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Title

An Evaluation of Affordable Housing Policy Tools in Mountain View, Santa Cruz, and Sunnyvale

Audience

The audience I intend to write for are San Francisco and Monterey Bay Area city/county planners, housing planners, affordable housing groups, and developers.

Background

For this report I will analyze affordable housing policies of three cities: Mountain View, Santa Cruz, and Sunnyvale. Those particular cities were chosen on the basis of innovative affordable housing policy tools used, land constraints, and population size.

The City of Mountain View is located along the Bay Area Peninsula with a population of 75,066\(^1\). Mountain View is bordered by the City of Sunnyvale, the City of Palo Alto, the San Francisco Bay, and the Santa Cruz Mountains. Mountain View has two interesting policy tools, residential impact fees and commercial linkage fees, which have the possibility to raise significant funds for affordable housing.

The City of Santa Cruz is located on the Monterey Bay coast with a population of 59,946\(^2\). Santa Cruz is bordered by the Monterey Bay, the Santa Cruz Mountains, and public open space areas. Santa Cruz has many affordable housing policy tools and programs with several innovative features such as accessory dwelling ordinances and zoning for manufactured housing.

The City of Sunnyvale is bordered by the City of Mountain View, the City of Santa Clara, the San Francisco Bay, and the Santa Cruz Mountains. Sunnyvale is a bit larger than Mountain View and Santa Cruz with a population of 140,081\(^3\) residents. The City also uses the commercial linkage fee which in 2012 raised $7 million\(^4\) in funds for the financing of affordable housing.

In conjunction with the policy tools previously mentioned, I will also analyze the inclusionary zoning ordinances for each city.

In order to understand the analysis of policy tools, an introduction of the tools is necessary. Inclusionary zoning ordinances are used by cities to require developers to set aside a portion of housing units for lower income households in new for-sale residential development. These set-aside housing units are referred to as Below Market Rate (BMR) units. In addition, there is an in-


\(^4\)Raania Mohsen, Kevin Zwick, and Shannon McDonald, Affordable Housing Funding Landscape and Local Best Practice. Cities Association of Santa Clara County and Housing Trust Silicon Valley: San Jose (December 2013): 5.
lieu fee provision that allows developers to waive the construction of units in favor of paying fees directly to the city to be used for financing affordable housing units in the future. The particulars of the ordinance vary by city. Mountain View’s ordinance requires ten percent of units be set aside in new developments over three units or mixed-use developments over six units. Mountain View’s in-lieu fee is allowed for BMR requirements resulting in less than one unit and if the price of the units is too expensive for practical BMR units. In the case of Santa Cruz, inclusionary zoning was instituted by a voter approved initiative. Measure O requires fifteen percent of units to be set aside in new for-sale or rental residential developments over two units. The developer has an option to pay in-lieu fees for new development between two and four units. Sunnyvale’s ordinance requires 12.5 percent of units be set aside in new for-sale residential development over eight units. The city allows the option of an in-lieu fee payment instead of actual units.

Commercial linkage fees are established by a nexus that constructing new commercial development inherently impacts the residential market of a jurisdiction by bringing in new jobs for people that will require housing. The fees are established on a per-square-foot basis and are usually limited to particular types of commercial development. Mountain View’s commercial linkage fee is $10 per square foot and Sunnyvale’s commercial linkage fee is $8.95 per square foot of high intensity industrial development.

Residential impact fees are similar in that a nexus is required between the development of residential housing and the need for affordable housing. Fees are charged to developers on a per-square-foot or per-unit basis for either new for-sale or rental residential development. Mountain View’s residential impact fee is $10 per square foot.

Accessory dwelling ordinances are another tool that allows homeowners of single-family homes to construct separate dwelling units, also known as granny units, on their property. Such ordinances may have guidelines regarding lot size, parking requirements, and design requirements. The purpose of ordinances of this nature is to increase the density within suburban areas zoned for single-family homes by providing additional dwelling units that can be rented out.

Zoning for manufactured homes is a tool that can potentially provide alternative affordable housing options due to the reduced costs of materials, labor, and the overall production process. Manufactured homes are constructed off-site and transported to the property site for placement on a foundation. Studies estimate a two-thirds savings on the cost of construction compared to on-site built homes.

