



City of Anaheim Housing Element Update Committee (HEUC) Meeting Summary

Thursday, May 20th, 2021
5:30 p.m.

Location: Virtual – Zoom

The City of Anaheim hosted the third meeting for the HEUC on May 20, 2021. The Committee meeting started at 5:30 p.m. Below is a summary of the meeting.

Attendance:

Committee members present: Cesar Covarrubias (partial participation), Rob Mitchell, Rochelle Mills, Jose Pena (alternate to Maggie Downs), Elizabeth Hansburg (alternate to James Lott), Mitchell Lee, Tim Graham, Natalie Rubalcava, Linda Lehnkering, Steve Lamotte, Benjamin Hurst (partial participation)

Committee members absent: James Lawson, Rachael Mask, Todd Ament

Staff present: Joanne Hwang, Susan Kim, Andy Nogal, Bianca Alcock

Consultant present: David Barquist, Molly Mendoza, Rossina Chichiri

Staff welcomed Committee members and introduced the live Spanish translation feature for English as second language participants. Staff then provided the opportunity for the newest Committee members to introduce themselves to the Committee and the public.

1. Community Outreach Next Steps

The Consultant team provided an update on the status of the live online community survey. The update included the following:

- Total number of Spanish participants
- Total number of English participants
- Close date of the survey
- Last date to submit written surveys

Staff also provided a timeline for community engagement next steps, which included:

- Stakeholder interviews
- A Community Forum
- The Public Review Draft
- Community Workshop #3

2. Annual Progress Reports

The Consultant team provided background information and an overview of the Annual Progress Reports (APRs) process and their purpose. The team then provided an overview of the City of

Anaheim's progress towards the 5th cycle RHNA allocation, by income category, through 2019. The presentation included a comparative table between Anaheim and other jurisdictions of similar size and demographics in Orange and Los Angeles Counties.

The Consultant team opened the floor to comments and questions from Committee members. Comments and questions are summarized below:

- Clarification on if numbers provided in the table (for the 5th cycle RHNA progress to date) reflect percentages of the total RHNA allocation.
- Percentage of the permits issued that have resulted in a unit.
- Clarification on "Moderate" and "Median" income definition.
- Discussion on things that the Committee can do to make appropriate recommendations to increase housing access for affordable housing.
- Likelihood of affordable units being built within market rate projects.
- Issues with low and very low-income units not remaining affordable.
- Clarification on whether or not the RHNA allocation include both for-sale and for-rent housing units.

3. Housing Element Goals, Policies and Programs

The consultant team provided an overview of the structure of Housing Element and its goals, policies, and programs. The presentation included an overview of the following:

- Intent and structure of housing goals
- The process for develop policies and programs that support housing goals
- An overview of what housing policies do and what they include
- The relationship between policies, programs and the APRs
- An overview of HCD's program requirements
- Key considerations for developing the Housing Element policy program

The Consultant team then walked through the City's existing goals for housing and the requisite housing policies and programs within the existing housing plan. The team also provided narrative for the City's guiding principles and directives for current housing goals.

4. Open Committee Member Q&A

The Consultant team and staff opened the floor to comments and questions from Committee members. Comments and questions are summarized below:

- What are other cities doing that is successful that Anaheim is not doing?
- Is there funding available to increase housing opportunity in the City?
- When did Anaheim receive its RHNA numbers for the 6th Cycle?
- Was there consideration given to the effects of the pandemic on those numbers?
- What is the current structure of the very low and low income in the City?
- Existing program looks very comprehensive; the issue is around how to meet the low and very low-income needs.
- The Committees role in updating this Housing Element/policy plan.
- How do we make the Housing Element process valuable statewide; housing policy should not be done in vacuum.

- Policies from the past element did not work to balance housing in the City. As such, the City needs to reevaluate existing policies and consider new policies to increase housing balance.
- The development of affordable housing has been on City owned properties and with City participation in those developments.
- Affordable sites identified are often being absorbed into the market. There has to be a comprehensive approach where the developers get what they need but the City also gets affordable housing units built in the City.
- Needs to be give and take from both the City and developers. The cost should not be a burden on one end entirely.
- We need to find a new way to create affordable housing in the City.

5. General Public Comment

Staff opened the floor for public comments and questions and provided responses to the questions. In addition, the members of public provided additional public comments and questions through Q&A function. The following are summary themes of questions received:

- Low-income homeownership opportunities should be available and presented as a part of this process.
- The context around low income is important because it informs people about who is low income, it could be local public workers/teachers. This context can help break the stigma around low-income housing.
- Who are stakeholders and how are they identified in this process?
- It is important to have a serious dialogue about affordable housing.
- There are many vacant units in the moderate and above moderate developments. Could those be considered as opportunity units?
- Development of affordable housing needs to be citywide.
- Are we going to be able to see or a list of who all is here tonight?
- Can housing element language be more clearly stated so Anaheim adheres to RHNA, aside from the 'market rate' units?
- Developers paying into senior rental assistance program as fee incentive instead of providing affordable units should not be allowed.
- How do you intend to capture more surveys from Spanish speaking community, which is a sizable population in Anaheim)?
- Are these housing for very low and low-income category provided through deed restriction or non-deed restricted sector?
- Is there element language that supports ADA upgrades to current stock of housing, specifically for our aging owning neighbors in single-family homes?
- Is there opportunity for language regrading first refusal on city owned property for affordable developers?
- The cities who have done better at low and very low category adopted inclusionary requirements. Wouldn't this be a minimal starting point?
- Housing can be tied to good connections to transportation, so parking isn't a major issue, how much is Transit Oriented Development being supported by our housing element? Can language be drafted to encourage more collaboration with OCTA to make parking less of a concern for wealthier neighbors?
- What is the income threshold for low and median income?

- Is there space during these meetings for committee members to propose action items to be explored and voted on? Does that need a committee member to initiate?
- (Re: possible in-person HEUC meeting): Consider a hybrid with public participation virtually with limits
- (Re: possible in-person HEUC meeting) How would public participate if full vaccination is not possible for everyone?

6. Next steps

Staff provided an overview of next steps for the update process, information on future public engagement opportunities, and a short discussion about potential in-person meetings. The committee provided recommendations about in persons meetings, and tentatively decided to host the first in person meeting in July. Staff also provided the time and date of the next HEUC meeting.

7. Adjourn

Staff called the meeting to a close at 7:45 p.m.