



## Oakland City Council Candidate Questionnaire

*EBHO is a member-driven organization working to preserve, protect, and create affordable housing opportunities for low-income communities in the East Bay by educating, advocating, organizing, and building coalitions.*

**1. Do you believe that housing is a human right? If not, why not? If so, what are you going to do ensure every one of your constituents has a safe, quality place to call home?**

Housing – and housing security – is a basic human need and an essential human right. Every person deserves a healthy, safe place to lay their head, a place to call home, a place to relax, a place from which to pursue and experience a life that brings them and their family happiness, meaning and prosperity, a place that give them comfort in the present and hope for the future.

I've played a leadership role in implementing a number of important strategies to provide shelter and support services for the homeless and expand and preserve the availability of affordable housing across the income spectrum. It's an enormous challenge and, while we've made progress, there's much more to do.

In our current housing crisis, "housing affordability" extends across the income spectrum, encompassing homeless residents, working families, seniors and families with young children, tenants and homeowners in one fashion or another. The effects of this crisis affect not only people with steep rents and mortgages but also the future of the local economy and the quality of life for the wider neighborhood in which they live.

We must remember who we're building homes for. As I look for push for a comprehensive vision for housing affordability that will protect our neighborhoods from displacement and energize our local economy, I am mindful of several key facts that should guide our collective response to this crisis.

Three out of five Oakland residents are tenants. Approximately two-thirds of Oakland renters pay more than the federally recommended maximum of 30% of their income on rent.

Roughly two-thirds of Oakland's senior households (nearly 20,000) are low-income, and a disproportionately large number of those are in communities of color. The disabled are also vulnerable to displacement: 23% of Oakland's population reported a disability, and nearly half of the population aged 65 or older is disabled.

As a consequence of the housing affordability crisis, Oakland's African American population declined by 24%, a loss of more than 33,500 residents, from 2000 to 2010.

The homeownership rate in East Oakland neighborhoods fell by 25% – more than 11,000 homes lost since 2007 during the Great Recession foreclosure crisis (hitting African American homeowners especially hard).

Housing affordability is also measured by Average Median Income levels, with typical thresholds of 30%, 60% and 80% AMI used in negotiating the "level" of affordable rents and number of such units below those thresholds with developers. We need a mix of new and rehabbed units in these different tiers as well, along with shelter and transitional housing for homeless residents.

We need to continue a comprehensive strategy that provides a mix of market-rate and affordable units. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment indicates that Oakland needs to add an almost equal number of both types to its current housing stock.

I've supported increasing the number of both market-rate and affordable units as the best comprehensive, equitable strategy to provide more housing for all income levels that also improves the regional jobs- housing balance.

The answer to homelessness is, ultimately housing, especially supportive housing and transitional housing that leads to



## East Bay Housing Organizations

---

permanent, affordable housing.

I continue to lead on affordable housing by advocating on a public land policy for the City of Oakland that prioritizes affordable housing on public land.

The City Council recently acquired a single-room occupancy hotel on West Grand Ave., which will expand the number of City-owned shelter beds for up to 140 more homeless residents. The building (641 W. Grand near I-980) will provide a second navigation center – like the existing Henry Robinson Multi-Service Center – that provides housing and support services for recently homeless people. More than one-half of the people housed at the Robinson center last year have been successfully transitioned into permanent housing. The building was purchased for \$7 million using Measure KK funds.

The 2017-19 City budget, which I spearheaded, also provides additional resources for on-site health and hygiene services, and to help unsheltered residents transition into permanent housing.

We will be using \$55 million in Measure KK funds to preserve and acquire affordable housing. I cosponsored the vacant parcel tax, Measure W (\$6,000/year to incentivize use of vacant and blighted lots) that will be on the November 2018 ballot that will generate substantial funding to help address our homelessness needs and other neighborhood services like illegal dumping.

I also secured funding to build tiny homes (in partnership with Laney College) to be used by homeless residents, in particular students at Laney College (located in my Council district) who are pursuing their education but don't have a place to live. I'm working with the faith community to site some of these tiny homes on church parking lots (and seeking other vacant parcels). It's a small step, but reflective of the kind of innovative strategies that we need to address our housing crisis.

