

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WORKFORCE HOUSING (ACOWH)

Charge: Review the Faculty-Staff Housing Assessment from Education Housing Partners and recommend to the Board of Education, using the information from that assessment, a prioritization of the four potential sites for employee housing.

Scope: To make a recommendation of the prioritization of the four potential sites for employee housing to the Board of Education at the February 13, 2025 Board of Education meeting.

Meeting Date: Tuesday, February 4, 2025
Meeting Topic: Recommendation to Board of Education
Meeting Location: 855 Lenzen Avenue, San Jose, CA 95126, Room 150
Meeting Start Time: 6:00pm
Members: Chair: José Magaña (Vice President, Board of Education)
Vice-Chair: Teresa Castellanos (President, Board of Education)
Renata Sanchez
Peter Park
Sharon Calhoun
Sammy Coppola
Ariya Amin
Jill Case
Vicky Ramirez
David Barry
Veronica Douat
Brian Glick
Gabriela Luna
Staff Designee: Seth Reddy (Chief Business Officer)
Committee Resources: <https://sjusd.box.com/v/ACOWH-resources>

Anyone planning to attend the meeting who has a disability and needs special assistance should call the Superintendent's Office, 408-535-6069.

Se ofrecen servicios de interpretación al español. Si desea solicitar interpretación al español, por favor llame a la Oficina del Superintendente, 408-535-6069.

Agenda

I. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 6:02pm.

II. Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Reddy proposed an amendment to item VII to strike the first part of the agenda item reading "Using the agreed upon Process for Using Criteria for Employee Housing Prioritization process". It is a clerical error and duplicative.

Chair Magaña asked for a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Motion: Ariya

Second: Teresa

Unanimous approval.

III. Approval of [Minutes from January 28, 2025 meeting](#)

Motion: Sharon

Second: Ariya

Unanimous approval.

IV. Public Comment

Individual speakers shall fill out a Request to Speak card and be allowed two minutes to address the committee. The total time for public input shall be limited to 20 minutes. With committee consent, staff may increase or decrease the time allowed for public presentation, depending on the topic and the number of persons wishing to be heard, and may ask that additional persons speak only if they have something new to add.

Speaker: Sanjay Khanna

Topic: Resident near Pine Hill school. Impact of housing on the neighborhood, specifically on parking.

Speaker: Erin O'Neill

Topic: Superintendent of MetroEd. Encourage how SJUSD might reconsider the MetroEd property as a whole. Programs that MetroEd provides.

Speaker: Alison Piergallini

Topic: Resident of Hammer neighborhood. Strongly oppose housing in the area. Impact of housing on the neighborhood.

Speaker: Jeff Arnett

Topic: Principal of SVCTE. Impact of campus traffic, solar panel project, and parking.

Speaker: Sherry Keosh

Topic: Resident of River Glen area. Concerned about questions that have not been addressed. Opposed to development on the Broadway (River Glen K-8) site.

Speaker: Michelle Thompson

Topic: Making tough recommendations with very little information. Concerned about no plans for tearing down the buildings.

Speaker: Geoffrey Day

Topic: Resident in the Bouret/Pine Hill neighborhood. Concerned about access and open space and impact on the neighborhood.

Speaker: Donald Leesch

Topic: Resident in the Bouret/Pine Hill neighborhood. Area is now the only green space.

Speaker: Kiran Grewal

Topic: Assistant Superintendent of MetroEd. Encourage the committee to consider the number of students who are served at MetroEd and the programs they provide.

Speaker: Alberto Massarotto

Topic: Concerns about access to the Broadway (River Glen K-8) site. Concerns about traffic analysis.



Speaker: Anna Sarsfield

Topic: Resident of Pine Hill neighborhood. Teacher at SJUSD. Opposed to Pine Hill. Concerns about green space. Concerns about impact on existing Non-Public School on the site.

Speaker: Robert Avey

Topic: Pine Hill resident. Opposed to the development in the neighborhood. Concerns about infrastructure issues.

Speaker: Linda Loesch

Topic: Pine Hill resident. Concerns about increase in traffic from existing non-public school program. Opposed to development in the neighborhood.

Speaker: Jenny Mankin

Topic: River Glen parent. Encouraged committee to consider impact on River Glen students. Resident near Lenzen. Shared positive feedback on the Lenzen neighborhood.

Speaker: Joe Kafka

Topic: Resident of Pine Hill. Concerns about green space. Concerns about impact on traffic.

Speaker: Deb Siebrandt

Topic: Pine Hill resident. Concerned about impact on the neighborhood. Concerns about green space and parking.

