34

Staff the County Roads Commission. Policy C-TR-30

Administer, Fund, and Maintain the County Bridge Program (Repair and Maintain all bridge facilities in the County). Policy C-TR 37 (This program is predominantly funded by Federal Transportation Funds)
- Enforce, Design, and Maintain County Road facilities for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Policy C-TR-28
- Departmental Review of the High-Speed Rail corridor throughout the County. Policy C-TR-41

**SUPPORT NEW TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGIES** *(Book A, Pages F31 – F32)*

- Continued work Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Investments, Maintenance, and Upgrades throughout the year on various Expressways and County Roads. Policies C-TR-10, C-TR-42, C-TR-43
- Capitol Expressway ITS and Sidewalk Project between Snell to McLaughlin. Policies C-TR-3, C-TR-10, C-TR-42, C-TR-43

**Parks & Recreation Chapter Book A & B**

**REGIONAL PARKS & PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDS** *(Book A, Pages G3 – G9)*

- Repair and restoration of windows of the historic Cottle House at Martial Cottle Park. Policy C-PR 10
- Completed design of the Grant Ranch Historic Buildings Rehabilitation Phase 1 at Joseph D. Grant County Park. Policy C-PR 10
- County permitted 21 non-profit and 7 private recreational events of 500+ visitors in various County parks in 2019. Policy C-PR 17
- Completed and secured County approval of the Natural Resources Management Plan and Interim Access Plan for the Coyote Canyon property that will support habitat connectivity and public access over a new property between Anderson and Coyote Lake - Harvey Bear County Parks. Policies C-PR 3, C-PR 4, C-PR 9, C-PR 10, C-PR 11, C-PR 12, C-PR 23, C-PR 24
- Substantially completed construction of the 4.4-mile Oak Cove Trail at Calero County Park that provides trail access for hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrians. Policies C-PR 1, C-PR 4
- Substantially completed the Youth Science Institute (YSI) Exterior Siteworks Improvements Project at Vasona County Park; enhancing a learning center and visitor center operated in partnership with YSI, a non-profit entity. Policy C-PR 10
- Facilitated over 2,600 individual volunteers in logging 36,000+ volunteer hours spent maintaining and operating County parks. Policy C-PR 18
- Facilitated over 170 volunteers and 3,600 hours spent through the Trail Watch, Adopt-a-Trail and monthly trail maintenance day programs. Policies C-PR 30.2, C-PR 30.3
- Completed exterior sitework and made substantial progress on interior improvements of the historic Dyer House at Sanborn County Park. This house serves as a visitor center and Park Ranger office, in partnership with the Youth Science Institute. Additionally, completed a project to stabilize and improve the "Casino" House building, or Dyer House annex, which serves as additional office space, and may in the future support reservations for weddings and events. Policy C-PR 10
- Carried out several well closures, dump remediations and various water system improvements. Policies C-PR 3, C-PR 8, C-PR 11
- Developed, launched and began implementation of new Computerized Maintenance and Management System. Policies C-PR 1, C-PR 9
- Completed construction of a new maintenance building at Metcalf Motorcycle Park. Policies C-PR 11, C-PR 13, C-PR 16
- Completed various paving management and improvement projects including a roadway at Los Gatos Creek County Park, Los Gatos Creek Trail at Vasona County Park, and the Coyote Creek Trail within Coyote Creek Parkway. Policies C-PR 3, C-PR 8, C-PR 12, C-PR 20.1, C-PR 30.2
- Identified various priority grazing infrastructure improvements throughout the park system, including perimeter and boundary fencing improvements. Developed implementation plans to
carry out improvements. *Policies C-PR 3, C-PR 4, C-PR 1*

- Made various improvements throughout the park system to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Policy C-PR 8*
- Developed plans and executed projects under the Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Program *Policies C-PR 3, C-PR 4, C-PR 9, C-PR 10, C-PR 11, C-PR 12*
- Completed shaded fuel breaks at Mt. Madonna as part of the Forest Health Management Program *Policies C-PR 3, C-PR 4, C-PR 9, C-PR 10, C-PR 11, C-PR 12*
- Administered the County's Historical Heritage Grant Program, awarding $590,000 to three projects that help protect valuable historic resources on parkland. *Policy C-PR 10*

**TRAILS & PATHWAYS (Book A, Pages G10 – G22)**

- Identified 60 private and public projects that could impact the Countywide Trails Master Plan and submitted comments to facilitate trail development and use. *Policies C-PR 22.1, C-PR 33.5*

**Resource Conservation Book A & B**

**HABITAT & BIODIVERSITY (Book A, Pages H20 – H26)**

- The County Planning and Development Department continued evaluating development projects impacts on sensitive habitat under the Habitat Conservation Plan areas in unincorporated areas. *Policies C-RC-30 through C-RC-33*

**AGRICULTURE & AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES (Book A, Pages H28 – H32)**

- In January, 2019, the Board of Supervisors adopted a series of actions and measures to implement the Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan, a strategic agricultural preservation plan previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors in January 2018.
- The County Planning and Development Department continued its work to establish conservation easements on vulnerable prime agricultural lands under the regional Agricultural Conservation Easements (ACE) program. *Policies C-RC 40 through C-RC-42*
- The County continued to support and manage applicants and properties under the Williamson Act. *Policy C-RC 39 through C-RC-42*
- The County’s Planning and Development Department continued development of an Agricultural Resilience Incentive (ARI) Grant Program to fund agricultural resource management projects in Santa Clara. The goal of the program is to incentivize climate-smart agricultural practices by funding resource management projects on working lands within the county. *Policy C-RC 43*
- The County Planning Department received a Conservation Grant to jointly study will focus on the critical role rural working lands and agricultural preservation play in regional planning for climate action and long-term resilience, with San Mateo County. *Policy C-RC 43*

**Land Use Book B**

**RESOURCE CONSERVATION AREAS (Book B, Pages Q1 – Q16)**

- The County Planning and Development Department has been working to update Non-residential Development Standards to replace the conditional definition ‘local serving’ uses in rural areas. Adoption of new development standards is expected to be adopted Board of Supervisors (BOS) in mid 2020. *Policy R-GD-1 through R-GD-4*

**SPECIAL AREA POLICIES –SAN MARTIN AREA (Book B, Pages Q19 – Q25)**

- The County Planning Department received a Conservation Grant to conduct a study, entitled San Martin Farm Futures. The project’s goal will be to envision several possible farm futures and plan for agricultural conservation that is responsive to the community’s diverse needs and aspirations. *Policy R-LU-136 through R-LU-143*
Summary and next steps
The actions taken by the County in 2019 are consistent with the goals and policies contained within the County’s General Plan. The County continues to implement these goals and policies with decisions that balance community needs, property rights, environmental stewardship and the health and welfare of the general public. The Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and Staff has continued to adhere to a vision for the County in promoting Social and Economic Well-Being; Managed, Balanced Growth; Livable Communities; and Responsible Resource Conservation.

The County is now beginning to embark on an extensive General Plan update that is envisioned to result in a comprehensive update to the 1994 General Plan. The County is currently starting updates to the Stanford Community Plan and will soon review the land use policies for the San Martin Planning Area. Subsequently, the County will begin updates to the Housing Element and subsequently prepare policies and strategies addressing regional sustainability, climate change mitigation, adaptation, and resiliency, with corresponding updates throughout the General Plan. The County expects to these updates by 2024.
RHNA methodology development process

- RHNA methodology must meet five statutory objectives and be consistent with the development pattern from Plan Bay Area 2050

- Housing Methodology Committee has been meeting since October 2019 to work collaboratively to recommend a proposed methodology for allocating units throughout the Bay Area in an equitable manner

- Guided by performance evaluation metrics based on how HCD has evaluated other regions’ methodologies
HMC guiding principles

1. More housing should go to jurisdictions with more jobs than housing and to communities exhibiting racial and economic exclusion

2. The methodology should focus on:
   - Equity, as represented by High Opportunity Areas
   - Relationship between housing and jobs; however, no consensus on specific factor

3. Equity factors need to be part of total allocation, not just income allocation

4. Do not limit allocations based on past RHNA

5. Housing in high hazard areas is a concern, but RHNA may not be the best tool to address it
Building blocks of the proposed RHNA methodology

1. Baseline allocation: **2050 Households (Blueprint)**
   - Captures benefits of using Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint
   - Middle ground between using Households 2019 and Housing Growth (Blueprint)

2. Income allocation approach: **Bottom-Up**
   - Allows more control over allocations for a particular income category
   - Can direct more lower-income units toward areas of opportunity while reducing market-rate units in jurisdictions with a higher percentage of lower-income households to reduce displacement pressures

3. Factors and weights: **Option 8A: High Opportunity Areas Emphasis & Job Proximity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low and Low</th>
<th>Moderate and Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% Access to High Opportunity Areas</td>
<td>40% Access to High Opportunity Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Job Proximity - Auto</td>
<td>60% Job Proximity - Auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Job Proximity - Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Attachment 3 - ABAG Staff Presentation to Regional Planning Committee on RHNA
Plan Bay Area 2050 and RHNA

Final Blueprint
Envisioned growth pattern at the county and sub-county levels over the next 30 years

STATE LAW: CONSISTENCY REQUIREMENT

RHNA
Housing allocations at the jurisdiction level over the next eight years; nexus with Housing Elements on local level

- Proposed RHNA methodology uses Year 2050 Households from Blueprint as baseline allocation
  - Advances equity and sustainability outcomes from Bay Area’s long-range planning efforts
    - Directs growth to job centers, near transit; excludes areas with high fire risk, outside Urban Growth Boundaries
  - Considers both current households and forecasted growth from Plan Bay Area 2050
- Methodology supports Blueprint focused growth pattern, adjusted to meet RHNA fair housing/equity goals
  - Blueprint one component of proposed methodology: baseline adjusted based on RHNA factors/weights
  - Blueprint focuses growth in some high-resource areas near transit; RHNA considers all high-resource areas
- Updates to Final Blueprint between now and December 2020 could affect RHNA allocations
Proposed 2023-2031 RHNA Methodology Overview

STEP 1:
Group RHND by income

STEP 2:
Factor weight = units allocated by factor

STEP 3:
Calculate jurisdiction’s units from each factor

Total Regional Housing Need Determination (RHND) from HCD
441,176

Allocation Factors for Very Low- and Low-Income Units

Very Low: 114,442
Low: 65,892

Allocation Factors for Moderate- and Above Moderate-Income Units

Moderate: 72,712
Above Moderate: 188,130

Allocation of Very Low and Low Units

Allocation of Moderate and Above Moderate Units

Jurisdiction score on AHOAs factor
Jurisdiction score on JPA factor
Jurisdiction score on JPT factor

Jurisdiction Baseline Allocation
Share of households in Year 2050 from Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint

Allocation of Very Low and Low Units
Allocation of Moderate and Above Moderate Units

70% Access to High Opportunity Areas (AHOAs)
15% Job Proximity – Auto (JPA)
15% Job Proximity – Transit (JPT)

40% Access to High Opportunity Areas (AHOAs)
60% Job Proximity – Auto (JPA)
Illustrative allocations from proposed methodology

Jurisdiction Growth Rate from 2019 households as a result of 2023-2031 RHNA
# Illustrative allocations by county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2023-2031 RHNA units (Cycle 6)</th>
<th>Share of 2023-2031 RHNA (Cycle 6)</th>
<th>Share of 2015-2023 RHNA (Cycle 5)</th>
<th>Share of Bay Area households (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>85,689</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>43,942</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>14,160</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>72,080</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>48,490</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>143,550</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>11,906</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>17,543</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY AREA</td>
<td>441,176</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HMC discussion at final meeting

- Opted not to include equity adjustment for lower-income allocations
- Reiterated its commitment to using the 2050 Households (Blueprint) baseline
- Confirmed that incorporating the Blueprint in the RHNA methodology is the best strategy for addressing natural hazards, rather than including as a methodology factor
- Moved forward with Option 8A because of its balance between factors related to High Opportunity Areas and Job Proximity
- Did not change methodology for unincorporated areas, pending agreements among local governments
Consistency between RHNA and Plan Bay Area

- Staff compared the RHNA allocation results from the proposed methodology to 30-year housing growth forecasts from the Plan Bay Area 2050 Draft Blueprint at the county and subcounty levels

- There were no consistency issues
Evaluation results for proposed methodology

**Objective 1:** Does the allocation increase the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner?

**Metric 1a.1:** Do jurisdictions with the most expensive housing costs receive a significant percentage of their RHNA as lower-income units?

- 25 jurisdictions with most expensive housing costs: 44%
- Other jurisdictions: 41%

**Metric 1a.2:** Do jurisdictions with the most expensive housing costs receive a share of the region’s housing need that is at least proportional to their share of the region’s households?

- Ratio of RHNA share to household share:
  - 25 jurisdictions with most expensive housing costs: 1.12
  - Other jurisdictions: 0.99
Evaluation results for proposed methodology

**Objective 2:** Does the allocation promote infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, the encouragement of efficient development patterns, and the achievement of the region’s greenhouse gas reductions targets?

**Metric 2a:** Do jurisdictions with the largest share of the region’s jobs have the highest growth rates resulting from RHNA?

**Metric 2b:** Do jurisdictions with the largest share of the region’s Transit Priority Area acres have the highest growth rates resulting from RHNA?

**Metric 2c:** Do jurisdictions with the lowest vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per resident have the highest growth rates resulting from RHNA?
Evaluation results for proposed methodology

**Objective 3:** Does the allocation promote an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing, including an improved balance between the number of low-wage jobs and the number of housing units affordable to low-wage workers in each jurisdiction?

**Metric 3a.1:** Do jurisdictions with the most low-wage workers per housing unit affordable to low-wage workers receive a significant percentage of their RHNA as lower-income units?

- 25 jurisdictions with the most low-wage jobs per housing unit affordable to low-wage workers: 42%
- Other jurisdictions: 41%

**Metric 3a.2:** Do jurisdictions with the most low-wage workers per housing unit affordable to low-wage workers receive a share of the region's housing need that is at least proportional to their share of the region's households?

- 25 jurisdictions with the most low-wage jobs per housing unit affordable to low-wage workers: 1.21
- Other jurisdictions: 0.98
Evaluation results for proposed methodology

Objective 4: Does the allocation direct a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category?

Metric 4: Do jurisdictions with the largest percentage of high-income residents receive a larger share of their RHNA as lower-income units than jurisdictions with the largest percentage of low-income residents?

- 25 jurisdictions with largest % of households above 120% Area Median Income: 43%
- 25 jurisdictions with largest % of households below 80% Area Median Income: 40%
Evaluation results for proposed methodology

Objective 5: Does the allocation affirmatively further fair housing?

Metric 5a.1: Do jurisdictions with the largest percentage of households living in High or Highest Resource census tracts receive a significant percentage of their RHNA as lower-income units?

Metric 5a.2: Do jurisdictions with the largest percentage of households living in High or Highest Resource census tracts receive a share of the region’s housing need that is at least proportional to their share of the region’s households?
Evaluation results for proposed methodology

Objective 5: Does the allocation affirmatively further fair housing?

Metric 5b: Do jurisdictions exhibiting racial and economic exclusion receive a share of the region’s housing need that is at least proportional to their share of the region’s households?

- 31 jurisdictions with above-average divergence scores and percentages of households above 120% of Area Median Income: 1.11
- Other jurisdictions: 0.98

Metric 5c: Do jurisdictions with the largest percentage of high-income residents receive a share of the region’s housing need that is at least proportional to their share of the region’s households?