This month, the City Council took action to fund a year-long "community cabins" program on the parking lot at the Henry J. Kaiser Auditorium (in my Council district) to help address homelessness around Lake Merritt. These cabins will offer emergency, temporary shelter that provides safer, healthier places while we help people seek work and get into more stable living conditions and permanent housing.

This is just one emergency response being implemented as part of the City's package of comprehensive strategies to rapidly rehouse residents and build more affordable housing to address the root causes of homelessness and our region's housing-insecurity crisis. Approximately \$200,000 in private funding has been secured for the cabins, with the City paying for site maintenance and support services for the residents.

The City has opened two similar communities. About 90 people have opted into the first pilot location at 6th St. and Castro St. in West Oakland since it opened in December, and the second site at 27th St. and Northgate Ave. has improved public health and safety conditions. To date, of the 126 people who have moved into these two cabin-community sites, 41 have moved on to transitional and permanent housing; 23 have found jobs; and all have received access to social services and healthcare assistance.

The small structures (8' x15') on the auditorium lot will serve up to 40 people at a time, with a total of up to 100 expected to be served over the course of a year. In addition to the safer, healthier shelter that the cabins will provide, on-site staff will help connect residents to health care and job opportunities. The cabin community setting will also connect mainstream services such as MediCal, food stamps, GA and SSI; and assist them moving into temporary or permanent housing. The site is voluntary and residents can come and go as they please.

Gentrification can have direct and indirect impacts on virtually every neighborhood, for current renters as well as existing and prospective homeowners – and the sustainability of our small businesses and shopping districts too.

Council District 2 includes several neighborhoods above and below I-580, with neighborhoods like East Lake, San Antonio and Chinatown perhaps the most at risk of displacement. We need to build both market-rate and affordable housing to solve the housing crisis in my district and throughout Oakland.

Consistent with the identified Regional Housing Needs Assessment for Oakland, the Council has adopted a plan to build 17,000 new units of housing while protecting 17,000 residents from displacement.

While we build more housing, we also need to strengthen and expand rent and eviction protections for existing tenants. Two-



thirds of Oakland's residents are renters. I've supported several steps to do that, and these efforts will continue to be a priority for me.

I have pushed for City funding to better enforce the Tenant Protection Ordinance. We were able to extend just-cause eviction protections to an additional 2,000 households last year.

The housing crisis is not just about escalating rents. Amid these housing and income stressors, we are seeing more cases of blight, utility neglect, fire hazards, and unfair evictions – and the health-related problems that come with them.

Renters should not have to choose between housing cost and housing quality. It's the City's job to make sure they don't have to. We must take action to ensure the best possible living conditions for the people who make these apartments their home. The City has received tens of thousands of complaints about housing blight and other habitability issues over the past decade. Sadly, our regulations have often only protected against the worst, illegal occurrences. The Safe Housing Inspection Program (SHIP), adopted in 2015, will help us serve all of our community more effectively and swiftly.

The City is also funding the Healthy Housing Code Enforcement / Proactive Rental Inspection program to reduce childhood lead poisoning and asthma.

***2. EBHO has put forward a proposal for a package of measures to preserve existing rental housing resources and protect tenants from displacement. What would you do to strengthen the condo conversion ordinance, prevent conversion of single room occupancy (SRO) residential hotels, and regulate short-term rentals such as Airbnb and dedicate transient occupancy taxes from short-term rentals to support affordable housing?***