---

Lastly, there are several terms that require defining to give clarity to the intent and use in this research effort:

**Effective** - The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines effective as “producing a result that is wanted; having an intended effect.”\(^9\) For the purpose of the report, effective refers to the ability of the policy tool to fund or facilitate the construction of affordable housing units.

**Policy tools** - Policy tools are separated into two categories. The first category are regulations that put the impetus of creating affordable housing on developers through policies such as inclusionary zoning, commercial linkage fees, and residential impact fees. The second category are policy tools that are not regulations, but guidelines that can be implemented by jurisdictions as methods that support the development of affordable housing such as accessory dwelling ordinances and zoning for manufactured housing.

**Affordable housing** - for-sale or rental housing designated for lower income households, typically making thirty- to fifty- percent of the area median income (AMI), as set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. Area median income (AMI) is the middle range income determined statistically for each county in California.

**Land constraints** - Limited supply of buildable land, housing market factors, and/or natural environment considerations (mountain ranges, ocean, open space).

**Research Question**

Do policy tools used by Mountain View, Santa Cruz, and Sunnyvale effectively influence (fund or facilitate) the construction of affordable housing, and what barriers exist to the implementation of the policies?

**Hypothesis**

My hypothesis is that residential impact fees are more effective than inclusionary zoning, commercial linkage fees, accessory dwelling ordinances, and zoning for manufactured housing at increasing the stock of affordable housing through the funding of affordable housing construction.

Residential impact fees are a newer tool with only several jurisdictions using them, including Mountain View. There are only a few research articles on the effectiveness of such fees, but with the challenges to inclusionary zoning (described later) this may be the best option. Residential impact fees are a mandatory fee that has the potential to collect significant funds\(^10\) and allow the construction of more affordable housing.\(^11\)

---


\(^10\) Raania Mohsen, Kevin Zwick, and Shannon McDonald, *Affordable Housing Funding Landscape and Local Best Practice*. Cities Association of Santa Clara County and Housing Trust Silicon Valley: San Jose (December 2013): 9.

In the case of inclusionary zoning, it is only effective if mandatory with a sufficient in-lieu fee. Many times developers can get around including affordable units in their projects, or pay an in-lieu fees which does not always generate enough funds for the complicated financial layering that is required for affordable housing. Additionally, inclusionary zoning is highly disliked by the building community, which recently resulted in a California court ruling that bars inclusionary zoning requirements for rental housing development.

This hypothesis was also reached from several other considerations. One, accessory dwelling ordinances may be limited due to constraints such as lot size requirements, impacts on parking, strict design guidelines, and zoning limitations. Second, manufactured housing may be constrained due to design regulations and financing difficulties with lenders.

Relevance

There is currently an affordable housing crisis in California in general, and in the Bay Area specifically. The rise of home prices and rental prices is exasperating the ability of moderate income and low income households alike when it comes to affording a place to live. Consider Mountain View: by 2008, median single-family home prices increased fifty-two percent while rent prices increased fifteen percent. Additionally, moderate income families could only afford seven percent of the single-family homes for-sale between 2008 and 2009. In Santa Cruz, the median single-family home price increased forty-nine percent from 2002 – 2007 while rents increased twenty-four percent. Consequently, only thirty-seven percent of households could afford to buy a median priced home in 2011. Similar trends are present in Sunnyvale with affordability gaps in both home purchase prices and rent prices. This predicament is further complicated by high demand and low supply of housing. For example, according to a housing survey conducted by the Association of Bay Area Governments, only seventy-eight building

---

permits were issued for low income housing in Sunnyvale and zero in Mountain View in 2008.\(^{22}\) This predicament speaks to the need for strong affordable housing policy.

Plan Bay Area, the regional “long-range plan to integrate transportation and land-use/housing strategy”\(^{23}\), acknowledges that “in order to ensure a healthy economy the region will need to focus on strategies and investment that provide housing for much of the region’s workforce…whose incomes would severely limit their housing choices.”\(^{24}\) The need for affordable housing strategies is considerable: according to the Center for Housing Policy’s annual Paycheck to Paycheck report, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties are within the top six most expensive metro areas for homeownership\(^{25}\) and renting.\(^{26}\) Likewise, according to the Out of Reach Report by the National Low Income Housing Coalition, in Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties hourly wages of $30.96 and $30.52 respectively are needed to afford two bedroom fair market rent.\(^{27}\) This presents a problem to the many moderate and low income households who end up cost burdened or in overcrowded housing.