- 25 jurisdictions with largest % of households above 120% Area Median Income: 1.26
- Other jurisdictions: 0.97
Evaluation results for proposed methodology

**Objective 5: Does the allocation affirmatively further fair housing?**

Metric 5d.1: Do jurisdictions exhibiting racial and economic exclusion above the regional average receive a total share of the region’s very low- and low-income housing need that is at least proportional to their total share of the region’s households?

Metric 5d.2: Do most jurisdictions exhibiting racial and economic exclusion above the regional average receive a share of the region’s very low- and low-income housing need that is at least proportional to the jurisdiction’s share of the region’s households?
## Next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPC recommends proposed methodology to Executive Board</td>
<td>October 1, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board approves release of proposed methodology and draft subregion shares for 30-day public comment period</td>
<td>October 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearing on proposed methodology and draft subregion shares</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC recommends draft methodology to Executive Board</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board approves draft allocation methodology to submit to HCD</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board approves subregion shares</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Following in 2021:** final methodology, draft allocations, appeals process

**For more information:** please contact Gillian Adams, RHNA Manager, at gadams@bayareametro.gov
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Update

Subject: Recommendation for Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Proposed Methodology

Background: RHNA is the state-mandated process to identify the number of housing units (by affordability level) that each jurisdiction must accommodate in the Housing Element of its General Plan. The RHNA allocation must meet the five statutory objectives of RHNA and be consistent with the forecasted development pattern from Plan Bay Area 2050.

ABAG convened an ad hoc Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) that has been meeting since October 2019 to advise staff on the methodology for allocating a share of the region’s total housing need to every local government in the Bay Area. The HMC includes local elected officials and staff as well as regional stakeholders to facilitate sharing of diverse viewpoints across multiple sectors. Agenda packets for the HMC meetings are available at https://mtc.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx.

Issues: Proposed RHNA Methodology

At its final meeting on September 18th, the HMC voted 27 to 4 to recommend Option 8A: High Opportunity Areas Emphasis & Job Proximity as the proposed methodology to the ABAG Regional Planning Committee and Executive Board. This option includes the HMC’s previously identified preferences for using Year 2050 households from the Plan Bay Area 2050 Blueprint as the baseline allocation and the Bottom-Up income allocation approach. Attachment A provides information about the proposed RHNA methodology.

Next Steps: The ABAG Executive Board will consider the recommended proposed methodology in October; staff will request that the Board approve its release for public comment.

Recommended Action: The ABAG Regional Planning Committee is requested to recommend that the ABAG Executive Board approve the proposed RHNA methodology, as reported.

1 See California Government Code §65584.
2 Government Code Section 65584(d).
3 Government Code Section 65584.04(m)(1).
October 1, 2020

Regional Planning Committee

Agenda Item 5.a.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Update

Attachments:

A. Memo – Proposed RHNA Methodology
   
   Appendix 1 – Allocation Maps
   Appendix 2 – Illustrative Allocations
   Appendix 3 – Methodology Factors Overview
   Appendix 4 – Evaluation Metrics

B. Presentation

Reviewed:

Therese W. McMillan
Illustrative Allocations from Proposed RHNA Methodology
Jurisdiction Growth Rate from 2019 households as a result of 2023-2031 RHNA

Option 8A: High Opportunity Areas Emphasis & Job Proximity (Baseline: 2050 Households (Blueprint))

Jurisdiction Growth Rate
Illustrative Allocations from Proposed RHNA Methodology

Jurisdiction Total Allocation of 2023-2031 RHNA

Option 8A: High Opportunity Areas Emphasis & Job Proximity (Baseline: 2050 Households (Blueprint))
## Draft Data Table: Proposed Sphere of Influence or Urban Service Area Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Baseline: 2019 HH</th>
<th>Baseline: 2050 Blueprint HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for reference</td>
<td>no adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>3,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>4,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>5,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Sereno</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>7,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>52,090</td>
<td>67,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>9,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>9,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Santa Clara</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Data Table: Proposed Sphere of Influence or Urban Service Area Adjustment
DATE: October 15, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Megan Doyle, Clerk of the Board
SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Work Plans for Commissions that Report to HLUET

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report relating to Fiscal Year 2020-2021 annual work plans for the following Commissions supported by the Office of the Clerk of the Board, and forward to the Board of Supervisors for approval:

a. Airport Land Use Commission  
b. Animal Advisory Commission  
c. Fish and Game Commission  
d. Historical Heritage Commission  
e. Parks and Recreation Commission  
f. Planning Commission

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no fiscal impact regarding acceptance of the work plans. However, the work plans reflect activities that may have associated costs. Acceptance of the work plans does not imply authorization for such costs. Commissions will submit separate requests to the Board of Supervisors for authorization of any expenditures.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
On February 2, 1999, the Board of Supervisors approved the reporting structure for the advisory Boards and Commissions that receive clerical/administrative support from the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors directed that advisory Boards and Commissions submit annual work plans for each fiscal year through the appropriate Board Committee for review prior to submittal to the Board of Supervisors.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.
SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
A committee of Board Policy Aides and the Office of the Clerk of the Board developed a standard template for the work plans in 1999. The work plans are based on a fiscal year rather than a calendar year. The Commissions were advised that work plans are to be completed and approved at a regular Board or Commission meeting no later than April 1 of each year. Development of Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-2021 Work Plans has been included on the Commission agendas since January 2020.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, many Commission meetings were cancelled. Commissions began meeting again in a phased approach, with the last groups resuming meeting in September 2020. The list of work plans below are for Commissions reporting to the Housing, Land Use, Environment and Transportation Committee (HLUET) that have been approved by the Commissions to this date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMISSION</th>
<th>DATE OF APPROVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Land Use Commission</td>
<td>April 22, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports Commission</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Advisory Commission</td>
<td>September 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Game Commission</td>
<td>August 17, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Heritage Commission</td>
<td>June 18, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Commission</td>
<td>August 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>August 27, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads Commission</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At its January 13, 2020 meeting, the Roads Commission authorized the Roads and Airports Department to make the final edits to the FY 2021 work plan and forward to HLUET. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting uncertainties regarding work plan items, the Department has requested for the work plan to return to the Commission for further consideration prior to submission to the Board through HLUET.

The Office of the Clerk of the Board serves as the ex-officio secretary for these Commissions, and this transmittal is forwarded on their behalf.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION
Advisory Boards and Commissions will not be in compliance with the Board of Supervisors' direction and will not have the opportunity to receive feedback and recommendations from HLUET prior to submitting the work plans to the Board of Supervisors.
**STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL**

Pursuant to the Rules of the Board of Supervisors, Section 33.3 (b), following the joint Committee meeting, the Chair of the Committee shall submit a written report of the meeting to the full Board of Supervisors, at an open meeting of the Board, and the work plans will be forwarded to the Board for approval.

The Deputy Clerk will notify the Commissions of the Committee action, comments, and recommendations.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Airport Land Use Commission Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Work Plan (PDF)
- Animal Advisory Commission Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Work Plan (PDF)
- Fish and Game Commission Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Work Plan (PDF)
- Historical Heritage Commission Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Work Plan (PDF)
- Parks and Recreation Commission Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Work Plan (PDF)
- Planning Commission Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Work Plan (PDF)
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
FISCAL YEAR 2021 WORK PLAN
AND
FISCAL YEAR 2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioners</th>
<th>Proxy Commissioners</th>
<th>Seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Donahue, Chairperson</td>
<td>Jamil Shaikh</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Barragan, Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Keith Graham</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Windus</td>
<td>Carl Honaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Ronald Blake</td>
<td>Julie Matsushima</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Matichak</td>
<td>Robert Holbrook</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Hendricks</td>
<td>Russ Melton</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSION STATEMENT:
The purpose of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is to create and adopt plans and policies for development of areas surrounding public airports in Santa Clara County. It is also intended to minimize the public's exposure to safety hazards and excessive noise and to ensure that the approaches to public airports are kept clear of structures that could pose an aviation safety hazard.

The ALUC has three primary responsibilities:
1. To prepare and adopt a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for areas surrounding public airports in Santa Clara County.
2. To review general and specific plans prepared by local agencies for consistency with the ALUC's (CLUPs) for Santa Clara County Airports.
3. To review, if requested, proposed land use actions for areas surrounding public airports.

The purpose of the CLUP is to provide policies for the compatible growth of areas surrounding public airports in Santa Clara County. The CLUP is intended to minimize the public's exposure to safety hazards and excessive noise. In formulating the plan, the ALUC established policies for the regulation of land use, building height, safety, and noise insulation within areas adjacent to each of the public airports in the county. The jurisdiction of the ALUC does not include the operation of any airport in Santa Clara County. Future growth and activity at each of the airports is, however, considered in the ALUC's Land Use Plans for purposes of determining appropriate land use policies.

Proposals for amendments to general or specific plans and either building or zoning regulations by local agencies must be submitted to the ALUC for a determination of consistency with its Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) for Santa Clara County Airports. Airport master plans are also subject to review for consistency with the ALUC's Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:
The Airport Land Use Commission was established in 1971 pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 21670, which mandates the establishment of an airport land use commission by counties with an airport served by a scheduled airline. The ALUC developed the Land Use Plan (CLUP) as a policy plan and adopted the document in 1973. In order to simplify the 1973 text, to clarify points, and to ensure that current practice is documented in written form, the current plan was updated in 1992. Airport-specific CLUP’s have been adopted for Palo Alto, Reid Hillview, San Martin, Moffett Field and San Jose International Airports.
## FISCAL YEAR 2021 WORK PLAN
**July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PRIORITY RANKING</th>
<th>TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate referred land use applications and make determinations of consistency with ALUC Land Use Plans CLUPs for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports, as required under PUC 21674 (a)</td>
<td>A. Review within 60 days referrals from the Cities of San Jose, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Palo Alto and County of Santa Clara, involving proposed rezoning and general plan amendments for project sites/areas located within the ALUC’s referral boundaries.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Adopt amendments to ALUC Land Use Plans for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports, per PUC 21674 (c) & PUC 21675 (a) | A. Review Airport Masterplan for San Jose International Airport following 2020 City Council adoption for any necessary amendments  
  1. Remove runway 11-29 from SJC CLUP and corresponding Safety Zones, Noise contours and FAA Part 77 height surfaces.  
  2. Amend Safety Zones, Noise contours and FAA Part 77 height surfaces for SJC as appropriate for runways 30R-12L, Runway 30L-12R.  
  B. Advocate to amend State Legislation to allow ALUC Staff to provide recommendations for DeMinimis projects.  
  C. Prepare Draft Heliport specific CLUP for Valley Medical Center (VMC). | 1                | December 2020            |

<p>|                                |                                                                                                                                   | 2.                | FY 2020-21               |
|                                |                                                                                                                                   | 3.                | FY 2020-21               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with Cities within Santa Clara County Airport AIA’s.</td>
<td>A. Host webinars to train jurisdictional Staff on ALUC referral procedures and aviation policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Engage with downtown development groups and steering committees to ensure project consistency with ALUC policies and procedures or amend them.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Staff to attend Cities Association meeting to provide update on their elected officials.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor availability of Grant Funding</td>
<td>A. Monitor State and Federal Grant Funding that may become available and apply for grant funding as it becomes available.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of ALUC Fee</td>
<td>A. Prepare a fee study to identify ways to pay for and maintain cost recovery for CLUP amendments, or resolve that this activity should be general fund reliant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Present fee options to the ALUC for adoption to enact a CLUP maintenance fee.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Present fee options to the ALUC to pay for Heliport specific CLUP preparation.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Make necessary fee adjustments to maintain cost recovery.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Airport Masterplans per PUC 21674 (d) &amp; PUC 21676 (c)</td>
<td>A. Review any Airport Masterplans referred to the ALUC and provide consistency determination with respective CLUP.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# FISCAL YEAR 2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

*July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING GOAL</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate land use applications and make determinations of consistency with Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports.</td>
<td>A. Acted on 14 (down from 33 in prior FY) land use applications, which included 9 Major projects (15 prior FY), three (3) Minor projects (3 prior FY), six (6) De minimis projects (2 prior FY) and 1 Peery Park SP area staff-directed level referrals from Sunnyvale (9 prior FY).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt amendments to Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports</td>
<td>A. Reviewed options to review height and potentially amend CLUP height polices.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Worked with the City of San Jose to provide alternatives to land uses in the Guadalupe Gardens area for homeless shelters</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. ALUC staff participated in two jurisdictional task forces for the El Camino Real Specific Plan in Santa Clara and Moffett Park Specific Plan Update in Sunnyvale to implement aviation policy.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Staff invited to participate in CalTrans Division of Aeronautics Handbook update.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Worked with the County Facilities Department and executive Office to ensure ALUC policy compliance with County -owned projects within airport AIA’s, including the County Main Jail expansion Facility.</td>
<td>Complete June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Progress made in extending the PAO CLUP into East Palo Alto (San Mateo County.)</td>
<td>Complete FY 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Staff developed a referral and tracking program in Accella for Land Use processing and fees.</td>
<td>Complete June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# FISCAL YEAR ONGOING PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold regular Commission meetings and workshops</td>
<td>Conduct regular business of the Commission, conduct joint meetings with other commissions and local organizations, conduct site visits to project referral locations within the Commission's jurisdiction and hold Commission Workshops when necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt amendments to all CLUPs to be consistent with Masterplans, as well as monitoring annually the accuracy of the 2009 cost recovery fee schedule and other items as required.</td>
<td>A. As Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with Cities within Santa Clara County</td>
<td>A. Correspond and meet with Santa Clara County municipalities as needed to facilitate common goals relating to planning for appropriate land use for property surrounding the County’s airports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate jurisdictions and the public at large regarding what the ALUC is and what its duties are, as well as any major projects of regional importance.</td>
<td>A. Provide public presentations on what the ALUC is and current projects. Staff attended a Cities Association meeting and provided the Committee members with background to the ALUC and updated them on current projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Staff to provide an ALUC update to Department of Planning and Development on current projects the ALUC was undertaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Work with the City of East Palo Alto to adopt their portion of the Palo Alto CLUP within the Airport Influence Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor State and Federal legislation relative to airport land use</td>
<td>A. Pursue implementation of legislation and guidelines that foster ALUC plans and policies and provide more ALUC authority. Also, monitor any changes that affect the ALUC functions as a body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor cost recovery fee schedule</td>
<td>A. Staff to evaluate fees received against cost and proposed appropriate amendments to maintain 10-yr. amortized cost recovery goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMISSION
FISCAL YEAR 2020 - 2021 WORK PLAN
AND
2019-2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Members:

Sharon Clute
Chris Vigil
Sandra Peterson
Jerry Burge
Katherine Dettmer
Julia Lewis
Cristie Kamiya
MISSION STATEMENT:

To promote community awareness of responsible care, humane treatment and respect for ALL animals, through Trap-Neuter-Return and affordable spay/neuter pet population control programs, humane education and other endeavors, of which it will apprise and advise the Board of Supervisors.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

The Animal Advisory Commission was established by Ordinance NS.300.393 on March 26, 1985. The Commission was established for the purpose of advising the Board of Supervisors on matters which relate to animal care, welfare and control. The powers and duties of the commission shall include: (a) to aid in coordinating and promoting pet population control measures; (b) to work with the county Office of Education on curriculum for humane education and responsible pet ownership/guardianship in the schools; (c) to investigate and find alternative ways of achieving an animal shelter at minimum cost to taxpayers; to make suggestions to the staff of the environmental management agency to strengthen the county animal control program; (e) to serve as an information and referral source on animals by working with the public and private animal welfare groups; (f) to educate the public about the seriousness of the animal control problem; (g) to advise the Board of Supervisors on any matters concerning animal control which may be referred to the Commission by the Board; and (h) to render to the Board of Supervisors at least once each calendar year a report or reports of its activities.
## FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PRIORITY RANKING</th>
<th>TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Monitor progress/status of proposed county shelter and adjust expectations as required. | • Review regular updates at bi-monthly meetings.  
• Contribute to additional requirements/needs to include funding/marketing methods if needed.  
• Make additional recommendations to the BOS where relevant. | 1 |  |
| 2. Identify and develop methods to benefit county Animal Care and Control (ACC) Projects. | • Increase public awareness/involvement via social media.  
• Identify POCs and partner with cities in the county.  
• Take the lead in programs that benefit county wide programs.  
• Engage and work with rescue/non-profits when mutually beneficial. | 2 |  |
| 3. Create areas of opportunity to engage the public. | • Identify underserved areas of the community.  
• Utilize social media to seek public comment and involvement.  
• Assure all county residents are afforded the same considerations. | 3 |  |
| 4. Develop additional social media outreach | • Review social media channels currently in place  
• Identify areas of opportunity to increase outreach/feedback communications and promote animal activities.  
• Suggest methods to exploit underutilized communication channels. | 4 |  |
### 2019-2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ONGOING PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING GOAL</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New County Shelter project</td>
<td>Continued to monitor shelter community information meetings as well as take public comment at Commission meetings to provide feedback and input to the Board of Supervisor.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 WORK PLAN
AND
2019-2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Members:
Joseph Chavez
Vincent Falcone
Mark Grisedale
Daniel Little
Richard White
MISSION STATEMENT:

It is the mission of the Santa Clara County Fish and Game Commission to protect, restore and enhance fish and wildlife resources in Santa Clara County. The Commission considers healthy, natural ecosystems the ideal. Where this is not always possible, the Commission seeks to minimize the effect human intervention while still supporting the goals of protection, enhancement, and restoration of fish and wildlife to the fullest extent. Activities of the Commission will be governed by State Fish & Game Code.