I endorse and support EBHO's recommendations for measures that help preserve affordable-housing stock and prevent displacement, including efforts to strengthen the Rent Stabilization Ordinance; strengthen and harmonize relocation benefits under the City's Ellis Act Ordinance, Code Enforcement Relocation Ordinance, and SRO Preservation Ordinance; strengthen the City's Condominium Conversion Ordinance by extending protections to 2-4 unit buildings throughout Oakland, eliminating provisions that allow condominium conversion credits to be generated by existing housing rather than newly developed housing, and establishing mandatory tenant protections as part of the requirement for Tenant Assistance Plans. I also support requiring one-for-one replacement, with units of comparable size and affordability, of all housing units demolished or converted to non-residential use by either public or private action. These replacement units should not be counted toward meeting the City's RHNA requirement, given that they maintain but do not increase the affordable housing stock. We should also develop and implement programs to acquire and rehab existing rental units and preserve as permanently affordable housing for lower-income households. I support the acquisition and land banking of opportunity sites to help foster equitable development and make it more financially feasible within major development projects and targeted areas. I co-authored legislation that would allow the City of Oakland to regulate SRO's (carried by Assemblymember Bonta).

We need to reintroduce and pass this legislation in the next session. Voter approval of Prop 10 would give us the tools we need to better regulate our housing stock.

I authored legislation that directs funds from Airbnb to support affordable housing. We need a status update on this, and direct Airbnb funds to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and anti-displacement support, as there is a clear nexus.

***3. What do you think are the critical elements of a public land policy for Oakland? Would you prioritize the use of public land for development of affordable housing? How would you ensure that at a minimum the City fully complies with the Surplus Land Act?***

Public land should prioritize affordable housing. The public lands proposal that I have brought forward – with input and guidance from EBHO and community groups – does just that.

As the sponsor of one of the proposals, I have been deeply involved in the policy nuances and practical logistics of "public land for public good" for the past 3-1/2 years. We have spent many months working with stakeholders to craft the current proposal.



I believe that, at least for the near future, City-owned land should be prioritize building affordable housing (perhaps with exceptions when the parcel is too small or poses other obstacles that make housing construction impractical).

During this extreme crisis of housing affordability and housing insecurity throughout the region, it might be justified to require any public lands sold over the next certain number of years (a term renewable by the Council as warranted) go toward affordable housing.

Since land costs are always a significant factor in making housing development pencil out, it makes sense to use City-owned parcels for projects that offer a high percentage of affordable units, a higher number of total units, and those affordable at the lowest AMI levels.

My proposal seeks to strike a balance between City staff's recommendations to sell public land and community advocates who would like to see 100% affordable housing on all public parcels even though that proposal results in fewer units over time and is not funded. The crisis is now and we can not wait ten years to get this housing built. Experience teaches us that we must ensure flexibility to be able to best assess the tradeoffs as opportunities arise.

We must also guard against evaluating development proposals for public land in isolation. It's penny-wise, pound-foolish to spend all of our housing trust fund to make one project with deep subsidies work, for example, at the expense of other projects on other parcels that would create more total net affordable units.

The Surplus Land Act requires that other public agencies be noticed before such property is sold to a for-profit entity. The City of Oakland must do a better job of noticing property that is available and should prioritize affordable housing on-site. While the Surplus Lands Act requires at a minimum 15% affordable housing component, my proposal would require 70% affordable units (1,077 units and could be built in the quickest amount of time, 3-4 years), with minimal amount of subsidy required.

#### ***4. What new sources of funding would you consider to create an ongoing stream of dedicated funding for affordable housing production?***

There isn't one panacea – realistically, we're likely going to a collection of steady, smaller streams to get the job done. We never truly have enough money for everything we want to do. But I believe we can make a real difference in making Oakland a more affordable place.

I led the fight for voter approval of the bond measures on the November 2016 ballot – City (Measure KK, \$100 million for housing) and County (Measure A1) – that will provide hundreds of millions of dollars in long-term, sustained funding for affordable housing and homeless shelter/support services.

As an alternative to redevelopment money, that is a game-changer, though we still need even more funding to do all that we want to do.

I would like to see redevelopment agencies brought back. Assemblymember Chiu put forward a bill that would do that, and I hope the next governor will sign this legislation.

We also now have development impact fees to help generate additional funding for affordable housing.

The Council has also found ways to increase its budget allocation for housing and homeless programs, which I have worked very hard as the Council's Finance Committee chair to secure. We've required relocation payments to tenants, which helps address the affordability problem on a smaller, individual- focused scale.