Affordable housing has a long history in the United States. Starting during the Great Depression up until the 1970s, the federal government was the main supplier of affordable housing through the funding of public housing projects. This model would not hold long though, as housing authorities could not meet the demands of low income households and the expense became a drain on public resources.\(^{28}\) Because of this, “governments have moved away from the public, supply side approach to affordable housing and more to privatization and a demand side approach.”\(^{29}\) This privatization led to affordable housing being supplied by the will of developers as well as the political will of jurisdictions to fund it. In the 1950s local Redevelopment Agencies (RDA) were created, providing a local funding source from incremental financing set-aside funds. Over the years, Redevelopment set-aside funds became the main driver of the funding and building of affordable housing in California.

Yet, with the dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies (RDA), jurisdictions of California are left with a significant gap in their policy tool kit for funding affordable housing construction. In addition, federal grant funding for the rehabilitation and construction of affordable housing such as Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME has diminished since the 1970s.\(^{30}\) As a result of the dwindling funding supply available to jurisdictions, the impetus for increasing


the stock of affordable housing has been pushed onto developers in the form of regulations and fees. Since jurisdictions do not actually perform the construction of affordable housing, they depend on for-profit or non-profit developers to perform the task of constructing the units.

The purpose of this research project is to analyze and compare specific policy tools including inclusionary zoning, commercial linkage fees, residential impact fees, accessory dwelling ordinances, and zoning for manufactured housing. Specifically, the analysis is being used to determine how effective the policy tools are at actually increasing the stock of affordable housing. The policy tools noted previously were chosen on their unique abilities to either fund or facilitate the construction of affordable housing. In the case of inclusionary zoning it is calculated that “a fifteen percent set-aside can produce twice the amount of affordable housing produced through [Low Income Tax Housing Credit], which is the main source of federal support for affordable housing.” As for commercial linkage fees and residential impact fees, researchers have “suggested that development impact fees may temper exclusionary zoning and other types of exclusionary regulations, allowing more low-income housing to be built within suburban areas.” If we turn to non fee based tools such as accessory dwelling ordinances and zoning for manufactured housing, we learn that “in metropolitan areas with high land costs, manufactured housing offers potential for substantial cost savings by substituting other inputs for land.”

The lack of affordable housing can be harmful to the strength of the Bay Area in the long run, if the people who live here are unable to afford to do so. A survey conducted by the Silicon Valley Leadership Group “found that almost nine out of every ten employers believe housing costs stand well above all other challenges to Valley companies and nearly all respondents (seventy-five percent) cited housing costs as the most significant challenges facing working families.” This project aims to address that challenge by studying if certain policy tools are effective at funding or facilitating affordable housing within a region of high housing costs. This project is unique in that a comprehensive analysis of policies in the San Francisco and Monterey Bay Area has not been conducted. Specifically, commercial linkage fees and residential impact fees have not been thoroughly analyzed. This project is valuable to the field of urban planning because it will study the effectiveness of affordable housing policies as well as determine barriers to implementation. With the crisis of affordability, it is imperative to understand successful mechanisms for influencing affordable housing in order to meet the needs of all residents.

Literature Review

Question 1: (Chapter 2 & 4)

34 Dr. Mathur Shishir, and Alicia Parker, Housing Silicon Valley: A 20 Year Plan to End the Affordable Housing Crisis, The Institute for Metropolitan Studies: San Jose State University, (2007): 2.
What are the strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and benefits of different inclusionary zoning ordinances used by jurisdictions around the United States?

Question 2: (Chapter 2 & 4)
What are the strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and benefits of impact fees used by jurisdictions around the United States?

Question 3: (Chapter 2 & 4)
What are the strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and benefits of accessory dwelling unit ordinances used by jurisdictions around the United States?

Question 4: (Chapter 2 & 4)
What are the strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and benefits of zoning for manufactured housing used by jurisdictions around the United States?

Question 5: (Chapter 2 & 5)
Are there any innovative policy tools being used in the United States that can be directly applied in the Bay Area to increase the stock of affordable housing?

I anticipate the use of the following databases:
- Academic Search Premier
- Science Direct
- Google Scholar
- Web of Knowledge

**Methods**

**Interviews**

A. **Overview**
   I will conduct interviews with affordable housing experts to gain deeper, background information on affordable housing policy tools.