To accomplish this mission, the Commission will support the following to the best of its abilities:

- Support the Federal and State agencies regarding the preservation, conservation or enhancement of fish and game resources.
- Support educational programs related to wildlife resources.
- Support projects that will enhance or protect fish and wildlife resources.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

The Fish and Game Commission was established by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Santa Clara County Ordinance NS-300.43, adopted April 18, 1960, last amended by Santa Clara County Ordinance NS-300.518 on April 27, 1993. The duty of the Commission shall be to investigate all requests for the expending of the monies in the County Fish and Game Propagation Fund per State Fish and Game Code Sections 13100-13103 and make written recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding expenditures. Requests may be initiated by members of the Commission or by any member of the public. Any investigation shall be for the purpose of determining whether the expenditure is in the interest of the propagation and conservation of fish and game within the County.

The Commission is composed of five members appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Each member shall be familiar with fish and game problems within the County of Santa Clara. Term for each member shall be four years.
# FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PRIORITY RANKING</th>
<th>TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide guidance to the Board regarding fish and game matters that affect the resources of Santa Clara County.</td>
<td>Advise the Board on matters related to fish and game resources; including advocating for hiring Fish and Game Wardens, within the county or that may affect the county.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommend expenditures from the Fish and Game Preservation fund to support education, conservation and preservation of wildlife resources within the county</td>
<td>Projects will be considered based on proposals submitted to the Commission.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seek state and federal funding to remedy problems related to threatened or endangered species in Santa Clara County and improve overall fish and game resources.</td>
<td>The Commission, from time to time, may recommend that the Board address a letter to a state or federal agency requesting funds.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advise the Board on state or federal issues that may affect fish and game resources in general.</td>
<td>The Commission, from time to time, may request that the Board address a letter to a state or federal agency to express a policy view on a particular topic.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PRIOR YEAR ACCOMPLISHMENTS FY2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approved funding ($8,000) for San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory to fund the western snowy plovers monitoring and banding program.</td>
<td>➢ San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory presented to the Commission on February 24, 2020. Commission approved funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
HISTORICAL HERITAGE COMMISSION

FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 WORK
PLAN AND
FISCAL YEAR 2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Christopher Manning, Chair
Sue McAllister, Vice Chair
Tere Johnson
Lila Gemellos
Debbie Shepherd
Susan Walsh
MISSION STATEMENT:

To advise the Board of Supervisors in the preservation and promotion of the historical and cultural assets of Santa Clara County. To advise the Board of Supervisors in matters related to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) and to make recommendations regarding districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects worthy of official designation of “historic properties”.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

A Historical Advisory Committee for the County of Santa Clara existed in the 1960s. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA: Public Law 89-665: 16 U.S.C. 470 et seq) was created in 1966 to preserve historical and archeological sites in America. This legislation was followed by similar statues on the state and local levels.

The Santa Clara County Historical Heritage Commission was established on March 20, 1973 by County Ordinance Code, which prescribes the Commission’s purpose, goals and tasks. On October 17, 2006 the ordinance was updated to reflect the duties of the Commission as they have evolved since the 1970s (Division C17).
# FISCAL YEAR 2021 WORK PLAN (July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PRIORITY RANKING</th>
<th>TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the identification, preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources</td>
<td>Evaluate applications for Historical Heritage Grant Program, consider applicant presentations on project proposals, conduct site visits, and provide funding recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a professional, active and educated historic preservation commission for Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Fulfill Certified Local Government requirements by participating in one and ideally two or more Commissioner workshops/training sessions. Including training on diversity and inclusivity. County Commissioners/staff to research trainings on historical resource.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, protect, preserve and enhance historic resources</td>
<td>Evaluate and recommend the designation of eligible properties as landmarks to the Board of Supervisors when landmark applications are initiated by property owners. Depending on funding, the Commission could start to proactively survey and identify eligible properties rather than waiting for referrals from property owners. Continue to update and maintain the list of County-owned structures with historical significance. Identify, inventory and monitor County-owned historic structures in need of immediate preservation/rehabilitation or restoration. Contact Heritage Resource Inventory property owners to inquire about consent for designating properties as County Landmarks and provide information about the Mills Act and other benefits of designation. Hear reports from the HHC representative to the CSG and staff, and to review the product and recommendations from the San Juan Hill neighborhood survey by ESA as commissioned by the Planning Department at the request of the Board of Supervisors. Request staff to plan for the HHC to hear directly from ESA. Proactively review the County’s Historic Inventory List for properties that may be moved to protected landmark status. Prioritize select properties and contact the owners to solicit approval of converting listings to “landmark” status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department and with the Parks and Recreation Commission to preserve historic structures within County parklands.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively review the survey conducted by the recent Stanford GUP and move the properties identified in the survey onto the HRI and/or landmark designation.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote public knowledge, participation, understanding and appreciation of Santa Clara County’s rich and diverse history and sense of place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Historic Preservation Month (May) activities to help raise awareness of historic preservation issues.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, initiate and collaborate with other County departments and organizations to promote and enhance knowledge of the history and cultural heritage of Santa Clara County. Coordinate and work with local communities to promote historical heritage awareness.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ONGOING DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES/PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advise the Board on matters of County history and the preservation of historic resources</td>
<td>Respond to inquiries from the Board of Supervisors, Department of Planning and Development, Parks and Recreation Department, or other departments as appropriate regarding County history and historic preservation issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Act Contracts</td>
<td>Consider Mills Act applications as received and make recommendations to the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Public Relations</td>
<td>Support an active and creative program of public education, maintain and enhance historic preservation web page and develop brochures and other publications related to County history, historic preservation and the Commission, and provide recommendations for County-related historic displays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support County Archives</td>
<td>Provide a Commission member liaison as requested to participate in the County Archives Committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Unused Structures Inventory</td>
<td>Provide recommendations to Parks and Recreation Department on documentation of unused structures on County Parklands and treatment of historic resources on County Parklands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FISCAL YEAR 2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS (July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING GOAL</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage, through public and private action and collaboration with other organizations, the maintenance and rehabilitation of historic resources</td>
<td>Evaluated applications for Historical Heritage Grant Program (HHGP) and provided funding recommendations to the Board.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Maintain a professional, active and educated historic preservation commission for Santa Clara County | Submittal of Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report  
Discussed requirements to maintain CLG certification | June 30, 2020  
Summary 2019 and December 16, 2019                                                                                                                  |
| Identify, protect, preserve and enhance historic resources.                     | Created Ad-Hoc Committees to evaluate potential historical resources throughout the County of Santa Clara.  
Recommend to the Board of Supervisors the designation of landmark-eligible properties as initiated by property owners.  
Prepare a list of County-owned Landmarks and identify those in need of immediate preservation/rehabilitation or restoration efforts and forward recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.  
Identify and recommend updates to historic context statement (per Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines for Historic Context Statement) for Santa Clara County and forward recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. | August 2019  
Ongoing  
Ongoing  
Ongoing                                                                                                               |
| Promote public knowledge, participation, understanding and appreciation of Santa Clara County’s rich history and sense of place. | Support Historic Preservation Month activities to raise awareness of historic preservation.  
Grant recipients of the Historical Heritage Grant Program presented to the Commission; the successful completion of restoration/preservation works to historic resources in the Santa Clara Valley. | Ongoing  
(Roll-over from FY 2020-2021, pending)                                                                                         |
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION (PRC)

FISCAL YEAR 2021 WORK-PLAN

AND

FISCAL YEAR 2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

ANN WALTONSMITH – CHAIR
CHRIS KANGAS – VICE CHAIR
STEVE MUNZEL
DAN MCCORQUODALE
JOE MITCHNER
FRANK SORIANO
MICHELE VAN ZUIDEN
**PRC MISSION STATEMENT:**

To advocate, advise, consent, make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors (BOS), and represent the community for the purpose of protecting and preserving regional parklands for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations.

**PRC HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:**

The BOS established the Parks Commission on August 29, 1956 in accordance with the Santa Clara County Ordinance NS-300.10. The PRC is composed of seven (7) members appointed by the BOS, one from each supervisory district and two at-large appointees. The term of each member is four years.

The PRC provides an open forum for the public input regarding the land use and recreational opportunities. It also serves as a liaison between the Parks and Recreation Department and the BOS.

Over the years the PRC has acted in an advisory capacity to the BOS in promoting, adding, planning, and developing public parklands. Additionally, the PRC has made recommendations to the BOS on the acquisition, planning, and development of recreation areas and facilities such as, picnic areas, campsites, and trails.

Members of the PRC participate in several ad-hoc committees with focus areas relating to park naming, marketing, funding, acquisition, trails, and master plans. Commissioners are active in serving as liaisons between the Parks and Recreation Department and several public agencies.
## Fiscal Year 2021 Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Objective</th>
<th>Proposed Activities</th>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
<th>Timeline for Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget review</td>
<td>To review, consider and endorse recommend CIP budget for FY 2021.</td>
<td>High (1)</td>
<td>Early Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning projects: (Master Plans, Conceptual Plans, Site Plans, Trail Plans…)</th>
<th>To review, consider and provide input on key milestones in planning projects that have undergone a public review and input process. These milestones include Draft Program Document, Preferred Alternatives, Draft Park Plan, and Final Plan (i.e. Master Plan, Trails Master Plan, Natural Resources Management Plan, Park Use Plan, etc.) Future work plan items for the Commission’s review and input include:</th>
<th>Normal (3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Joseph D. Grant County Park Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Normal (3)</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Martial Cottle Park (MCP) Life Estate Site Plan</td>
<td>Normal (3)</td>
<td>Winter 2020/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

2/10/2020
## PRIOR YEAR (FY 2019) ACCOMPLISHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING GOAL</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget review</td>
<td>PRC reviewed, considered, and endorsed recommended CIP budget for final Department’s inclusion in the FY 2020 budget approved by the BOS in June 2019.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ON GOING PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL/OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING GOAL</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard report review | PRC reviewed the following reports:  
1. Environmental impact updates  
2. Revenue updates  
3. Special events status updates  
4. Summary of BOS actions related to Parks and Recreation Department  
5. Legislative updates  
6. Oral reports from the Director of Parks and Recreation Department  
7. Oral agency and community liaison updates  
8. Oral committee updates | Ongoing |
| Public recognitions | Staff and/or Commission public recognition of volunteer groups, members of the public, or staff for outstanding service and contribution. | Ongoing |
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
Planning Commission

Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2021
(July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021)

and

Accomplishments for Fiscal Year 2020
(July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020)

Commissioners:
Aimee Escobar, Chairperson
Vicki Moore, Vice Chairperson
Marc Rauser
Kathryn Schmidt
Erin Gil
Bob Levy
Gabriella Chavez-Lopez
Aaron Resendez (Resigned December 2019)
MISSION STATEMENT:
The Santa Clara County Planning Commission is a seven-member body of community representatives appointed by the Board of Supervisors. It is the primary decision-making authority for certain development applications, and it advises the Board of Supervisors on various land use policy matters.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
State law and local ordinance prescribe the roles and responsibilities of the Planning Commission. In general, state law defines a planning commission as a committee appointed by the elected legislative body (Board of Supervisors) to review matters related to planning and development and as a general advisory body on land use planning. Santa Clara County ordinances, together with applicable provisions of state planning law, define the roles and responsibilities of the Commission as follows:

- Hold public hearings and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding proposals to adopt or amend the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, adopt or amend specific plans, and change zoning districts.
- Conduct workshops, open to the public (generally on the day of each regularly scheduled monthly meeting), for the purpose of studying, evaluating, and facilitating decision-making regarding items scheduled for public hearings, or with relevance to land use.
- Serve as decision-making authority for use permits and major subdivisions.
- Serve as hearing body for appeals of decisions of the Planning Director and the Zoning Administrator.
- Provide Zoning Ordinance interpretations.
- One member serves as a member of the South County Joint Planning Advisory Committee.
- One member of the Planning Commission serves as a Director of the CordeValle Youth Golf Foundation.
FISCAL YEAR 2021 WORK PLAN

• Schedule, notice, and conduct monthly meetings (usually held on the 4th Thursday of each month) for the purpose of carrying out the roles and responsibilities described within this Work Plan.

• Conduct workshops, open to the public (generally on the day of each regularly scheduled monthly meeting), for the purpose of studying, evaluating, and facilitating decision-making regarding items scheduled for public hearings, or with relevance to land use. These workshops serve to educate the Planning Commissioners about County planning policies, legal requirements, department procedures, and work programs. Workshop topics may include the following and other topics as suggested throughout the year.

  o Brown Act/ Robert’s Rules of Order
  o CEQA/Housing Legislative Updates
  o RHNA Allocation/ Housing Element
  o CEQA Updates Study Session
    - Changes in Transportation Analysis from Level of Service (LoS) to Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT), effective July 1, 2020
    - Wildfire Impact Analysis
  o County’s General Plan Update
  o Stanford Community Plan Update
  o San Martin Vision Plan Options
  o Regional Efforts on Sustainability that would inform the General Plan Update
    - Plan Bay Area 2040
    - Santa Clara Valley Water District One Water Program
    - Open Space Authority’s Santa Clara Valley Greenprint
    - Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan / Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan
    - County Sustainability Master Plan
  o Water Systems in Santa Clara County
  o San Juan Historic Review and Development Standards
  o Rural Development Standards (formerly Local-Serving Standards)
- Ordinance Updates for Equestrian Uses
- Tree Ordinance Workshop
- Role of the Local Agency Formation Commission and urban growth boundaries as they relate to Santa Clara County growth management policies.
- Study session relating to Surface Mining and Reclamation Act and significant environmental issues surrounding quarries.
- Surface Mining and Reclamation Act Workshop (Mobile)

- Request representation on any subcommittees or working groups created during a General Plan Update.