The statewide bond will help. We also have to take advantage of existing state funds for affordable housing (such as cap-and-trade proceeds) – several projects have been built with AHSC funds.

Early in my Council term, I also began exploring the potential of Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs). For example, EIFD funds could be used for projects that implement a Sustainable Community Strategy and Transit Priority Project, such as BRT, green buildings and affordable housing. In West Oakland and the part of East Oakland I represent, an EIFD could provide housing with brownfield restoration, clean-up sites along the Oakland marina, and with BRT along International Boulevard. The actual projects also don't have to be within the district as long as the project has a "tangible connection" to the



work of the EIFD.

***5. In 2016, the City Council reallocated “Boomerang Funds” (the city’s share of property tax increment that used to fund redevelopment) from affordable housing development to homeless services. Measure W would create a vacant property tax to fund homeless services and deal with illegal dumping. If this measure passes, what would you do to ensure that the Boomerang Funds are returned to their original purpose of providing permanent housing?***

I co-authored Measure W. If approved by the voters, it will bring in about \$10 million a year that could be used for programs to address homelessness and combat illegal dumping. As Chair of the Council’s Finance and Management Committee, I am committed to reallocating boomerang funds toward affordable housing, especially for existing residents at the lower AMI levels.

***6. What do you feel are the greatest barriers to affordable housing development in Oakland, and how would you remove those barriers?***

In terms of improving the development process, we need to look to find ways to expedite the Planning and Building Department’s staff review process. The Council has allocated funds in the budget for more than one-dozen planning staff but has not hired up fully.

Aside from funding, we need to streamline the permit process. A streamlined process would allow pre- approved architectural plans to bypass the Planning Commission and require ministerial approval. When it comes to plan check, affordable-housing developers should not be in the same line as for-profit developers. We should bifurcate the system and allow affordable-housing developers to the front of the line.

Development impact fees are a step in the direction of making sure that the financial engine of development also serves the wider needs of the community – and encourages developers to work with the community early in the development process, which can help get more housing in the pipeline and in the ground more quickly.

The devil is in the details: We want to streamline our permit process so that housing of all types can be built faster, while simultaneously protecting our environment and public health. We want to minimize impacts and provide wider community benefits beyond just those solely for residents in the new building. Context matters – a one-size-fits-all approach is not the best solution.

Democracy is a balancing act of interests and power. In crafting our zoning and housing rules, we must be mindful that everybody likes to feel that they have meaningful input into what the world around them looks and feels like. If the proposed project is next to where you live, you want a say in what gets built regardless of the rules.

I’ve also found that developers can shorten the approval time by engaging the community early in the process – often starting at the pre-design phase of a project – and continuing throughout the various stages of the development plan. We’ve had pretty good success in reaching mutually beneficial agreements between the developer and the community in my district.

Developers – for-profit and non-profit alike – like certainty. As everybody gets used to the phase-in of development impact fees and community-benefit agreements like I pushed for on District 2 projects become the accepted model, I look forward to housing projects moving forward more quickly in the future. We should also have a handful of secondary units that have been deemed “pre-approved” designs that can bypass typical approval processes to cut down the time it takes to build these secondary units.

We recently passed legislation that eliminates parking requirements in the downtown area. The construction of parking in new buildings is expensive and can cost about \$80,000 per space. These funds could be better used to build more housing for people rather than storage spaces for vehicles.

Minimum parking requirements should be eliminated so that private development projects no longer can insist on a certain level of parking. Of course, we still need some parking to be built, while creating places that support walking and biking.



## East Bay Housing Organizations

---

How to overcome the obstacles? We make the investments and we change the rules.

We need to build a mix of market-rate and AMI affordable units across the income spectrum. We all know what the tools are, and we need to pursue a comprehensive, integrated package of all of them: more TOD and secondary units and inclusionary zoning, micro-targeted upzoning and mixed-income neighborhoods, housing on vacant, underutilized and City-owned parcels, stronger rent-stabilization and eviction protection laws, a better jobs-housing balance, more job training and small-business assistance, improved infrastructure for alternative transportation, better transit access, lower parking requirements, more public funding (and stronger requirements for developers) for subsidizing the construction, conversion and rehabilitation of housing for lower-income residents.

