**SUMMARY**

**COVID-19 Response Call**

**Friday, March 20, 2020**

**1:00pm -2:00pm**

**Jurisdictions in Attendance:** Gilroy, Morgan Hill, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara (city), Los Gatos, Gilroy, Palo Alto, County of Santa Clara, Campbell, Cupertino, Mountain View, Los Altos Hills, Milpitas, Saratoga, MTC/ABAG

1. **Welcome, Review Agenda**
2. **Overview of Planning Collaborative**
	1. Santa Clara County - SCAPO Meeting (next week) can continue with COVID discussion and Planning Collaborative focuses on housing.
3. **New State Laws**
	1. General (2019)
		1. Cities Association representative from Milpitas spoke about RHNA numbers in relation to BART station. Cities Association is putting a lot of stock into Planning Collaborative conversations: “Sharing the burden” for the RHNA numbers.
		2. SB 330
			1. Milpitas - Recently an extended stay hotel came up, City wanted to support, but that zoning district doesn’t allow for housing because of previous City Council. The City is about to approve a General Plan update that will allow for supportive housing, but current zoning/General Plan won’t allow it.
			2. San Jose - Currently having discussion and consternation on state laws (SB330) because it sounds like regardless of General Plan, if zoning allows for it, then housing is allowed by-right. In San Jose the General Plan prevails, a project needs to be consistent with General Plan.
			3. Sunnyvale - zoning says no housing (except for caretaker housing) but General Plan says in the future it's possible. City attorney says it can allow housing if General Plan allows it
			4. Morgan Hill - If General Plan allows for it, then housing is allowed.
			5. Santa Clara - more likely that General Plan allows and Zoning doesn’t.
			6. San Jose - using zoning that most conforms for housing if General Plan allows for (uses off-the-shelf zoning to allow it).
4. **RHNA 6**
	1. San Jose - laws are biased against more urbanized cities, not pushing cities with greenfield
	2. No net loss rule
		1. Cupertino - Don’t you have to keep re-zoning to make sure there’s no net loss?
		2. Josh - good to re-zone, but better to keep a buffer between available sites and RHNA numbers
		3. Two rules:
			1. Project specific - developer will need to make up
			2. For each income category in RHNA, for each cycle will need sites to make up for each income category.
	3. Vacant/Non-Vacant sites
		1. San Jose - have zero vacant land left, every affordable site that we identify will be occupied.
		2. Sunnyvale agrees - pushing back on this will be helpful. We know what site is vacant, you can get two units on it.
		3. Santa Clara (city) this will apply to all of us.
		4. Santa Clara County - for non vacant sites, is there something that will help define that better, an evaluation tool?
		5. HCD - will help develop a list of indicators, to determine if sites are vacant.
		6. Josh indicates that helpful step for cities include:
			1. Hiring an economic firm to develop guidelines, at county level, so you know how many units can be developed by land area. Developing prototypes of what would be reasonable.
			2. County-wide analysis of all the sites with current zoning and option to re-zone, with a third party to explain which sites to re-zone and what criteria uses.
	4. Past performance
		1. Sunnyvale - hoping past performance will be helpful, for past few years we’ve converted industrial to residential. Would be helpful to apply economic analysis throughout the county and then add the city’s past performance record to determine likelihood to develop.
		2. Milpitas - have made great strides around BART station, increasing densities where directly connected to BART and expanding the station area. For the past decade, cities that have been making strides should receive credit for that.
	5. Small/large sites
		1. Campbell - What's the difference between small/large sites (1/2 acre to 10 acres).
		2. Josh - Will be more clear when SoCal cities go through the process to see how strict HCD will be when interpreting the law.
	6. Market rate vs Affordable housing on sites, use of overlay zones will help with affordable housing sites.
	7. San Jose - Prefer “Reduce GHG” vs “Transit” (GHG includes more GHG reduction options like walking)
	8. Opportunity Zone
		1. Milpitas - why not high opportunity zones.
		2. Sunnyvale - it's not very not clear.
		3. Cupertino - Sunnyvale and some of Cupertino are all in these zones
	9. Ways to address RHNA –
		1. Start with population - that’s what the MTC/ABAG [visualization tool](https://rhna-factors.mtcanalytics.org/) does
		2. Start with land area - you don’t get it easier if you’d zoned predominately Single Family Homes
		3. Start with jobs - jobs and near jobs
		4. Santa Clara (city) - won’t RHNA committee just follow the process that was developed? Josh - some don’t want to reward cities that have been exclusive in the past.
	10. RHNA Expectation
		1. Usual RHNA expectation has been 2.5x than before, but will be significantly more this time.
		2. San Jose assuming 3x+ (LA area got more than 3x).
		3. Josh - 3X is a safe assumption. Model is looking at economic growth and overcrowding (overcrowding is being applied earlier and more important.
		4. Josh - 1.4 employees per household assumption won’t change much over time.
5. **Potential Projects**
	1. Sunnyvale - all good topics, should also look at cities’ programs (inclusionary housing, transit area plans, housing mitigation fee for non-residential).
	2. Milpitas - Sites inventory with messaging support from nonprofit orgs (SV@Home, Catalyze SV, SPUR)
		1. San Jose - None of the nonprofits are considered neutral, but they are respected. Accept that they are advocacy groups, but doesn’t mean they can’t be involved in how we craft things moving forward
	3. Milpitas - Post-COVID world, we don’t know what the housing situation will be like. Don’t know if Housing Elements should address that. How projections will affect that.
	4. Josh - Housing Elements due in 2023, hopefully not much COVID fallout and will be a ten year plan, will likely have had an economic recession within that timeframe anyway.
	5. San Jose - Wondering if we partner with League of Cities, develop a letter together that addresses challenges or tweaks that goes to the State.
		1. Josh - Simple fix would be to fix the previously used sites to be allowed for current sites (in lieu of developing the presumption).

**Polls Results:**

**Attendees:**

Jeannie Hamilton, Monte Sereno

Jennifer Carman, Morgan Hill

Joel Paulson, Los Gatos

Stephen Rose, Campbell

Adam Paszkowski, Morgan Hill

Trudi Ryan, Sunnyvale

Adam Marcus, Milpitas

Martin Alkire, Mountain View

Paul Kermoyan, Campbell

Cindy McCormick, Gilroy

Julie Wyrick, Gilroy

Ned Thomas, Milpitas

Debbie Pedro, Saratoga,

Adam Paszkowski, Morgan Hill

Jessica Garner, Milpitas

Andrew Crabtree, Santa Clara (city)

Amy French, Palo Alto

Kerri Heusler, Cupertino

Sharon Goei, Milpitas

Jonathan Lait, Palo Alto

Robert Musallam, Milpitas

Rob Eastwood, Santa Clara County

Zach Dahl, Los Altos Hills

Daniel Saver, MTC/ABAG

Michael Brilliot, San Jose

Mark Shorett, MTC/ABAG

Ruth Cueto, San Jose

David Ying, San Jose

Piu Ghosh, Cupertino

Bharat Singh, Santa Clara County

Sally Zarnowitz, Los Gatos

Ada Chang, MTC/ABAG

Jenny Carloni, Sunnyvale