- Attend the virtual American Planning Association California Conference in September 2021.
FISCAL YEAR 2020 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Forwarded to the Board of Supervisors recommendations on the following:

- Proposed zoning map amendment to County of Santa Clara Zoning Ordinance Section 1.20.060 to re-zone 597 MacArthur Avenue, San Jose from OA (Administrative/Professional Office) to R1 (One-Family Residence).
- Proposed text amendments to various sections of County of Santa Clara Ordinance Code Appendix I (Zoning) for the purpose of regulating Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in accordance with State law, including Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs) and Movable Tiny Homes.
- Proposed text amendments to County of Santa Clara Ordinance Code Appendix I (Zoning) relating to Industrial Hemp regulations for unincorporated Santa Clara County.
- Proposed text amendments to County of Santa Clara Ordinance Code Appendix I (Zoning) relating to increasing the available options and flexibility for agricultural employee housing and streamlining the permitting process for such housing.
- Proposed Cemetery Permit application for the Cordoba Center Project.

Accepted required status reports for the following approved uses:

- Stanford University General Use Permit for reporting period September 1, 2017 through August 31, 2018.
- Annual Status Report No. 7 for period July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 relating to compliance by Lehigh Southwest Cement Company with the 2012 Reclamation Plan Amendment conditions of approval, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, annual Surface Mining and Reclamation Act inspections, and financial assurance cost estimates for the Permanente Quarry.
- Annual report for Calendar Year 2019 relating to compliance with conditions of approval for Stevens Creek Quarry.

Decided Appeals of decisions of the Zoning Administrator:


Decided and made determinations for the following land use projects:

- Use Permit, Architecture and Site Approval, and Grading Approval for a Contractor’s Facility, subject to a categorical exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- Modifications to Use Permit, Architecture and Site Approval, and Grading Approval for the Conservation Center for Wildlife Care project, previously approved by the Planning Commission on November 20, 2014, including relocation of three previously approved wildlife habitat enclosures, removal of two previously approved enclosures, modification of water tanks and retaining wall design, and modification of grading quantities.
- Use Permit, Architecture and Site Approval, Design Review, Building Site Approval, Grading Approval, and Environmental Impact Report relating to a proposed Religious Institution and Cemetery development (the Cordoba Center Project).
- A Tentative Map, Cluster Permit, and Grading Approval for a 24-lot subdivision.
- Use Permit, Architecture and Site Approval, and Grading Approval for a Retail Sales and Services – General facility, with ancillary Indoor Warehousing and Storage use for the sale of granite, tile, and other indoor and outdoor stone products; and, Building Site Approval for a single-family residence. CEQA: Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- Use Permit, Architecture and Site Approval (ASA), and Grading Approval relating to a permanent Agricultural Employee Housing facility. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): Categorical exemption under Section 15301, Class 1, of the CEQA Guidelines.
- Design Review and Grading Approval relating to a new 32,044 gross square-foot single-family dwelling (Tier 3 Design Review) and 1,141 square-foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) on a 2.42-acre site. Estimated grading quantities outside the footprint of the residence and ADU are 1,075 cubic yards of cut and 1,520 cubic yards of fill. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): Exempt pursuant to Section 15303 (Class 3a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Convened Workshops and Training regarding the following topics:

- Receive report from Code Enforcement Program Manager, Department of Planning and Development, relating to code enforcement processes and procedures.
- Study session relating to affordable housing impact mitigation fees and proposed inclusionary housing ordinance regarding Stanford University Community Plan.
- Study session relating to proposed amendments to Recreational Vehicle Park regulations in unincorporated Santa Clara County.
- Study session relating to proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments to replace local-serving provisions with land development standards.

Attended the following conferences:

- American Planning Association California Conference in September 2019 (Santa Barbara, California)
DATE: October 15, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Jo Zientek, Director, Consumer/Environmental Protection Agency
SUBJECT: Customer Rate Increase Outreach and Protests - County Unincorporated Garbage District West

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to outreach and protests for the September 1, 2020 GreenTeam of San Jose customer rate increase for unincorporated County District West. (Referral from August 25, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 8a)

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no fiscal impacts to the General Fund as a result of the Recommended Action.

CONTRACT HISTORY
Refer to Legislative File #101743.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
This report responds to a referral from Supervisor Simitian approved by the Board on August 25, 2020 (Item No. 8b). This referral to the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation (HLUET) Committee is an update on the resolution of issues raised by 14 customers who protested in response to the rate increase notice that the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA) sent in summer 2020.

Staff sent the notice and supplemental public outreach to all 6,950 customers following the Board’s approval on June 23, 2020 of Extraordinary Cost compensation to GreenTeam of San Jose (GreenTeam) for Unincorporated District West solid waste service. Staff and GreenTeam implemented extensive outreach to all impacted customers which are detailed in the Background section of this report.

Staff and the Clerk of the Board received 13 written and one verbal protest to the notice. Staff reached out to all protesters regarding their concerns and received seven customer requests to discuss questions and concerns. These outcomes are summarized in the table below.
## Unincorporated District West 2020 Rate Notice Protests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Supervisor District</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>GreenTeam/Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer rarely put out garbage, but pays full price, limited vacation credits—would like discount</td>
<td>Explained mandatory service is required for public health and safety per County Ordinance (Ord. No. NS-517.72, § 2, 4-15-03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rate increases higher than inflation; GreenTeam should audit accounts to charge all customers correctly, and should enforce for customer contamination of recyclables</td>
<td>Explained phased rate increases were used in current contracts to buffer one large rate to bring rates to full cost recovery; provided information on recyclables contamination education and enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unhappy about COVID-19 suspension of Bulky Item Collection and Clean-up events</td>
<td>Bulky collection and curbside clean ups resumed in August; clean-up event alternatives being piloted to ensure safe resumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confusion about service compared to neighbors served by different collection contracts, including Clean-up events. Long call hold times with GreenTeam customer service were also reported</td>
<td>GreenTeam supervisor responded to service questions; GreenTeam has hired another full-time dedicated staff person to reduce hold times; clean-up event alternatives being piloted for safe resumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduced services under COVID-19 should reduce costs to customers</td>
<td>Explained added safety activities for haulers, which require additional staff effort, response time, and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preferred previous hauler, Recology</td>
<td>Explained that Recology did not bid to provide services in GreenTeam district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>COVID-19 impacts make rate increase timing incorrect. County should re-bid contract</td>
<td>Explained contractual process for rate increases, and process for new 2025 contracts which will provide new bid opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Multiple missed pickups, slow customer</td>
<td>Staff reached out to resident,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Service differences with neighboring communities including loose yard trimmings</td>
<td>Staff reached out to resident, but resident did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multiple increases in utility rates are hard on seniors with limited income</td>
<td>Staff reached out to resident, but resident did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GreenTeam should look for alternatives for recyclables. Retiree with limited income</td>
<td>Staff reached out to resident, but resident did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor timing with COVID-19, GreenTeam should reduce their costs during this time</td>
<td>Staff reached out to resident, but resident did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Protest rate increase</td>
<td>Staff reached out to resident, but resident did not respond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff followed-up on all customer requests. In every situation, the customer reported that they had a better understanding of the reason for the rate increase and the changes to service conditions under COVID-19. GreenTeam received the protest information and immediately responded to concerns over long hold times by adding another customer service representative. There were two customers with specific service requests that were transferred to GreenTeam for resolution. CEPA will continue with ongoing follow-up of the customer service concerns, including the use of a customer survey in 2021.

**CHILD IMPACT**

The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

**SENIOR IMPACT**

The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

**BACKGROUND**

On June 23 (Item No. 45), the Board considered recommendations regarding Extraordinary Cost Compensation requests from Recology and GreenTeam for Unincorporated Solid Waste Franchise Agreements for Garbage Collection Districts East and West. At the meeting, Supervisor Simitian requested increased outreach to District West customers regarding the standard annual rate adjustment and the extraordinary rate increase Public Hearing at the August 25 Board meeting. California Constitution Article XIII C and Article XIII D created by the passage in 1996 of Proposition 218 requires a mailed notification letter to every affected property owner 45 days before a Public Hearing, detailing the reasons for the rate
increase, and the opportunity to participate in a public hearing or written protest. In addition to this notification requirement, staff implemented the following:

- July 10 – Launched specifically designed rate website: [www.SCCDistrictWestRates.org](http://www.SCCDistrictWestRates.org);

- August 1 - GreenTeam mailed County-approved color 6”x10” postcard (attached) to all properties using the same mailing list as the Proposition 218 notices;

- August Customer Bills - GreenTeam message on August billings promoted the rate website to all ratepayers; and

- August 21 - GreenTeam sent 4,033 emails and 2,075 robocalls reminding property owners who had provided GreenTeam with this contact information about the public meeting.

As a result of those strategies, the following response was received:

- 194 visits to the [www.SCCDistrictWestRates.org](http://www.SCCDistrictWestRates.org) website;

- 12 views of Proposition 218 Notice translated in Spanish;

- Ten views of Proposition 218 Notice translated in Vietnamese; and

Eight phone calls to the County for more information about specific customer rates, which were followed up by GreenTeam customer service staff.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The HLUET Committee would not receive this report.

**LINKS:**

- References: 101743 : 101743
  Recommendation to proceed with Prop 218 noticing

- References: 101914 : 101914
  Approval of proposed rate increase for District West

- References: 101912 : 101912
  Request for report on outreach and protest response

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Formal 218 protests - Final - GT Rate increase  (PDF)

- RWRD Final 218 Flier  (PDF)
I have just read the proposal for increasing the rates for our garbage service. I wish to not only protest for this rate change, but also use this occasion to express my disgust with the service that we in the unincorporated districts are receiving. We are living in times of distress in which most of us are sheltering in place due to COVID. Among many side effects, this does also mean that we are all at home producing more waste. What has been the response from you and the waste company? Increase the service? No! In fact, service has been reduced! We have not had a single Yard Cleaning day since Shelter In Place started. I understand there are health concerns. What I don’t understand is how we cannot get curb pickup as our neighbors two streets down. Are we paying less taxes and deserve worse service? Are we second citizens just because we live in an unincorporated area? What are we expected to do with the excess waste that we are producing in these difficult times?

With this context in mind I find it completely unacceptable that you propose a rate increase. I urge you to pull it back and to also please consider a better service for us during these times.

July 17th, 2020
16540 Camellia Ter, Los Gatos
Xavier Amatriain
Dear Clerk,

Please see my attached .PDF opposition to the GreenTeam proposed rate adjustment, and, a copy of a related 2016 determination by the county EPA. It should be directed to the particular attention of Board Operations, per your recent postal mailing. Please acknowledge receipt of this message and the two attachments. Thank you very much!

Best,

Darren
FROM THE DESK OF DARREN EASTMAN

27 July 2020

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Board Operations
70 W. Hedding Street, 10th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110

Board Operations,

I respectfully oppose the proposed GreenTeam rate increase. I’ve had 7 occurrences this year where bins weren’t serviced, with 8 in 2019. Calling the company often results in the employee hanging up; particularly if you ask if they can see your previous calls. The bins aren’t always serviced the next day. They refuse to issue any billing credit and will hang up if asked.

When GreenTeam received the current contract, it attempted to raise rates because the area was “difficult to service.” This was a simple extortion attempt foiled only by multiple residents causing Senator Jim Beall’s office to intervene—declaring no such difficulty. My letter to my BOS member was unanswered. Moreover, I don’t recall such issues with the previous franchisee. GreenTeam has breached contract and should be released. If the preceding franchisee was petitioning for a rate increase, I’d not oppose.

Thank you very much!

Best,

/s Darren Eastman

DARREN EASTMAN

21446 ONEDA COURT
LOS GATOS, CALIFORNIA 95033
January 12, 2016

Darren Eastman
21446 Oneda Court
Los Gatos, CA 95033

RE: COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA HARD-TO-SERVE DETERMINATION APPEAL

Dear Darren Eastman,

Thank you for submitting your Hard-to-Serve Designation Appeal.

The Department of Environmental Health Local Enforcement Agency for the Solid Waste Program assessed the geographical location of your service address and determined that your property located at 21446 Oneda Court in Los Gatos does not meet the criteria for the Hard-to-Serve designation. The collection location of your carts does not preclude the use of a standard size collection vehicle and can be reasonably served (Sec. B11-186) by GreenTeam of San Jose. Please continue to place your carts in the designated cart location for collection and return them to your property within 24 hours of collection (Sec. B11-189 (g)).

Sec. B11-186. - Mandatory garbage collection service; collector responsibility. Permitted collectors are required to collect from all garbage producers in the collector's designated territory. The collector must provide collection service to all garbage producers that can be reasonably served, except as otherwise exempted pursuant to Section B11-185.

Sec. B11-189. - Refuse container requirements (g) Containers must be placed for collection not more than 24 hours preceding the scheduled collection time. Placement times and collection locations also apply to uncontained wastes such as yardwaste, cardboard and other recyclable wastes. It is the responsibility of the occupant of the premises producing the refuse to remove all containers from the curb, roadside or collection station within 24 hours after collection. Following removal, containers must be stored in a less conspicuous area of the premises so as not to create a nuisance to the occupants of neighboring premises.

We have therefore determined that you are entitled to basic-rate service. We will provide GreenTeam of San Jose with a copy of this letter and they will credit your account from July 1, 2015 to the end of the current billing cycle.

All decisions made by this department are final.

Thank you,

Jim Blamey
Director, Department of Environmental Health
To Whom it May Concern.

I received a letter concerning the rate hike proposal a day before I spent over 30 minutes trying to connect with Customer Service at Green Team of San Jose.

Our Spring Clean was cancelled this year due to Covid-19 quite understandably, but a neighbor received a flyer indicating that we were going to get a curbside clean up today July 15th. According to the Next Door posting, she called and had it confirmed by the company. I was thrilled, as we only get bins compared to the town of Los Gatos which gets much better service with the community clean up.

I called the company and as I said had to wait 30 minutes to get a human. I wanted to know if they were taking electronic waste. She checked my address and said No there was no pickup. I explained that my neighbor, also in unincorporated Los Gatos, received a flyer in the mail and had posted to all of us and had confirmed it with the company. The representative was very nice, but reiterated that again there would be no pick up today other than the usual garbage. I said that they were going to get a lot of calls because this incorrect information was out.

Why is it that there was no date reset for the unincorporated areas of the county for pick-up? Why would you send flyers to the wrong houses? Why do we not get curbside pick up when the houses five doors down from us do?

It is very disappointing to see these rate increases when we haven't even received the minimum that we were contracted for and yet the houses next to us have all the benefits.

I recognize that the County of Santa Clara bargains differently from the Town of Los Gatos, but we used to have the same twice yearly curb pickup which was very handy. This trying to haul stuff to the bins is difficult and time consuming.

I don't want a rate increase. I want curbside pick up the way we used to have and I want the spring clean up done now.

Thank you.

Eleanor Gallmeister
Sorry about that. Our address is 16210 Lilac Ln. Los Gatos, CA 95032 and what I really want is a curb-side clean up since ours was cancelled.

Eleanor

On Thursday, July 16, 2020, 11:25:37 AM PDT, SCC Reduce Waste <sccreduce.waste@cep.sccgov.org> wrote:

Hi Ms. Gallmeister,

We received your email in regards to protesting the garbage rate hike for unincorporated Los Gatos. For the protest to be officially counted, we need your address.