***7. Oakland is in the middle of an unprecedented building boom, with building permits issued for over 7,000 units between 2015 and 2017, and thousands more in the pipeline. This is far more housing that was created under the “10K” Program in the early 2000s. However, 93% of the housing being built is market rate for above moderate-income households, while only 7% is affordable to very low, low and moderate income households. Oakland’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) incorporated in the adopted Housing Element states that 50% of new housing should be for very low, low and moderate income. What will you do to ensure that Oakland’s housing production is at least proportional to the City’s stated needs?***

We need to build more housing for all income levels. We must increase the number of both market-rate and affordable units. The RHNA estimates Oakland needs approximately 15,000 new units, roughly divided equally between market-rate and affordable units. The City’s Housing Equity Roadmap describes a variety of strategies, which I support, to reach the goal of 7,000 new affordable units. The Council has adopted a plan to build 17,000 new units of housing while protecting 17,000 residents from displacement. The City’s Housing Element has identified 221 opportunity sites that could supply nearly 24,000 units of new housing.

There are ample opportunities around our transit corridors to place all of that housing.

Much of our potential for success depends on finding the money. I am hopeful that the State Housing Bond Measure will pass and, in combination with Measure KK and Measure A1, we can put together the financing required to get projects completed.

I have also pushed for on-site affordable housing. In this crisis, we can’t wait and say, we will build later when we have the funding. Healthy, equitable communities require that we have mixed-income housing and on-site affordability by design. I’m proud that, in my district, we have hundreds of units of affordable housing in the pipeline for a range of affordable income households.

We have to delve deeper into the fundamental, structural conditions of the crisis. A quick, 30,000-foot view: The “housing affordability” crisis is fundamentally a symptom of the intersecting conditions of population changes and income disparities. It’s only an “affordability” problem if you don’t have enough money to pay the rent or mortgage. We talk about displacement in terms of affordable housing – which it is – but the root cause is an income problem.

More people want to live in Oakland – to stay here and move here – than the city currently has housing for. That’s a problem of population growth and demographics (income levels and disparities, and subsequent neighborhood displacement).

Furthermore, Oakland’s housing crisis is also a function of geography: Most large cities are relatively self-contained ecosystems of housing pressures and resources. However, a steady flow of people from higher-priced San Francisco and Berkeley are always looking to move into comparatively cheaper Oakland. This supply-and-price disequilibrium poses a unique external obstacle for Oakland to keep its housing affordable.

Like other cities throughout California, we didn’t make and sustain the investments needed to build enough housing stock and we didn’t exercise the political will to adjust zoning and building codes to foster the creation of more – and more affordable (0-80% AMI, in particular) – homes.

Building more affordable housing, especially TOD, will help put housing closer/more accessible to their jobs.

I will continue support state legislation (and regional/local measures) that foster compact, affordable, equitable development



## East Bay Housing Organizations

---

focusing on stemming displacement of existing residents. We need to change the rules to allow for and incentivize TOD and, just as important, provide sustained funding sources (from state cap-and-trade proceeds to city housing bonds) to actually build it.

Housing and transportation solutions are inextricably linked. A longtime proponent of transit-oriented development to build higher-density, infill housing and strengthen transportation alternatives, I've also pursued funding and implementation of a complete-streets approach that promotes safer places for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders.

The transportation-infrastructure project with perhaps the most long-term consequences (including affordable housing) in my district may eventually be BRT, which will run through my neighborhoods along International Blvd. and connect to downtown Oakland. Mindful about the debate whether this project was the best use of transit funds, BRT will serve as a vehicle to not only better connect East Oakland to downtown but also an engine to encourage more higher-density housing density around the corridor.