B. **Reason for collecting the data**
   The data collected will be used in conjunction with my policy analysis which is crucial to discovering the effectiveness of policies. The specific questions I ask in the interviews are tied to the criteria evaluation in the policy analysis. The data will help me to write chapter 3 and chapter 4.

C. **Data collection procedures**
   I intend to interview at least one affordable housing planner from each of the jurisdictions included in this report. In addition, I anticipate conducting four additional interviews to provide a different perspective on affordable housing policy. I will interview an affordable housing policy advocacy group (such as Silicon Valley Leadership Group), affordable housing developer (such as MidPen Housing), community development financial institution (such as Housing Trust Silicon Valley), and affordable housing
public policy group (such as Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California). Since these interviews are from experts outside of the planning department, there is more of an “on the ground” viewpoint that can provide differing opinions as well as information on the policy tools that planners may be hesitant in sharing.

The interviews will be in person, unless the interviewee insists on a phone interview. For the affordable housing planner interviews I will review the City website for staff and phone numbers. After I have identified the expert I will contact him or her by phone to schedule an interview. If I leave a message, then I will follow up with an email.

For the four other interviews I first will identify the organization that I would like to interview and gather the phone number from websites to call for an interview. I will call the organizations to ask who the right person is and from there schedule an interview. Again, if a voice mail is left, I will follow up with an email.

The interviews will be semi-structured with open ended questions. I will take handwritten notes during the interview which I will review and type up immediately afterwards to ensure all details are saved. I will also ask the interviewee for permission to record the interview so I can use the voice recording as a back up to verify any confusion in my notes. If the interviewee does not wish to be recorded, I will only use handwritten notes. From these interviews I would like to collect information on their view of:

- Policy tools’ effectiveness.
- Costs associated with the implementation and monitoring of the policy tools.
- Timelines for collecting and dispersing funds.
- Legality of the policy tools from the standpoint of General Plans, Municipal Codes, and guidelines for establishing impact fees.
- Feasibility of the administration, implementation, and monitoring of the policy tools.
- Costs to government to administer the policy, costs to developers to build affordable housing using the policy, costs to home buyers, costs to land owners, and costs to the public to build accessory dwelling units and buy manufactured homes.
- Political will of the local government towards affordable housing and public opinion of the City residents towards affordable housing.
- Equity issues such as who benefits or does not benefit from affordable housing if built; who benefits or who does not benefit if affordable housing is not built; and the strata of income levels for each City that need affordable housing.
- Impacts of fees on market rate housing development.
- Impacts of fees on affordable housing development.

Before the interviews can begin, an Institutional Review Board (IRB) application must be submit, and approved by the IRB committee. First, complete the IRB application and IRB protocol. Second, submit the documents to the IRB committee for review and approval.
D. Method of data analysis

The main purpose of the interviews is to assign key findings to the criteria evaluation of the policy analysis. The steps for the interview data analysis are as follows:

1. Transcribe the interview notes into a Word document.
2. Read and annotate the transcripts. Record the preliminary observation on the transcribed notes.
3. Read again through the transcripts to identify themes. In the margins of the transcribed notes, note down the themes that come across. The themes may be in the form of phrases, words, and terms.
4. Review the themes to develop a list of categories based on the themes that emerge. Then develop a coding scheme using different colors for each category to code the data. The coding scheme consists of highlighting phrases, words, and terms in the notes.
5. Read again through the transcripts and code the themes.
6. Collect all the coded data and add to an Excel worksheet. Group the coded data into the relevant categories.
7. Read through the data to extract patterns and relationships. Use the patterns and relationships that emerge to develop subthemes and big themes of the data. See the example below.

Sample Coding Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Coded Data</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Big Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary zoning</td>
<td>Inclusionary zoning dissuades developers from building in cities with the ordinance.</td>
<td>Dissuades developer</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If the data presents the possibility, quantify the data using frequencies and percentages in a table format.

Literature Review

A. Overview:
I will conduct a literature review of scholarly journals, public policy institutional reports, government reports, and affordable housing research reports to learn about the policy tools from the perspective of other research organizations and jurisdictions.

B. Reason for collecting the data:
The data collected will be used in conjunction with the policy analysis. Themes that emerge from the literature review will be categorized and coded. The data is then assigned to the relevant criteria evaluation of the policy analysis. The data will help me to write chapter 2 and chapter 4.
C. **Data collection procedure:**
   Search journal databases through San Jose State Library, Google Scholar, and directly from affordable housing policy websites to collect articles and reports.