Let me know if you have any questions – Clif

Clifton Chew
Management Analyst
County of Santa Clara
1555 Berger Dr., Bldg #2, Suite 300
San Jose, CA 95112
phone: 669-210-5067

NOTICE:

This email message and/or its attachments may contain information that is confidential or restricted. It is intended only for the individuals named as recipients in the message. If you are NOT an authorized recipient, you are prohibited from using, delivering, distributing, printing, copying, or disclosing the message or content to others and must delete the message from your computer. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by return email.
To Whom it May Concern.

I received a letter concerning the rate hike proposal a day before I spent over 30 minutes trying to connect with Customer Service at Green Team of San Jose.

Our Spring Clean was cancelled this year due to Covid-19 quite understandably, but a neighbor received a flyer indicating that we were going to get a curbside clean up today July 15th. According to the Next Door posting, she called and had it confirmed by the company. I was thrilled, as we only get bins compared to the town of Los Gatos which gets much better service with the community clean up.

I called the company and as I said had to wait 30 minutes to get a human. I wanted to know if they were taking electronic waste. She checked my address and said No there was no pickup. I explained that my neighbor, also in unincorporated Los Gatos, received a flyer in the mail and had posted to all of us and had confirmed it with the company. The representative was very nice, but reiterated that again there would be no pick up today other than the usual garbage. I said that they were going to get a lot of calls because this incorrect information was out.

Why is it that there was no date reset for the unincorporated areas of the county for pick-up? Why would you send flyers to the wrong houses? Why do we not get curbside pick up when the houses five doors down from us do?

It is very disappointing to see these rate increases when we haven't even received the minimum that we were contracted for and yet the houses next to us have all the benefits.

I recognize that the County of Santa Clara bargains differently from the Town of Los Gatos, but we used to have the same twice yearly curb pickup which was very handy. This trying to haul stuff to the bins is difficult and time consuming.

I don't want a rate increase. I want curbside pick up the way we used to have and I want the spring clean up done now.

Thank you.

Eleanor Gallmeister
From: Matt Larson
To: SCC Reduce Waste
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Protest letter - garbage rates
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 7:12:48 PM
Attachments: Protest Letter - Garbage Rates.pdf

Please reply to confirm receipt
Matthew Larson  
16981 McGill Rd  
Saratoga, CA 95070  
(408) 834-3558  
mlarson100@yahoo.com

15th July 2020

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
Attn: Board Operations

Dear Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

I’m writing to protest the proposed garbage rate increase for the Garbage District West.

I would ask that GreenTeam wishes to adjust rates, that the garbage service be re-bid in order to ensure the best value for the County Residents. While it’s understandable that costs may have increased, that is part of the competitive business environment. I’m sure that if the costs had decreased, GreenTeam would not be approaching the County to offer the savings back to residents. GreenTeam should bear the risk of these costs, and work to control them and find alternatives to reduce costs. As residents who are forced to use this service (we are unable to opt out of garbage service per county rules), we should not bear the costs of a changing business environment.

Also, it’s unclear why the county is asking these protest letters to be attachments to emails, rather than just emails. It appears that the county is attempting to put in place barriers to these protests, as writing an attachment letter is more difficult and time consuming than writing and email. The letter from the county was also worded to defend the position of GreenTeam, when instead the county should be advocating for the rate payer. I’d like a response from the county indicating why an attachment to email was required.

In this time of economic uncertainty, many residents have been negatively impacted by Covid related closures. This is not the time to place additional burden on rate payers.

Sincerely,

Matthew Larson
To the county board of supervisors.

I protest the rate increase because our residence is not receiving the same level of service as other nearby neighborhoods.

In early July, 2020 I called to arrange for a free large trash pickup as we are entitled to 2 per year and was told they have suspended that service in my area due to Covid-19.

While I understand that - what I don't understand is that down the hill for me and nearby in Monte Sereno and Los Gatos they provided a Summer Large trash pick up service for those areas but not mine.

Why must I pay increased rates when I am not receiving the same service as others - even in the times of Covid-19?

Thank you,

EP Sheikh
19630 Canon Drive
Los Gatos, CA 95030
August 2020
Board of Supervisors,

I am protesting the scheduled garbage rate increase by Green Team for Garbage District West. Vote NO.

This method makes Green Team profitable without considering better alternatives or the customer's recycling needs.

1) Although Green Team may NOT have known about China's National Sword policy for importing recycled materials until 2018, they failed to consider or develop other ways to correct the problem after this date.

SEE attachment for solutions to the recycling problem in Santa Clara County and the U.S.

2) I am retired ON A FIXED INCOME, but very active with several not-for-profit and volunteer groups. I donate a lot of my time and effort, but do not have the money to waste on failed methods.

Please reply before the vote - contact me by email. I would be interested in your thoughts about developing a STRONG local recycling program.

William Shepard 14696 Nelson Way, San Jose, CA 95124
To Whom It May Concern:
Please accept my letter of protest of the proposed Green Team rate increase.

~Adam Silverman
1087 Empey Way
San Jose, CA 95128

7/24/2020
To: Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors and County Executive

From: Adam R. Silverman
       1087 Empey Way
       San Jose, CA 95128

Date: 7/24/2020

RE: Protest of proposed rate increase for garbage, recycling and yard waste collection services

Madam(s)/Sir(s),

I am writing in protest of the proposed rate increases for garbage, recycling and yard waste collection services. Rather than long winded prose, let me summarize the issues I have with the proposal:

1. It is tone deaf! During this pandemic which has resulted in significant financial hardship and required belt tightening on behalf of most of us, this proposal is poorly timed and at odds with our overall community ethic of taking care of one another. Businesses are closing, jobs are being lost. Public and private organizations all need to play their part in not exacerbating the financial impact of COVID-19.

2. I don’t see a financial justification that overrides #1. I see no evidence of belt tightening at the Green Team. Have executives reduced their compensation? Have they reduced waste and inefficiency in their processes to make up for their reported financial shortfall from rising recycling costs? And surely there has been a financial benefit to their bottom line from other sources as a result of the pandemic, i.e., reduced fuel costs, financial support programs and low interest rates.

3. The cited independent auditors report is not provided and therefore cannot be publicly corroborated.

4. Green Team’s customer service is abysmal. When I moved to San Jose a year ago, it took 4 phone calls, 3 emails and 2 weeks to establish service. I was finally able to connect only after spending 64 minutes on hold. This is not something that should be rewarded.

Thank you for considering my protest!

Sincerely,

Adam R. Silverman
1087 Empey Way
San Jose, CA 95128
This is outrageous. I've called the Board many times because of the poor service of this company. I live alone and only take my garbage bin or recycling bin up to the main road once a month and yet I have to pay for a full month's service. They only allow a two months' vacation credit as well. Do they think people are made of money, especially now with so many people out of work? FIND ANOTHER LESS GREEDY COMPANY. Ron Tomich, PO Box 620, Redwood Estates CA 95044. (408) 353-1006.
Board of Supervisors -

At this point in time when families are struggling to make ends meet, many without jobs due to the requirements presented by COVID-19 to even consider raising rates is to completely disregard the well being of your Constituents.

Perhaps the rates should be increased but this is certainly not the time. Just like everyone else Green Team can tighten it’s belt.

I am actually ashamed that this email even needed to be sent. That any reminder of the hardship so many families are suffering needs to be pointed out to a group who is supposed to be looking out for the residents best interest.

Please do not pass this at this time.

Thank you,

Kathryn M. Torre

430 Hodges Avenue

San Jose, CA 95128

They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

Benjamin Franklin
To The County Board of Supervisors,

I protest the rate increase for Green Team. Our monthly expenses are overwhelming and increasing frequently for all residential utilities and services. Green Team needs to reduce their budget and operating expenses. They should be audited and have the ability to cut their budget and not push the rate increases onto already suffering residents.

Zuzanka Vosky
August 8, 2014
15970 Longwood Dr.
Los Gatos, CA 95032
County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,
Please consider the attached as my written protest for the public hearing scheduled for tomorrow.

Regards,
Erika Murphy
21790 Bertram Rd.
San Jose, CA 95120
August 24, 2020

Clerk of the Board
Attn: Board Operations
70 W. Hedding St., 10th Floor
East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

RE: Written Protest of Garbage, Recycling, and Yard Waste Rate Increase for Unincorporated Garbage District West

To Whom It May Concern,

Consider this letter my protest of the proposed rate increase for Garbage, Recycling, and Yard Waste for Unincorporated Garbage District West. Our rates have increased by nearly 35% over the last 5 years, with the most recent increase just taking effect this June. Meanwhile, the rate of inflation has only been 10% over the same period.

I would argue Green Team isn’t doing their job and this is contributing to their increasing costs.

I called to report a neighbor in my neighborhood for repeatedly not using their green waste and recycle cans for the correct materials. I had hoped that Green Team would educate the neighbor on the correct use of these cans and/or educate their drivers to refuse pick-up. I have to imagine contaminated recycle and green waste cans costs Green Team additional money to resolve at the recycling sites.

After repeated calls to Green Team, it came to light that this neighbor had not been paying any collection fees since the County’s last service provider switch to Green Team several years ago. So not only was this customer costing us all more money by not using the cans as designed, but they were not even paying for basic service. I understand the neighbor now has an account; however, it doesn’t appear that any education was provided to prevent the mis-use by the neighbor and there still doesn’t appear to be any enforcement of not picking up contaminated cans by Green Team.

Green Team needs to...

* Perform an audit of who they are collecting from to ensure they are paying customers and develop a process for monitoring this on an ongoing basis.

* Train their team on what is acceptable to pick up and what is not. (I understand that there is not time to open everyone’s cans before picking them up; however, when they are overflowing with the incorrect materials in plain sight (i.e plastic and metal sticking out of green waste and large black garbage bags, yard tools, non-recyclable black garden containers, ski boots, etc sticking out of the blue recycle cans), then it should be easy to see without getting out.)
Until Green Team can ensure they can provide the above and ensure that I’m not footing the bill for people that get service without payment then I protest any further rate increases and I urge the County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors to hold Green Team accountable for the services they have selected them to provide for their constituents.

Regards,

Erika Murphy

21790 Bertram Rd.

San Jose, CA 95120
> County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,
> Please see the attached addendum to my previously submitted protest.

Regards,
> Erika Murphy
> 21790 Bertram Rd.
> San Jose, CA 95120

> On Aug 24, 2020, at 4:20 PM, Erika Murphy <erikaemurphy@yahoo.com> wrote:
> County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,
> Please consider the attached as my written protest for the public hearing scheduled for tomorrow.
> <Protest Rate Increase.pdf>
> Regards,
> Erika Murphy
> 21790 Bertram Rd.
> San Jose, CA 95120
August 24, 2020

Clerk of the Board
Attn: Board Operations
70 W. Hedding St., 10th Floor
East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

RE: Addendum to Written Protest of Garbage, Recycling, and Yard Waste Rate Increase for Unincorporated Garbage District West

To Whom It May Concern,

Please consider an addendum to my previously submitted written protest of the proposed rate increase for Garbage, Recycling, and Yard Waste for Unincorporated Garbage District West.

In addition to our rates having increased by nearly 35% over the last 5 years while the rate of inflation has only been 10% over the same period. And in addition to the apparent lack of checks and balances within Green Team to ensure payment for services provided and enforcement for blatant mis-use of services. I would like to protest this rate increase on the basis that there has been no change in service provided and there are no household cleanup days offered for our location. The only household cleanup days that are offered for our location require a 30+ minute drive over Highway 17.

Regards,

Erika Murphy
21790 Bertram Rd.
San Jose, CA 95120
Please find attached my official protest letter. For the meeting scheduled for Tuesday, August 25th, 2020

Sincerely,
Stephen Barton
Property Owner
APN 331-10-051-00
August 24, 2020

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Attn: Board Operations
70 W. Hedding Street, 10th Floor,
East Wing
San José, CA 95110

Dear Sir/Madam:

**Re: Protest Against the Garbage, Recycling and Yard Waste Rate Increase**

I would like to record my protest against the proposed rate increase to be considered at the August 25th meeting.

I propose instead that the frequency of pickup be reduced. We find that our household is generating less waste than in days gone by. For example, for our household, we believe that:

- a garbage bin pickup every 2\textsuperscript{nd} week would be adequate
- a recycling bin pickup every 2\textsuperscript{nd} week or every 3\textsuperscript{rd} week would be adequate
- a yard waste bin pickup every 2\textsuperscript{nd} week would be adequate

With appropriate trip scheduling by the Green Team, the number of truck trips through each neighborhood would be reduced. This would give us the added benefit of reduced pollution from the truck exhausts. Reduced costs for the Green Team to operate fewer truck miles, of course.

My suggestion is that the County conduct a survey of the households to verify what level of service is felt to be desired. Perhaps send a questionnaire to each household with questions about the requested frequency of service?

Sincerely,

Stephen Barton
Property Owner
APN 331-10-051-00

1455 Topar Avenue
Los Altos, CA 94024-5943
APN 331-10-051-00
Trondic10@outlook.com
To whom it may concern,

I am writing to protest the proposed rate adjustment for garbage collection by GreenTeam. I find any increase in garbage collection rates completely unreasonable. Our rates already dramatically increased five years ago when the County change collection in our area from Recology to GreenTeam. Not only did our rates almost double, but the quality of service dropped dramatically, with missed garbage collection, garbage left on the side of the road, and hours waiting on hold to speak to someone in customer service (not to mention that they might offer to call you back and never do).

Somehow Recology was able to provide much better service at much lower prices. If GreenTeam is facing increased costs in the current environment, perhaps they should follow whatever Recology has been doing instead of sticking it to the County residents.

The whole situation has left the residents in this area with the feeling that the people responsible for the contract were not looking out for residents. Do not compound this by rewarding GreenTeam for their inefficiency by giving them even more money.

Regards,

-Eben Haber
17450 Stevens Canyon Road
Cupertino, CA 95014
APN 351-15-033
August 24, 2020

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Attn: Board Operations
70 W. Hedding Street, 10th Floor, East Wing
San José, CA 95110

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to protest the proposed rate adjustment for garbage collection by GreenTeam. I find any increase in garbage collection rates completely unreasonable. Our rates already dramatically increased five years ago when the County changed collection in our area from Recology to GreenTeam. Not only did our rates almost double, but the quality of service dropped dramatically, with missed garbage collection, garbage left on the side of the road, and hours waiting on hold to speak to someone in customer service (not to mention that they might offer to call you back and never do).

Somehow Recology was able to provide much better service at much lower prices. If GreenTeam is facing increased costs in the current environment, perhaps they should follow whatever Recology has been doing instead of sticking it to the County residents.

The whole situation has left the residents in this area with the feeling that the people responsible for the contract were not looking out for residents. Do not compound this by rewarding GreenTeam for their inefficiency by giving them even more money.

Regards,

-Eben Haber
17450 Stevens Canyon Road
Cupertino, CA 95014
APN 351-15-033
Dennis Liu  
18441 Hillview Drive  
Los Gatos, 95030  
July 20, 2020

To the County Board of Supervisors

I am protesting the proposed rate adjustment of the rate increase by Green Team for garbage service, this increase affects seniors the most and is one of many never ending increases in utilities, water and now garbage. In your letter you state “if market conditions improve, GreenTeam will refund service revenues to customers “, you know this will never occur so why state it? Also you are making this harder to vote no ( which is what this letter basically constitutes ) than voting in an election. Why don’t you make it easier because the majority of the people would not want an increase in rates. But count this as a definite no to raising rates.