The implementation of the Lake Merritt BART Station Area Specific Plan's housing and transportation goals are also a priority for District 2. The BART Board of Directors voted this month to enter into an exclusive negotiating agreement with EBALDC and the Strada Investment Group to develop affordable housing in a transit-oriented development around the Lake Merritt station. Helping to improve connections between Lake Merritt, Downtown, Chinatown and Laney College, the proposed mixed-used project will include 519 new apartments – 44% of them affordable – and more than 500,000 square feet of commercial space. About one-fifth of the office space will go to local nonprofit organizations (jobs-housing balance and community benefits).

Oakland development in the coming years must likewise improve the jobs-housing balance. That's why I pushed to turn the lot in my district at 1100 Broadway, which had been vacant for 30 years, into a new office tower. The thousands of people who will work in this much needed office building will fan out at lunchtime and in the evenings, and support surrounding small businesses throughout downtown and Chinatown neighborhoods in my district. This walkable, transit-friendly project will create 500 good-paying construction jobs and provide office space for approximately 1,700 new workers once it opens.



## East Bay Housing Organizations

---

I also want to make sure Oakland has enough hotel rooms – my district encompasses the Downtown, Chinatown and Eastlake neighborhoods as well as Lake Merritt, Laney College, the UC system office and a number of cultural attractions – to sustain tourist and business activity, which is a vital boost for workers in service industries.

Some advocates think we must put all our efforts into subsidizing housing just for residents at the lowest income levels (often below 30% AMI). Some even want to block construction of market-rate housing, which they believe spurs higher rents and increases displacement.

We can debate logistical theories forever. However, the simple, on-the-ground reality is that if there isn't a "market-rate" apartment available, a higher-income tenant will pay a higher rent than a less wealthy tenant can for an otherwise "affordable" apartment. Over time, that forces average rents higher and causes wider displacement of existing residents.

When some advocates preferred a proposal for some 250 fewer units on the E. 12th St. remainder parcel that would also have gutted the City's Housing Trust Fund for other projects, for example, they were ultimately supporting the displacement of 250 families living in other parts of town.

As a result, we need a comprehensive mix of market-rate and affordable housing balanced across the income spectrum. The best housing approach, it's also the best philosophy to avoid ending up with a city that is home to only the very rich and the very poor. That's the approach I've taken as Councilmember in pushing for legislative reforms, negotiating development agreements, and securing a lot more funding for affordable housing.

We need to find ways that we can ensure that the Area Specific Plans that the Council adopted are implemented and are performing effectively as planned. During my time on the Council, we have more than 1,700 units of mixed-income housing currently coming online. That is in addition to approximately 3,000 units of housing at Brooklyn Basin that was approved before I joined the Council.

In addition to the income mix, I support the construction of more housing for families (2-/3-bedroom units). I support the construction of more workforce housing, particularly for our teachers, nurses, firefighters and police officers. As Baby Boomers get older, we will increasingly need to expand housing (and transportation) opportunities for our seniors and mobility-impaired residents. That's also a reason to relax the rules for second units.

**IMPACT FEES:** I voted for the current citywide, zone-structured impact fee to help make sure that it would generate more money for affordable housing while not discouraging new development. Oakland's fee structure is roughly consistent with those of surrounding cities (if too much higher, Oakland would be at a competitive disadvantage to attract developers, especially in the short term when building more market-rate and affordable housing is at a crisis point). Impact fees only work if and when development occurs.

The City identified areas where the fees could be higher (particularly around transit corridors and hubs where higher-density buildings will be developed). The plan envisions gradually increasing the fee levels over time.

The fees, by themselves, are not adequate to generate enough revenue to build all the affordable housing we need. We would all like the fees to be higher, but, on balance, this is probably the most reasonable first step that was doable. Once we see how this set of fees work, we can adjust them.

I also supported Measure KK, the November 2016 bond measure that provides substantial, sustained funding for affordable housing and homeless programs – this will provide far more funding than an impact fee would.

I've also helped negotiate with, and pushed, several developers of major projects in District 2 to provide for both on-site and off-site affordable housing as part of Community Benefit Agreements. These collaborative efforts can achieve the same – or better – results as the impact-fee route.