   Read and review the selected documents for information relevant to the affordable housing policy tools. While reviewing, take notes on any striking or interesting information. The information is quotes, statistics, and paraphrases.

   Read again through the documents to identify themes. In the margins of the documents, note down the themes that come across. The themes are in the form of phrases, words, and terms.

D. **Method of data analysis:**
   The analysis for the literature review takes two forms: data analysis and policy analysis. The first step is to perform the data analysis:

   1. Review the themes uncovered during the data collection process to determine if any additional categories need to be added to the categories developed during the interview data analysis. Add any necessary categories.
   2. Use the coding scheme developed in the interview method, read through the documents and code the themes.
   3. Collect all the coded data and add to the Excel worksheet. Group the coded data into the relevant categories.
   4. Read through the data to extract patterns and relationships. Use the patterns and relationships that emerge to develop subthemes and big themes of the data. See the example from the interview method.

   The second step is to perform the policy analysis, see below for the process.

**Policy Analysis**

A. **Overview**
   I will conduct a policy analysis of data collected from document reviews, interviews, and literature review to learn the effectiveness of the selected policy tools.

B. **Reasons for collecting data**
   The data collected will be used to perform the policy analysis which will determine effectiveness of policy tools and inform recommendations. The data will help to write chapter 3 and chapter 4.

C. **Data collection procedure**
   The first step is to collect documents (Consolidated Plans, Actions Plans, and Housing Elements) from the City websites of Mountain View, Santa Cruz, and Sunnyvale.

   a. Mountain View: Navigate to the Neighborhoods and Housing page to retrieve the Consolidated Plan and Action Plan. The Housing Element is a bit harder to locate. For this document use any search browser and search “Mountain View Housing Element.” In the results navigate to the pdf link for the “City of Mountain View Housing Element 2007-2014.”
b. Santa Cruz: Navigate to the Economic Development page to retrieve the Consolidated Plan and Action. Navigate to the Planning and Community Development page to retrieve the Housing Element.

c. Sunnyvale: Navigate to the Community Development page to retrieve the Consolidated Plan, Action Plan, and Housing Element.

After the documents have been retrieved, read through the relevant section, typically in the appendix, to collect the data on affordable housing projects built in the City. Collect the following data: project name/address, total affordable units, unit type, affordability level (i.e. very low, low), project date, and project funding source. Note: the data on manufactured homes is collected through interviews.

Now transcribe the data into an Excel spreadsheet as in the sample below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Project Name/Address</th>
<th>Total Affordable Units</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Affordability Level</th>
<th>Project Date</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1008 Soquel Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>2- low</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Meas O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After all the data is transcribed, sort through to calculate the total number of affordable units for each policy tool.

D. Method of data analysis

With the data collected from the documents, interviews, and literature review it is time to conduct the policy analysis.

1. Establish evaluation criteria – the role of the criteria is to compare and measure the policies. There is not a specific procedure to identifying the criteria. Yet, the criteria specifically need to measure the research question of this project. Therefore, use the research question as well as the data as a guide to inform the criteria selection. A sample of the criteria can be viewed in the sample policy matrix below.

2. Create the policy matrix - Using the table program in Word or with Excel, place the criteria along the vertical axis and the policy tools along the horizontal axis. Now take the data from the documents, interviews, and literature review and enter into the relevant criterion box in the policy matrix. This data includes total affordable housing units built, coded data from interviews, and key findings/coded data from the literature review.

3. Evaluate the policies – the policies are evaluated by comparing the data for each criterion. Each data item is assigned a unit of measurement to weight according to the quantifiable benefits for each criterion. The units of weight (see sample below) are 1, 2, and 3, plus the total number of affordable units.
Sample Rating System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th></th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Tally the weights for each policy tool.
5. Evaluate the tally to determine effectiveness of the policy tools and examine the data for key findings on the barrier to policy implementation.

Sample Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Inclusionary Zoning</th>
<th>Commercial Linkage Fees</th>
<th>Residential Impact Fees</th>
<th>Accessory Dwelling Ordinances</th>
<th>Zoning for Manufactured Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (Number of units constructed; amount of funds collected)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legality (General Plan, Municipal Code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Feasibility (Administration, Implementation, Monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (Cost to government, cost to developers, cost to public)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Viability (Political will of government; public opinion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (Social benefits, constraints)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Feasibility (market rate &amp; affordable housing development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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