Dennis Liu
Rate Adjustment Update for Unincorporated District West

Garbage, Recycling, and Yard Waste

August 2020 - Annual July 1 rate adjustment (based on consumer price index) will be included on garbage bills.

October 2020 - Special proposed September 1 rate adjustment (based on changes to international recycling markets) will be included on garbage bills.

The County has used existing fees to minimize this rate increase but reduced special rate increases are needed to continue to meet recycling goals.

Future increases from market changes will be limited to 1% per year, until the end of the contract in 2025.

For questions about your current rates or collection services, call GreenTeam Customer Service at (408) 283-8500
Upcoming Public Hearing

County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors
August 25, 2020
Proposed garbage, recycling, and yard waste rate changes for Unincorporated District West

BY VIRTUAL TELECONFERENCE ONLY

Notices available at:
Notificaciones disponibles en:
Thông báo có sẵn tại:

SCCDistrictWestRates.org
DATE: October 15, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Don Rocha, Director, Parks and Recreation Department
SUBJECT: Coyote Canyon Property Natural Resources Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Parks and Recreation Department relating to natural resources management on the Coyote Canyon Property.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
The Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee considered Coyote Canyon Natural Resources Management & Interim Access Plan (Plan) on October 31, 2019 (Item No. 4) and made a recommendation to forward the item to the Board of Supervisors with amendments. The Plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 10, 2019 (Item No. 78).

At the Committee’s request, the Department will report annually to the Committee for a period of three (3) years on the implementation of the Plan. The annual report will track implementation of recommendations from the Plan for the monitoring, protection, management and enhancement of natural resources, specifically monitoring of the grazing program, protecting wetlands and riparian areas, constructing wildlife-friendly fencing where appropriate, and monitoring impacts from public access on natural resources.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
The management of natural resources on the Coyote Canyon Property (Property) is funded annually through the Park Charter Fund and through credits available in the County’s grazing license with the cattle grazing operator.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
The Plan identified natural resource management and initial public access for the 2,741-acre Property, which connects Coyote Lake-Harvey Bear Ranch County Park, Anderson Lake County Park, and Henry Coe State Park. Under the Plan, the Department will eventually construct an approximately 10-mile trail network with varying characteristics, difficulties, and experiences.
The Department’s current land management practices promote healthy ecosystems that strengthen the region’s resilience to climate change and preserve sensitive species and their habitats. The Plan established a comprehensive natural resource management program that identifies and evaluates the existing land management regime, introduces adaptive management strategies to address potential impacts from public access, and guides management strategies for habitat enhancement and preservation.

There is currently no public access on the Property. Construction of new trails and conversion of existing ranch roads requires permit approval from several different agencies to protect natural resources. Construction is expected to begin in April 2021, with potential public access available in late 2021.

The Department prepared a technical memo, which is attached to this legislative file, on September 4, 2020 to support this report to the Committee. The technical memo addresses grazing and rangeland management, wildlife improvements, sensitive species monitoring, and fire risk reduction, as well as establishing and updating monitoring protocols and resource management strategies for the Property.

The Department’s most comprehensive land management tool for the Property is cattle grazing. At the May 5, 2020 meeting of the Board of Supervisors (Item No. 51), the Board approved and awarded a new five-year Grazing License Agreement to a new grazing operator, Agco Hay, to provide conservation grazing services and assist with rangeland management. The Department, California Conservation Corps, and grazing operator made considerable efforts to maintain existing infrastructure by repairing over 14,500 linear feet of barbed-wire fencing. No wildlife-friendly fencing was installed this year, but about 1,400 linear feet of hazardous, derelict fencing was removed that improved wildlife movement through the Property.

Over 12,500 linear feet of repaired fencing was along Coyote Creek, which is a tributary to Anderson Reservoir. The repaired fence was a priority of the Plan and completely separates cattle from this riparian area. Although no additional cattle troughs were installed as alternatives to surface water ponds, a spring box, water pump, and concrete trough are proposed next year to reduce cattle pressure on Windmill Pond.

In Summer 2020, a sensitive plant monitoring checklist and schedule was developed. The existing Santa Clara Valley dudleya populations, a species covered by the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan, were re-surveyed and additional populations were observed. Since the Property is not open for public recreation, there were no impacts from public access.

Fire risk reduction was a focal point of the Plan, particularly using strategic grazing to reduce fuel loads. In June and July 2020, cattle were rotated into pastures adjacent to residences in the Jackson Oaks neighborhood and Foothill Avenue. In addition, the Department partnered with the California Conservation Corps to establish defensible space around existing structures and a fuel break near the Property’s former residence off East Dunne Avenue.

**CHILD IMPACT**

The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

**SENIOR IMPACT**

Board of Supervisors: Mike Wasserman, Cindy Chavez, Dave Cortese, Susan Ellenberg, S. Joseph Simitian
County Executive: Jeffrey V. Smith
Agenda Date: October 15, 2020
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

**BACKGROUND**

On October 31, 2019, the Department presented the Draft Plan, Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Draft Revised Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan to the Committee (Item No. 4). Public comments during the meeting were largely in favor of public access on the Property but identified natural resource concerns associated with public access and cattle grazing. The Committee asked for periodic updates related to natural resources, including wildlife friendly fencing, wetland and riparian area protection, and grazing, and directed the Department to provide annual updates on those areas for a period of three (3) years after Plan approval.

At the December 10, 2019 meeting of the Board of Supervisors, the Board adopted the Plan and Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Item No. 78).

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

Failure to receive the report will conflict with the Committee’s direction for annual updates for three (3) years following approval of the Plan.

**STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL**

No further steps are required.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Coyote Canyon Technical Memo Sept 2020 (PDF)
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 4, 2020

TO: Jeremy Farr, Principal Planner

FROM: Jared Bond, Natural Resource Program Supervisor

SUBJECT: Annual Report to Housing Land Use, Environment & Transportation (HLUET) Committee on Improvements and Natural Resource Monitoring at Coyote Canyon

Purpose

This document provides an annual report on the progress and improvements made by the Natural Resource Program to Coyote Canyon between November 2019 and September 2020. To further the Department’s goal of natural resource protection this document also includes an update on the current monitoring protocols and resource management strategies for the property. The purpose of this document is to provide a summary of the natural resource activities completed by the Department to comply with the annual reporting requirements set forth by HLUET in October 2019.

Background

In April 2016, the Santa Clara County Parks & Recreation Department purchased the 2,741-acre property which borders Anderson Lake County Park and Coyote Lake-Harvey Bear Ranch County Park. The park also connects Henry W. Coe State Park, Palassou Ridge Preserve, and San Felipe Ranch. Since the purchase, the goal of the Department has been to manage the existing resources and provide public access to the property by 2020. The Coyote Canyon Natural Resource Management Plan & Interim Access Plan (NRMP & IAP) was adopted in 2019 to provide public access and recommendations for long-term preservation of natural resources within the property. During the plan approval process, the HULET committee required the Department to report on the Property’s improvements for the first three years. The annual reporting requirement is intended to provide updates on the monitoring, protection, management, and enhancement of natural resources, specifically monitoring of the grazing program, protecting...
wetlands and riparian areas, construction of wildlife-friendly fencing, and monitoring impacts from public access.

**Improvements Implemented in 2019-2020**

The following is a summary of the natural resource improvements completed. The Natural Resource Plan Implementation and Monitoring Checklist has been updated and is included as Attachment A.

**Grazing Improvements and Rangeland Management**

In Fall 2019, approximately 1,430 linear feet of remnant fence was removed on the west side of the property by the California Conservation Corps (CCC). In addition, the CCC also repaired approximately 2,085 linear feet of fence along the northern boundary of the property. Twenty-five boundary signs were placed across 3.5 miles of fence as part of the improvement project.

In May 2020, the Board of Supervisors approved and awarded a new five-year term Grazing License Agreement to a new grazing operator (Agco Hay) to provide conservation grazing services and assist with rangeland management.

In June 2020, approximately 12,672 linear feet of fence was repaired and patched by Agco Hay along the eastern portion of Windmill and Long Lake Pastures, spanning the entire east fence boundary of Coyote Creek. This fence repair and improvement was necessary to keep cattle out of Coyote Creek to reduce potential impacts to wetland and riparian areas. Fencing repairs were also completed along the northern property boundary adjacent to the Jackson Oaks community to prevent and reduce cattle escapes onto private property.

In July 2020, Agco Hay was approved to grade existing roads to help maintain road infrastructure and access to the property. Due to wildfire activity in the area the project was not initiated. It is anticipated that the project will resume in Fall 2020 when conditions are appropriate to support such actions.

In September 2020, Agco Hay will install a solar pump at the Windmill Pond to bring water from the existing spring box to a 5,000-gallon poly water storage tank. This tank will run water to a concrete trough located at Windmill Pasture, which will improve conservation grazing at this pasture and adjacent pastures and reduce impacts from cattle using the pond as a water source.

**Wildlife Improvements**

The approximately 1,430 linear feet of fence removed by the CCC in Fall 2019 improved wildlife connectivity and has reduce impediments to wildlife movement on the property.

In July 2020 pond turtle basking platforms and camera traps were installed in Wigeon Pond and Two Gates Pond. Images from the camera traps are checked periodically. As of August 2020, western pond turtles have not been observed at the ponds.

**Sensitive Plant Species Monitoring and Management**

In summer 2020 the Santa Clara Valley dudleya population in Zone 1 of the property was revisited and additional populations were surveyed and located within Zone 4.
New data points were collected and imported to the GIS database. A Sensitive Plant Monitoring Checklist and schedule was developed in summer of 2020 and will be used to track data and monitoring populations.

**Fire Risk Reduction**

In Fall 2019 the CCC help establish defensible space around existing structures and established a fuel break at the East Dunne Complex/Orchard (6.5 acres). In June 2020 cattle were rotated into Front, Bull, and Middle Pastures for fuel management and fire risk reduction. In July 2020 cattle were rotated into smaller Windmill Pasture to target the fuels adjacent to the Jackson Oaks neighborhood.

**Development of Biological Monitoring Priorities and Protocol**

In summer 2020 an intern from the Natural Resources Management Department conducted field surveys, read the NRMP & IAP, and reviewed the Coyote Canyon Plan Implementation written by the Planning Department in order to establish the biological monitoring protocol and monitoring calendar for the property. Survey methods were developed and data sheets were established for future monitoring efforts and uploaded into tracking software for consistency in data management. The intern’s project was completed within eight weeks during the summer.

**Future Projects and Next Steps**

**New Trail Improvements**

Trail improvements include connecting Coyote Lake-Harvey Bear County Park to Coyote Canyon. Trail improvements will include a connection at the Ed Wilson Trail, an added single-track trail, and an improved vehicle width trail for patrol. Please refer to Section 3, Table 6 of the NRMP & IAP for details.

**Grazing Improvements**

A cattle corral needs to be enhanced to allow for proper stocking and rotation of cattle. The existing corral was removed in May 2020 when the new license agreement was awarded to a new cattle operator. Priority grazing improvements include the corral and improved water infrastructure.

**Pond Habitat Management**

Presence/absence surveys of California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander are needed in the ponds noted in the monitoring protocol. Based on the results, pond enhancements should be evaluated and considered. Monitoring of pond hydrology in each of the high priority ponds located on the property will be initiated in 2021.

**Sensitive Plant Management**

Visual assessments of big-scale balsamroot populations will determine if grazing, invasive species, or public access has created impacts. Natural Resources Coordinators shall update the map of all sensitive plant locations, along with other topography layers in Coyote Canyon using
ArcGIS. Visual assessments of sensitive plants and big-scale balsamroot population will be monitoring during quarterly grazing evaluations of the property.

Oak Woodland Management

Oak woodland survey areas will be established and assessed using the oak woodland monitoring protocol recommendations. Oak woodland habitat will be monitored quarterly as part of grazing assessments. Photo monitoring may be established in 2021 to assist with monitoring efforts.

Conclusion

Improvements to grazing infrastructure was the focus of enhancements on the property over the last year. The biological monitoring protocol established by the Natural Resources intern in Summer of 2020 identifies methods, schedule, and adaptive strategies to monitor and manage the natural resources on the property. The protocols were based on the recommendations included in the NRMP & IAP.

Over the next year the Natural Resource Program will continue to focus on monitoring conservation grazing efforts, expand and improve water infrastructure, initiate trail construction, and identify opportunities to improve wetland and riparian habitats throughout Coyote Canyon
Coyote Canyon – Natural Resources Plan Implementation and Monitoring

The Property provides highly suitable habitat for sensitive plant and wildlife species, and there are currently no significant impediments to the continued health of these populations that require immediate attention. The Property supports or has previously supported a number of sensitive species, including at least five sensitive plant species (Santa Clara Valley dudleya, most beautiful jewelflower, smooth lessingia, big-scale balsamroot, and woodland woollythreads); breeding populations of California red-legged frogs and golden eagles; and a wintering population of burrowing owls. Although no major changes to the existing management regime are necessary at this time, protections for these resources are recommended below to avoid impacts from public use.

All recommended protections, monitoring, adaptive management strategies, and enhancements for sensitive natural resources on the Property are summarized in Table 8 of the Coyote Canyon Plan and Section 5 of the full NRM Plan (Appendix C).

Measures to be Completed for Streambed Alteration Agreement Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Annual report to HLUET Committee on improvements at Coyote Canyon for three years from approval (through 2022)</td>
<td>N/A s</td>
<td>Every September through 2020</td>
<td>09/04/2020</td>
<td>NRM Intern drafted an annual report sent to Planning on 09/04/2020 listing the improvements and monitoring completed over the last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife Habitat Restoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serpentine Plants</td>
<td>Visually assess dudleya populations in serpentine rock outcroppings</td>
<td>Collector data points, to be transferred to GIS</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Download sensitive plant data from the 2018 HT Harvey Report to establish and serpentine and sensitive plant baseline map for future monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create GIS boundaries of population extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Look for evidence of poaching or grazing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpentine Plants</td>
<td>Visually assess serpentine bunchgrass grassland for most beautiful jewel flower and smooth lessingia</td>
<td>Smooth lessingia populations locations being mapped for baseline data to GIS.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create GIS boundaries of population extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Look for impacts from public use or grazing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 2020, Updated September 2020.
| **Other Sensitive Plants** | Visually assess known big-scale balsamroot and woodland woolly threads populations in annual grasslands  
- Create GIS boundaries of population extent  
- Look for impacts from public use or grazing | Spring 2021 | Same as above |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| **All Sensitive Plants** and **Wildlife** | Record any new occurrences found during Operation of the Property (ongoing)  
- Record in California Natural Diversity Database | Ongoing | In Progress | We currently do not have access to CNDD, set up account |
| **Riparian and Wetlands** | Add or repair fencing along Coyote Creek to exclude cattle  
- Document fencing added or replaced (in linear feet) | NA | Spring 2020 | June 2020 |
| **Pond and Wetlands Enhancement** | Install or repair fencing along streams or wetlands/ponds to limit impacts of cattle  
- Document fencing added or replaced (in linear feet)  
- Monitor hydrology in Wigeon Pond to determine hydrological period (August).  
- Add WPT basking platform for potential camera monitoring location in Wigeon Pond. | Hydrometer installation, basking platform installation.  
After pond survey determine ponds suitable for fencing to limit cattle access. | Summer 2020 | Basking platform installed at two ponds. Need to install hydrometer sticks prior to Spring 2020 |
| **Golden Eagles** | Conduct annual surveys of known nest locations | Visual monitoring | Spring 2020 | Completed, talk with Patrick Kolar |
| **Burrowing Owls** | Visually assess for impacts to overwintering areas  
- Create GIS boundaries for overwintering habitat  
- Look for impacts from public use | Point Count Survey | Winter 2021 | Overwintering surveys will be completed in Winter 2021. Baseline map of Overwintering habitat to be created. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Nesting Birds</strong></th>
<th>Conduct pre-construction surveys during nesting season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rangeland Management</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Oak Woodlands** | Visually assess damage to oak woodlands due to disturbance or herbivory (by cattle)  
  - Note areas of reduced growth or noticeable browsing  
  - Consider constructing tree cages to promote saplings | Oakwood land health data sheet to record qualitative data. | 2020 | In Progress | Oak woodlands are currently evaluated quarterly as part routine rangeland assessments. |

| **Riparian and Wetlands** | Add new troughs to deter cattle from over-using riparian areas  
  - Identify number and locations of new troughs | 2020 |

| **Wildlife** | Where feasible, construct or replace cattle fencing with wildlife friendly designs  
  - Document fencing added or replaced (in linear feet) | TBD |

| **Rangeland Management** | Prepare annual operating plan with grazing lessee by October 1 of each year | In Progress |

| **Rangeland Management** | RDM surveys up to four time annually. Surveys should be used to make changes to annual operating plan | Locate monitoring points for stakes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Trail Development and Maintenance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Riparian and Wetlands** | Rehabilitate degraded roads, degraded trails, and stream crossings to reduce erosion  
  - Note number of crossing improved and amount of trails improved (in linear feet) | TBD Trails Crew |