Beyond impact fees, I am advocating for a comprehensive strategy to help ensure that affordable units do get built and built at the same time as market-rate housing – and foster neighborhoods that have a better mix of incomes.

I've had success in getting developers in District 2 to provide affordable housing as part of several Community Benefits Agreements, and Oakland's impact-fee law helps give the community more leverage to get affordable units built and secure



other neighborhood amenities.

These projects include the W-12 project, 1314 Franklin, 301 12th St., 285 12th St., 226 13th St., and the E. 12th remainder parcel. This approach can create thousands of new apartments, while being sensitive about specific neighborhood context.

I'm also working to encourage second units, especially near transit hubs and walkable to neighborhood shops. This will produce more housing, and can also help provide some residents with additional income to allow them to stay in their homes.

Oakland has some 20,000 vacant and underutilized lots. I'm pushing for measures that encourage housing construction on these lots. A vacant parcel tax is one example for generating revenue to underwrite the construction of affordable housing.

We must also be mindful about the demographic implications of our development policies. Equity and environmental justice is imperative.

In addition to ensuring affordable housing, we need to work together to make sure that new development provides open community/green spaces, public art, urban forests, that are accessible to everyone. I have been successful in securing community-developer agreements on a number of projects in my district that achieve these goals.

***8. Large sections of Oakland, particularly in the North and East Oakland flatlands, have been recently designated "Opportunity Zones" where investors are entitled to significant federal tax benefits. How will you ensure that those investments benefit existing residents rather than exacerbate displacement in transitioning neighborhoods? Would you support the City reclaiming a portion of the enhanced value for affordable housing, for example by creating an Opportunity Zone overlay where housing impact fees and jobs/housing linkage fees would be higher than in other areas of the City?***

This depends on which specific neighborhoods and sections within those neighborhoods, but I generally agree with the concept. Such overlays are particularly attractive in transit-oriented corridors and areas with a large number of vacant and underutilized parcels (ripe for "transitioning" and more accelerated rates of displacement).

Developers will always go first to where housing construction makes the most financial sense for them, and then they expand outward. Right now, that means around the downtown. More construction in other neighborhoods will occur normally over time, especially as downtown projects get completed. Our goal is to try to accelerate this natural pattern. Opportunity zone overlays could help with that, as long as we clearly understand the economic drivers of the neighborhoods we're targeting and the outcomes we want (avoiding unintended consequences that often occur with such market mechanisms).

The City can do a better job with potential developers of identifying and marketing opportunity sites with good transit access in other neighborhoods. There are many good sites in my district, for example, where 3- and 4-story buildings are ideal (compared to the taller buildings that are well-suited for the downtown core).

We also need to push for vacant and blighted properties to be developed for higher-density housing.

I am a strong advocate for making it easier to build secondary units on single-family home properties, especially in areas close to transit.

We also have to work with transit agencies and other partners to close the first mile/last mile gap. That's crucial to promoting more housing in neighborhoods that aren't right on top of transit lines.

I've installed more bike lanes, fixed potholes and broken sidewalks, made crosswalks safer, and worked with residents and transportation staff to implement traffic-calming road diets on District 2 streets. These transportation improvements create better conditions for more housing.

We can think beyond immediate housing crisis: Keep in mind that the downtown has enough developable land – much of it vacant or used for surface parking – to accommodate more than 8,000 housing units "without demolishing any existing buildings" (SPUR).

***9. Do you support Prop 10, and if it passes, what would you do to strengthen Oakland rent control?***



## East Bay Housing Organizations

---

YES, I support the repeal of Costa Hawkins because it will give Oakland the opportunity to make choices about adjusting our city's rent-stabilization measures. We should be able to decide what works best for our community – and not have those choices restricted by outside interests.

Costa-Hawkins prohibits cities from imposing rent control on single-family homes or condos, and bans cities from capping rent on any building in Oakland that was built after 1983. It also allows landlords of rent-controlled units to raise monthly payments to whatever they want after a tenant moves out – “vacancy decontrol” – which can motivate some landlords to try to unfairly evict their tenants. Prop 10 can let us change that in Oakland.