January 2020, Updated September 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oak Woodlands</th>
<th>Locate trails outside of root zone of existing large trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Woodlands</td>
<td>If necessary, prune oaks based on industry standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian and Wetlands</td>
<td>Establish a 50-foot buffer for future roads and trails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prescribed Fire and Fire Risk Reduction

| Fuel Loads | Maintain a maximum of 500lbs/acre RDM for areas within 200-500 feet of residential development  
- Establish RDM survey locations  
- Consider adding fencing near residential development to increase intensity of grazing | RDM monitoring | Cows rotate in pasture last month and this month, front and windmill pasture | July 2020 | Cattle now rotated into smaller Windmill Pasture to target the fuels near Jackson Oaks (Last week of July 2020). Last month June 2020, Front, Bull and Middle Pastures. CCC-Fuel break at East Dunne Complex/Orchard Fall 2019 (6.5 acres) |
| Invasive Species | Divide Windmill pasture into two smaller pastures to facilitate targeted grazing | In Progress | Fall 2020 – Exhibit E for water improvements to Windmill Pasture to target graze |

### Tree Safety and Tree Health Assessment

| Tree Safety | Assess trees at any locations that meet criteria for inspection under the Tree Safety Program (biannually) | Tree Safety Program will be initiated when park is open to public. |
| Tree Health | As needed, assess tree failures to determine health of trees, future risk of failure, and any maintenance recommendations | Ongoing |

### Improving Forest Health – N/A
Department of Parks and Recreation. The GIS files were compiled from various sources. While deemed reliable, the Department assumes no liability.

Created: 9/14/2020
Created By: J. Farr
DATE: October 15, 2020

TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)

FROM: Consuelo Hernandez, Acting Director, Office of Supportive Housing

SUBJECT: Supportive Housing Reports

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Consider recommendations from the Office of Supportive Housing relating to Supportive Housing System of Care reports.

Possible action:

a. Receive monthly report relating to Supportive Housing System Dashboard.

b. Receive semi-annual report relating to Rapid Rehousing Programs.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no fiscal implications associated with this informational report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At its meeting on January 12, 2016 (Item No. 11), the Board of Supervisors directed the Administration to provide the Board with recurring reports or dashboards about the capacity and effectiveness of the supportive housing system for homeless individuals and families. The purpose of the reports is to communicate the impact of the County and community investments in solutions to prevent and end homelessness. On October 19, 2017 (Item No. 13), the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET) approved a monthly reporting schedule that includes a Supportive Housing System Dashboard and a semi-annual program type or subpopulation report or annual system report.

Attached is the Supportive Housing System Dashboard Report and the semi-annual Rapid Rehousing Report (Attachment A).

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.
SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
The supportive housing system includes Permanent Supportive Housing programs (PSH), Rapid Rehousing programs (RRH), Homelessness Prevention programs (HP) and a Crisis Response system of outreach services, emergency shelter and transitional housing. The backbone to the system of care is a coordinated entry system with a robust Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and dedicated staff to support performance management, compliance with federal grants and system planning.

This report describes the type, content of and frequency of reports that the Office of Supportive Housing (OSH) would provide to the Board.

Types of Reports

- Supportive Housing System Report – This report describes the overall supportive housing system of care. The report’s primary function is to communicate whether different program types are contributing to an overall reduction in homelessness. For example, the report describes housing placement rates across all programs.

- System Component Reports – OSH provides four reports, one each for PSH, RRH, HP and Crisis Response strategies. The primary purpose of these reports is to summarize the effectiveness of all programs under each strategy.

- Sub-Population Reports – OSH provides reports for certain sub-populations. Currently, the only sub-population scheduled for ongoing reporting is homeless veterans. This report provides the Board with a summary of the community’s progress toward ending veteran homelessness. Unlike the System Component Reports, this report summarizes the effectiveness of the entire supportive housing system as it relates to homeless veterans, who can and are served by the full range of supportive housing programs.

Report Content

- Programmatic Capacity – Each report describes the total resources that were available to serve homeless individuals and families. Depending on the program type, the resources are categorized in different ways. For example, emergency shelter for single homeless individuals is organized into number of shelter beds whereas emergency shelter for homeless families is organized into the number of shelter units.
• Utilization – Each report provides the current and cumulative utilization rates of applicable programs. As with program capacity, utilization is described differently for different programs. For example, emergency shelter utilization is typically limited to how often shelter beds are occupied. However, for PSH programs, utilization reports consider both enrollment in services and the number of enrolled clients who are housed.

• Performance Measures – As a requirement of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009, OSH and local stakeholders established performance measures by program type and for the supportive housing system. Each report includes the relevant programs’ progress toward community-approved performance measures. For example, housing retention after 12 months is a key performance measure for PSH programs.

• Demographic Information – Each report describes program participants basic characteristics including, but not limited to, ethnicity, income, gender, income source and last permanent address.

• Funding – Each report provides the total funding and sources of funding for the programs in question.

• Other – Each report includes other information such as expansion opportunities (e.g., new grant opportunities) and development activities (e.g., new permanent supportive housing projects).

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

The HLUET committee would not receive the requested reports. OSH would continue providing the current reports on a monthly basis for system reporting and management purposes.

ATTACHMENTS:

• Attachment A - SH Dashboard and System Report Combined Oct 2020 (PDF)
October 1, 2020

TO: Board of Supervisors
Housing, Land Use, Environment and Transportation Committee (HLUET) Committee

FROM: Consuelo Hernandez, Office of Supportive Housing (OSH)

SUBJECT: Supportive Housing System in Santa Clara County and Rapid Rehousing Report

The attached report highlights trends, successes, and challenges of the supportive housing system in Santa Clara County between September 2019 and August 2020. The report’s primary function is to communicate how different programs are contributing to an overall reduction in homelessness. The supportive housing system includes housing programs that fall into five main categories: Emergency Shelter (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), and Homelessness Prevention (HP). Additionally, this report provides supplementary data focusing on the County’s RRH programs.

Supportive Housing System Trends and Highlights

Appendix A highlights two new goals in the new 2020-2025 Community Plan to End Homelessness, described in more detail in last month’s report. Year-to-date, the County has housed 2,314 individuals, 12% toward the goal of housing 20,000 people by 2025. The chart on the right depicts progress toward the County’s goal of a 30% reduction (3,253) in the annual inflow of people becoming homeless. Inflow for calendar year 2019 (4,647 people) is used as a baseline, rather than inflow for the current year, which was atypical due to the pandemic. The OSH will continue to report inflow counts each month using the twelve-month rolling period. We expect an increase in inflow over the next year, as the residential eviction protections afforded by the State’s COVID-19 Tenant Relief Act come to an end.

OSH continues to encounter unique challenges presented by the pandemic. For example, social distancing orders, exposures, and infections have resulted in frequent changes to our
TH and ES program capacities, presenting an ongoing challenge in the accurate reporting of utilization for some programs. Shelter-in-place (SIP), exposures, and infections have also negatively affected successful housing exit rates for some TH and ES programs. For example, time-limited client stays in TH programs are being extended, resulting in primarily unplanned exits for clients with behavioral or other issues.

Appendix B provides program capacity and utilization for our five program categories plus the Safe Parking (SP) initiative. Program utilization averaged 85% across programs.

Appendix C illustrates key system performance measures, benchmarks for which are determined in coordination with community partners on an annual basis. Notable trends and highlights for the reporting period include the following:

- Chart 1 depicts the number of people experiencing homelessness for the first time (inflow) compared to the number of clients enrolled in a housing program during the same period. As shown in chart 1, inflow remained steady at 49% of the total number of housing program enrollments – up 1% from last year, and the same rate as last month.

- Chart 2 provides data on exits to permanent housing destinations by housing type and period. Exits to permanent housing from RRH programs remain just below the benchmark at 73%. Overall program exits to permanent housing have remained steady (33%), but below the 40% benchmark.

- Chart 3 illustrates that PSH retention remains high at 96%, continuing to exceed the system-wide 95% benchmark each month over the past year.

Appendix D presents data on housing placements and system entries by project type. The upper chart shows the number of households moving from homelessness to permanent housing, and the type of project from which they were receiving assistance. The lower chart indicates the number of households that moved to permanent housing for the period, compared to the number of households assessed for the first time (new entries to the homeless system). The number of newly homeless residents continues to outpace the rate of housing placements. For August, first-time homeless households exceeded monthly housing placements by 45%.

Appendix E illustrates data on returns to homelessness for households that were permanently housed through the supportive housing system. For the specified reporting period, while only 4% of households exiting PSH programs returned to homelessness within two years, households that exited to permanent housing from other types of programs returned to homelessness at higher rates. Thirty-four percent of households exiting TH
programs, for example, returned to the housing system within two years, while 17% of those exiting RRH programs to permanency returned to homelessness within two years. While overall outcomes suggest that most individuals and families remain stably housed, these data suggest that households enrolled in RRH, TH, and ES may need additional supports to achieve housing stability after program exit. To this end, the OSH has begun expanding HP programs, with additional growth planned as a key strategy of the new Community Plan to End Homelessness. July 2020 saw a 39% increase from the previous period in the County's capacity to serve households via HP programs.

Appendices F through H include data related to the County’s RRH Programs. RRH programs provide time-limited rental assistance and supportive services to help people obtain housing quickly, increase self-sufficiency, and remain stably housed. Most RRH programs are focused on serving specific subpopulations. Accordingly, the RRH data is split by subpopulation. Some highlights:

- As shown in the table in Appendix F, RRH programs have the largest capacity to serve veterans and families. While veteran programs have slightly larger capacity than programs serving families, the latter served and housed significantly more households during the specified period.

- Appendix G shows 1) the length of time from enrollment to housing, and 2) the exit destinations for the various subpopulations served in RRH. The upper chart demonstrates that youth are housed in the fewest number of days (66) after enrollment, followed by families with children (72 days) and veterans (85 days). The bottom chart indicates that programs serving veterans and families have the highest rates of exit to permanent housing, at 76% and 75%, respectively.
Appendix A: Community Plan Goals

The 2020-2025 Community Plan to End Homelessness

The county-wide plan is our roadmap for ending homelessness in Santa Clara County. The 2020-2025 plan sets aggressive targets designed to reverse the current growth in homelessness and bring us one step closer to our collective goal of eliminating homelessness in our community. Appendix A will highlight specific goals related to this plan.

Program Capacity (Units or Households)

- **Goal: Housing 20,000 People by 2025**
  - Aug 2019: 12% to goal
  - Aug 2020: 20,000

- **Goal: Achieve a 30% Reduction in Annual Inflow of People Becoming Homeless**
  - Baseline inflow of individuals in 2019: 4,647
  - Inflow over the past one year (Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020): 3,918
  - Goal: Reduction of baseline inflow by 30%
    - Baseline: 4,647
    - Goal: 3,253

Appendix B: Capacity and Utilization as of 8/31/2020

- **Program Utilization, August 2020**
  - PSH: 94%
  - RRH: 88%
  - TH: 70%
  - ES: 78%
  - SP: 92%
  - HP: 86%

- **Program Capacity (Units or Households)**
  - Aug 2019: 3336, 1483, 574, 1880, 103, 1540
  - Aug 2020: 3546, 1513, 355, 2140

- Utilization: PSH, RRH are point-in-time utilization on August 31, 2020, TH and ES utilization are based on the month of August, and SP and HP utilization is based on the previous year.
- Program utilization is based on households enrolled in programs that are tracked in HMIS.
- PSH programs that are not tracked in HMIS include HUD Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH), consisting of 1,222 units, and other programs which comprise 79 units. PSH capacity includes 33 units which are Permanent Housing with services (no disability required).
- For Safe Parking programs, one parking space is the equivalent of one unit of capacity with an estimated 2.5 individuals per vehicle.
Appendix C: System Performance Measures

1. Total System Entries and Homelessness for the First Time
   - Persons with Entries into ES, SH, TH, or PH
   - Inflow: People Experiencing Homelessness for the First Time*
   
   *“First Time” per HUD = no entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inflow</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/17-8/31/18</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/18-8/31/19</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/19-8/31/20</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations
   Of Persons in ES, TH, and RRH who Exited, the Percentage of Successful Exits to Permanent Housing

   - 9/1/17-8/31/18
   - 9/1/18-8/31/19
   - 9/1/19-8/31/20

3. Permanent Housing Retention
   Percentage of People in Permanent Housing Programs (excluding Rapid Rehousing) Retaining Housing during the Reporting Year (Benchmark = 95%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/17-8/31/18</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/18-8/31/19</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/19-8/31/20</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix E: Returns to Homelessness

### Returns to Homelessness (Within 6 Months)

*After exiting to Permanent Housing Destinations, the Percentage of People who Return to Homelessness within 6 Months (\(N = \text{Exits to PH between 9/2017 to 8/2018}\))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM (N=2600)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT HOUSING (N=272)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID REHOUSING (N=910)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSITIONAL HOUSING (N=367)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGENCY SHELTER (N=972)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Returns to Homelessness (Within 1 Year)

*After exiting to Permanent Housing Destinations, the Percentage of People who Return to Homelessness within 1 Year (\(N = \text{Exits to PH between 9/2017 to 8/2018}\))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM (N=2600)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT HOUSING (N=272)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID REHOUSING (N=910)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSITIONAL HOUSING (N=367)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGENCY SHELTER (N=972)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Return to Homelessness (Within 2 Years)

*After exiting to Permanent Housing Destinations, the Percentage of People who Return to Homelessness within 2 Years (\(N = \text{Exits to PH between 9/2017 to 8/2018}\))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM (N=2600)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT HOUSING (N=272)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID REHOUSING (N=910)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSITIONAL HOUSING (N=367)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGENCY SHELTER (N=972)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) enrollment data is based on two programs that track anonymous data in HMIS.

“Any Population” programs are those that serve multiple subpopulations. Currently, these programs are primarily serving Single Adults.

### Target Population of RRH Programs (Data for Head of Household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Adults</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Population</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall RRH Utilization Rate = 88%

**Point in Time Capacity**

- **1022**

**Households Currently Enrolled as of 8/31/2020**

- **903**

### Rapid Rehousing Household Enrollments, Sept 1, 2019 to August 31, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Annual Capacity (Units)</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Housed</th>
<th>Exits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Adults</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Population</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentry</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL CAPACITY (UNITS)**

- **438**
- **1636**
- **477**
- **580**

**ENROLLED**

- **1513**
- **1636**
- **477**
- **580**

**HOUSED**

- **1235**
- **1235**
- **307**
- **494**

**EXITS**

- **738**
- **738**
- **15**
- **16**
Appendix G: RRH Outcomes - Sept 1, 2019 to August 31, 2020

Average Number of Days to Housing and Average Number of Days Housed in Program, by Target Population

Program Exit Destinations by Population Type
DATE: October 15, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Jo Zientek, Director, Consumer/Environmental Protection Agency
SUBJECT: Annual report regarding the Weed Abatement Program

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive annual report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the Weed Abatement Program for inspection and abatement of privately and government-owned parcels that do not meet minimum fire safety standards.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no Fiscal implications in receiving this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
On November 17, 2015, the Board of Supervisors requested annual reports to HLUET regarding the Weed Abatement Program (Program) in the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency (Agency). Program revenue comes from fees charged to property owners for the abatement of weeds on parcels that were out of compliance with the minimum fire safety standards as set forth in the California Fire Code. Program fees are set to cover all costs without General Fund subsidy.

Each year weed abatement work begins in March and continues through the end of October. Expenses for work completed prior to June 30th will be incurred in FY21, but the revenue for this work is collected through the property tax roll in FY22. Due to the timing of tax roll billing, staff must account for the delayed revenue when making Program budget and projections.

Program fees and projected changes
Program fees are calculated using estimates of projected workload and County costs. Program staff have historically been successful in increasing voluntary compliance resulting in reduced number of non-compliant parcels. However due to more awareness of wildfires and as the result of more people staying at home due to COVID-19, the number of parcels added to program increased 7% and the non-compliance rate increased 12% this past season.
Program costs increased this past year with the February 25, 2020 Board of Supervisors (Board) approval of an additional Weed Abatement Inspector position. Even with the the new resources, additional revenue from increased number of parcels allows for a decrease in Program fees for 2021. Therefore, the Agency will be seeking Board consideration to change the following three fees:

1. **The annual compliance fee would decrease from $101 to $84.** This fee is charged to all parcels inspected in the Program. Parcels are placed in the Program due to non-compliance of the minimum fire safety standards at least once in the last three years. These parcels are monitored each year by Program staff, and the fee recovers the cost for data entry, file preparation, noticing, boundary determination, and overhead costs. Parcels are removed from the Program once they have satisfied three consecutive years of compliance with fire standards.

2. **The second inspection fee would decrease from $582 to $466.** This fee, assessed when the property fails the first inspection and must be re-inspected, recovers costs for additional inspections, noticing, and overhead costs.

3. **The contract work administration fee would decrease from $984 to $829.** This fee is assessed when the property fails the second inspection and a contractor is assigned to clear the weeds. This fee recovers County costs of monitoring the contractor, billing, and quality control assurance. Actual contractor costs are an additional charge.

The proposed fees are being reviewed by the Controller-Treasurer for compliance with cost accounting guidelines. After the Controller review, the Agency will bring a legislative file with the final fees to the Board for consideration.

The fees will apply to all parcels in the Program. Under the County’s contract with the participating cities, the cities would receive a 60-days’ notice of the fee changes and, unless they opt-out of the Program within that 60 days, the new fees would go into effect for the 2021 fire season. The new fee schedule will be included in the annual notification package that is mailed to all parcel owners in the Program. The notification package would also contain the Agency’s contact information should parcel owners have questions. This information will also be included in the County’s Weed Abatement website.

It should be noted that if the abatement non-compliance rate declines, neither the current fees nor the proposed fees would be adequate to sustain funding for the Program into the future. A fundamental Program goal is to educate the public about the minimum fire safety requirements and to ensure all property owners are compliant. However, fewer properties in the Program also results in fee increases. As the Board requested at the November 17, 2015 meeting, staff continues to assess fees annually to ensure cost recovery.

**Amended contracts with participating jurisdictions**

This County currently administers the Program for thirteen jurisdictions including most of the cities in the county, with no cost to the participating jurisdictions. While the California Fire Code sets the Program Standards and the California Health and Safety Code provides a
provision to enforce weed abatement standards, there is no mandate to have a program. The decision to participate is an option jurisdictions can implement to enhance fire safety.

On November 2015, the Agency informed the Board of the intention to amend the contracts with the participating jurisdictions to include a clause stating that if the Program does not recover their costs for the year by collecting the fees, the jurisdictions will be responsible for a prorated cost. On December 10, 2019 the Board of Supervisors approved Resolution BOS-2019-160 which provided a Delegation of Authority for the execution of these amendments.

The following twelve jurisdictions in addition to unincorporated County participate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Campbell</th>
<th>City of Morgan Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills County</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Erroneous referrals**

The Board has also requested that staff report annually on the number of referrals determined to be erroneous or unfounded. For 2020, the Program received 328 total service requests, down from the 401 received in 2019; this included 27 from government jurisdictions and 301 from the public.

For public referrals:
- 45 of 301 resulted in adding parcels to the Program;
- 125 of 301 were already in the Program, and provided updated information; and
- 131 of 301 resulted in no enforcement which could be due to the property owner mitigating prior to County inspection or an erroneous referral.

For government referrals:
- 6 of 27 resulted in adding parcels to the Program;
- 0 of 27 were already in the Program, and provided updated information; and
- 21 of 27 resulted in no enforcement which could be due to the property owner mitigating prior to County inspection or an erroneous referral.

**CHILD IMPACT**

The recommended action impacts the Safe and Stable Families indicator by maintaining minimum fire safety standards to help keep children and youth safe from fire dangers.

**SENIOR IMPACT**

The recommended action will have a positive impact on seniors by maintaining minimum fire safety standards to help keep seniors safe from fire dangers.
**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

The Weed Abatement Program reduces the risk of spreading fire from wildland or from rubbish to structures. Sustainability implications associated with this Program include improved air quality, reduced resources used to rebuild homes, native plant species and habitats protected and water conservation when fires are prevented, and homes are protected.

**BACKGROUND**

Each year, the Board declares weeds, brush or rubbish a public nuisance on certain described properties in the unincorporated areas as part of a fire prevention program and authorizes the nuisance to be abated by the County. After three years of demonstrated compliance, parcels are removed from the Program. Program staff inspects parcels throughout the fire season to ensure compliance with minimum fire safety standards in the California Fire Code. On December 10, 2019, the Board approved an increase in the fees charged to property owners in the Program. Fund balance decreased by $35,796 in FY20. Increased fees approved by the Board of Supervisors on (date) will result in an increase to fund balance of $43,319 in FY21.

On October 2008, the Program anticipated an FY09 fund balance deficit of approximately $20,000, and a deficit of $100,000 in FY10 if the fee for the annual compliance inspection (or second inspection) of $298 was not implemented. The Board approved the implementation of this fee, which was in addition to the administrative fee (of 150% plus the contractor fee) for property owners that had their property abated by the County contractor.

In 2010, the City of Morgan Hill requested an evaluation of the County fee to consider a different method to allocate costs for work involved. The main concern was the 150% administrative fee added to the contractor’s abatement costs, as this mechanism resulted in very high charges levied against just a few owners with larger parcels. Working with the City of Morgan Hill, the Department developed the fees which were approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 2, 2010.

Annually, the County’s Hearing Officer confirms a report of unpaid fees for County inspections and abatement and allows the charges to be placed on the Tax Roll as special assessments to the respective property. The same process is followed in each of the twelve contract cities participating in the County Program for the properties in their jurisdiction.

The Agency mails notices to each property owner that fails to comply with the weed abatement requirements. The property owners are advised that weeds must be removed and notified of the public hearing process to object to the proposed abatement.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The Board of Supervisors would not receive the information in the report.

**LINKS:**

- Replaces: 99633 : 99633
DATE: October 15, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Jo Zientek, Director, Consumer/Environmental Protection Agency
SUBJECT: New Animal Services Center Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the construction and funding of a new County Animal Services Center.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no fiscal impact as a result of receiving this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At the March 16, 2017, meeting, the Housing, Land Use, Environment and Transportation Committee (HLUET) asked that Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA) provide a bi-monthly update on the development of the County’s new Animal Services Center.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
The project remains on schedule with the following updates:

- Construction on the new Animal Services Center continues with minimal disruption related to the COVID-19 Public Health Order. XL Construction has implemented additional safety and screening measures to protect the safety of those working on site;
- PG&E energized the new building with primary, permanent power;
• Hardscape and site grading is complete and landscaping and irrigation installation are underway;
• Canine housing equipment and community meeting space doors have arrived and were installed;
• Ten-stall barn installed;
• Staff from FAF, XL Construction, Dreyfuss + Blackford Architecture, and CEPA continue to meet weekly to ensure the project remains on schedule and budget, and to identify and resolve potential issues and plan for building move-in and occupancy;
• Center furniture and equipment ordering was completed;
• On October 6, the Board considered appropriating funds into the construction budget to purchase the new Center telecommunications/audio-visual and building access control systems;
• Programming and resources for the new Center is being to prepare for increased capacity and anticipated surges in volunteerism; increased adoption; staff is being trained to use technology, equipment, and in-building features of the new Center; preparation for operating the new community meeting space veterinary clinics and services is underway;
• On September 25, Board approved new Animal Services Center Operations Manager classification which replaced previous Animal Shelter Supervisor classification to better support the new Center. A study to update the current Kennel Attendant classification is also underway in support of the Center;
• Staff considered proposals for art for the new Center and have chosen an artist to work on the project;
• CEPA staff have added additional social media channels to promote pet adoption, provide public education on pet care topics and showcase the new Center;
• The Center’s fundraising webpage (www.aplaceforanimals.com) has been updated to feature recent construction photos with side-by-sides of architectural renderings, time-lapse footage of construction and dedication opportunities. Additional interactive elements are in the works;
• CEPA staff sent monthly Animal Services Newsletter to over 10,000 subscribers in early September and October. Topics included: Center construction progress update; dedication and donation opportunities; Animal Control wildfire assistance, adoptable pets and success stories; and
• The Board considered a $40,000 donation at the October 6 meeting for the Center.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

The Committee will not receive the report.
DATE: October 15, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Megan Doyle, Clerk of the Board
SUBJECT: HLUET 2021 Meeting Dates

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Approve Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee meeting schedule for Calendar Year 2021.

ATTACHMENTS:
- HLUET Proposed 2021 Meeting Calendar (PDF)
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
HOUSING, LAND USE, ENVIRONMENT, AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
PROPOSED 2021 MEETING SCHEDULE

Meetings are held in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, 1st Floor, San Jose, California, or by virtual teleconference.

- Thursday, January 21, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, February 18, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, March 18, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, April 15, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, May 20, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, June 17, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, August 19, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, September 16, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, October 21, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, November 18, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.
- Thursday, December 16, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.
DATE: September 17, 2020, Regular Meeting
TIME: 10:00 AM
PLACE: By Virtual Teleconference Only

MINUTES

Opening

1. Call to Order.

Chairperson Wasserman called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. A quorum was present via teleconference, pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order N-22-20 issued on March 17, 2020 by the Governor of the State of California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wasserman</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Joseph Simitian</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Public Comment. (ID# 103050)

Two individuals addressed the Committee.

3. Approve Consent Calendar and changes to the Committee's Agenda.

3 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]

MOVER: S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
AYES: Wasserman, Simitian

Regular Agenda - Items for Discussion

4. Receive Management Audit of the Los Altos Hills County Fire District and forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. (Referral from August 21, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 154) (ID# 102958)

Considered concurrently with Item No. 5.

Five individuals addressed the Committee.

The Committee received the report and approved forwarding the Management Audit to the Board of Supervisors with favorable recommendations relating to all Management Audit Recommendations, excluding Recommendation No. 1.2 regarding suspension of the Fire District's delegation of authority to the Fire Commission. The Committee
further approved forwarding an unfavorable recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding Management Audit Recommendation No. 1.2.

4 RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
AYES: Wasserman, Simitian

5. Receive Management Audit of the South Santa Clara County Fire District and forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. (Referral from August 21, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 154) (ID# 102959)
Considered concurrently with Item No. 4.
The Committee received the report and approved forwarding the Management Audit to the Board of Supervisors with favorable recommendations relating to all Management Audit Recommendations, including additional consideration of continued use of service zones where appropriate.

5 RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
AYES: Wasserman, Simitian

6. Receive report from the Office of the County Executive relating to a Land Use Compact with local jurisdictions in San Mateo County. (Referral from November 5, 2019 Board of Supervisors meeting, Item No. 13) (ID# 102684)

6 RESULT: RECEIVED

7. Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development relating to an updated proposal for Zoning Ordinance amendments to establish objective land development standards for rural unincorporated areas. (ID# 102144)

7 RESULT: RECEIVED

Consent Calendar

8. Receive report relating to Fish and Game Commission recommendation to provide $7,450 in funding from the Fish and Game Commission Fines and Forfeitures Fund to the State of California Department of Fish and Wildlife, North Coast District, to purchase tranquilizer guns and darts for wildlife capture to reduce wildlife and human conflict, and forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. (ID# 102733)
8 RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
AYES: Wasserman, Simitian

9. Consider recommendations relating to annual competitive grants.

  a. Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to competitive grants for period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. (ID# 102891)

9.a RESULT: RECEIVED

  b. Receive report from the Parks and Recreation Department relating to competitive grants for period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. (ID# 101870)

9.b RESULT: RECEIVED

  c. Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development relating to competitive grants for period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. (ID# 102901)

9.c RESULT: RECEIVED

  d. Receive report from the Roads and Airports Department relating to competitive grants for period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. (ID# 102737)

9.d RESULT: RECEIVED

10. Receive annual report from the Employee Services Agency relating to extra-help usage for agencies and departments reporting to the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee. (ID# 102677)

10 RESULT: RECEIVED

11. Receive the Fiscal Year 2019-2020 County of Santa Clara Integrated Pest Management Program annual report from the Office of Sustainability. (ID# 102883)

11 RESULT: RECEIVED

12. Receive report from the Office of Sustainability relating to key successes and progress on sustainability and climate action programs for January through June 2020. (ID# 102826)

12 RESULT: RECEIVED

13. Consider recommendations from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the County Animal Services Center Spay/Neuter Program report. (ID# 102900)
Possible action:

a. Receive final report.

b. Approve discontinuing monthly reporting relating to the Spay/Neuter Program.

c. Direct Administration to report to the Committee in May 2021 relating to programming and objectives for clinic services at the new Animal Services Center.

### 13 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]

**MOVER:** S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson  
**SECONDER:** Mike Wasserman, Chairperson  
**AYES:** Wasserman, Simitian

### 14. Consider recommendations from the Office of Supportive Housing relating to Supportive Housing System of Care reports.  (ID# 102776)

Possible action:

a. Receive monthly report relating to Supportive Housing System Dashboard.

b. Receive semi-annual report relating to Reentry Housing Programs.

### 14 RESULT: RECEIVED

### 15. Approve minutes of the August 20, 2020 Regular Meeting.

### 15 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]

**MOVER:** S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson  
**SECONDER:** Mike Wasserman, Chairperson  
**AYES:** Wasserman, Simitian

### Adjourn

16. Adjourn to the next regular meeting on Thursday, October 15, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California, or by virtual teleconference.

Chairperson Wasserman adjourned the meeting at 11:32 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy Doyle  
Deputy Clerk