If Costa-Hawkins is repealed, we can move to quickly extend rent stabilization and eviction protections to more Oakland tenants. It would open the door for Oakland to place more of its housing units under rent-stabilization regulation and extend eviction protections to more tenants. This would provide a crucial tool in our efforts to prevent displacement, especially while we work to increase the supply of affordable housing in Oakland.

In addition to swift Council action, I would want voter approval for the more sweeping adjustments to ensure that these protections are permanent, and not subject to the whim of future Councils.

For example, I voted at the July 24 Council meeting, to place a measure of the November 2018 ballot to extend just-cause eviction protections to tenants in 2- and 3-unit owner-occupied buildings.

We need to take steps to make and keep apartments affordable for existing tenants. Three out of five Oakland residents are tenants. Approximately two-thirds of Oakland renters pay more than the federally recommended maximum of 30% of their income on rent. A third of Oakland's 92,000 apartments – 32,000 units built after 1983 – are exempted from rent control because of Costa-Hawkins.

Roughly two-third of Oakland's senior households (nearly 20,000) are low-income. The disabled are also vulnerable to displacement: 23% of Oakland's population reported a disability, and nearly half of the population aged 65 or older is disabled.

The goal requires much more than the repeal of Costa-Hawkins and subsequent local actions that become available to us. We will continue to strengthen eviction protections. We build more housing (affordable and market-rate) to help ease the escalation of average rents. I'm proud that the City Council approved my legislation this year to regulate Tenant Move-Out Agreement Ordinance. The measure, which went into effect May 1, regulates move-out agreements and negotiations with landlords, requires disclosure, and provides remedies for violations.

During a time when tenant displacement is one of the most pressing issues in Oakland, this ordinance provides a clear process for negotiations and agreements when tenants move out. It will help foster better communication and information shared between Oakland tenants and landlords. Tenants will now have more time and the information they need to make decisions that reflect their needs.

Under the new law, property owners must submit notifications of their intent to enter into move-out negotiations and completed agreements to the City's Rent Adjustment Program. The ordinance doesn't apply to move-out agreements that are negotiated or agreed to during the course of an unlawful detainer (eviction) proceeding.

We address the income side by supporting job-training programs, career education opportunities and the quality of our public schools to help tenants increase their incomes. We will continue to support and enforce higher minimum wages. We can try to reduce the obstacles of transportation and childcare needs to make getting and keeping a job more manageable.

***10. The Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program only serves a fraction of the people who qualify. Those who are fortunate enough to receive such assistance often discover that they cannot find landlords willing to accept their vouchers. What would you do to ensure that Section 8 vouchers are accepted throughout the City so that all who receive them can actually use them?***

We need to conduct more outreach to Oakland landlords to demonstrate that, in fact, the program works and is easy to access. I think that we should also perhaps increase the financial incentive to landlords for signing up for the program and work with



## East Bay Housing Organizations

---

individual landlords to help get the word out about the program.

I also plan to bring forward an ordinance to prohibit discrimination based on the source of income, such as housing vouchers.

***11. What measures will you support to prevent at-risk households from becoming homeless, and what would you do to provide housing for those who are already homeless? Please discuss both short-term and long-term strategies.***

The answer to homelessness is more housing. However, the best first step is to stop people from becoming homeless in the first place. We need to take more steps immediately to deal with the crisis. Rapid rehousing and assistance to relocate are crucial.

Stronger and expanded tenant protections dealing with unfair rent hikes and unjust evictions that we've enacted during my Council term encompass both short-term and long-term solutions for at-risk households and to keep those who aren't currently at-risk of displacement from becoming at-risk (housing-insecure) in the future.

All of the affordable housing and transportation infrastructure efforts I've described in previous responses come into play to create conditions that minimize the dangers for at-risk households and reduce the number of households that will become exposed to housing insecurity. Building a mix of housing that is affordable across the income spectrum with mixed-income housing in our neighborhoods creates an equitable, inclusive community that can provide affordable, healthy homes for all its residents.