Speaker: Wendy Zhang

Topic: Staff of MetroEd, resident of SJUSD. Shared information about MetroEd. Concerns about impact on the program.

Speaker: Alejandra Acosta

Topic: River Glen alumna, former SJUSD teacher. Opposed to River Glen site for housing. Concerned about next steps for the school should River Glen be chosen. Expressed support for Lenzen site.

Speaker: Melissa Barney

Topic: Pine Hill resident. Concerned about green space. Concerns about infrastructure in the neighborhood.

Speaker: Michelle Whitfield

Topic: Resident of Pine Hill. Concerned about the impact of development on the neighborhood. Opposed to the development.

Speaker: Celina Hernandez-Luna

Topic: Representing River Glen program. Opposed to the development and lack of certainty about where program would go.

Speaker: Jessica Ultreras

Topic: River Glen parent. Opposed to the development on the Broadway site. Encouraged the committee to consider Lenzen.

Speaker: Bart Willner

Topic: Spoke about the Civil Grand Jury report. Apologized to the committee because the information was several years old.



Speaker: Yocelin Cervantes

Topic: Resident of SJUSD and employee at MetroEd. Concerned about the impact of housing on the program.

Speaker: Kim Timoteo

Topic: MetroEd employee. Provided information about the program. Concerned about the impact of housing on the program.

Speaker: Teresa Lopez

Topic: Pine Hill resident. Concerned about the impact of the development on the neighborhood and green space. Opposed to the development in the neighborhood.

Speaker: Mike Keogh

Topic: Resident of Pine Hill. Encouraged the committee to not make a recommendation and provide learning and feedback to inform a different decision.

Speaker: Joell Hanson

Topic: SJUSD resident and MetroEd employee. Described MetroEd program. Concerned about the impact of the development on the program.

Speaker: Katherine Tseng

Topic: Board member of Los Gatos-Saratoga Union High School District and MetroEd board member. Concerned about the impact of the development on the MetroEd program.

V. Follow Up and Questions from Last Meeting

Mr. Reddy stated I can give a report on this after discussing with our legal counsel. First, staff would not commit nor recommend to the board to commit to never selling any property, including our schools. This not only ties the hands of future elected officials but also removes the option to, in an unlikely but possible scenario where there is a natural disaster and selling property is a way to provide funding to rebuild or repair schools. However, what I can say is that school districts receive different types of revenue that are restricted to different uses. For example, we receive revenue for special education that can only be used on special education expenditures. Bond proceeds, and any money received that stem from bond proceeds like selling a property that was improved/built using bond funds, have to be spent on facilities. So while it is legally possible to sell a property that money isn't profit, generally couldn't be used for salaries or other expenditures, and would be restricted to facilities. Another consideration is one-time profit vs. ongoing benefit. The savings in retention costs, recruitment costs vastly outweigh any financial benefit we will get.

Ms. Douat asked about use of funds from bond for things other than facilities. Mr. Reddy answered.

VI. Review of Criteria for Employee Housing Prioritization

Mr. Reddy reviewed the criteria for employee housing prioritization to ground the committee in it prior to the next agenda item.

VII. Recommendation to Board of Education

Mr. Reddy reviewed the process for using criteria for employee housing prioritization.



Ms. Douat stated she appreciated the public comment. Lots of perspectives and everyone has valid reasons and concerns about which site is chosen. That is somewhat alleviating.

Trustee Magaña stated that Ms. Sanchez last time talked about how challenging this decision is.

Mr. Barry stated he was struck by, in public comment, the comments from Hillsdale were mainly employees. Nothing he heard from the Hillsdale speakers were not issues that couldn't be overcome by good community feedback and quality design. No other site presents the opportunities to put a dent in the need for employee housing. The proposed site is a patch of land and is currently surrounded by housing.

Mr. Glick was curious if any of the numbers would jump out at me. What I'm seeing based on our input is that the number of units and employee demand and number of units are the lowest. This seems to be the most important thing that we've identified as a committee. There is agreement we are in a housing crisis and this is an opportunity, possibly a once in a generation opportunity, to provide as much housing as possible.

Mr. Barry stated his number one criteria was number of units.

Ms. Case stated, referencing a public comment, on the round pegs with square holes. What we are learning is everyone is scared of change and the unknown, which this is. To start from the beginning again we would cycle through this again. Make sure we are good partners in this process to alleviate any concerns. The number of units is very important and the Lenzen project has so few units.

Trustee Castellanos stated that the board is the one that will decide. Weighing the cost of the housing vs. other investments under Measure R. There is most definitely a housing crisis. Building housing is really, really hard. As a Board member, I have been trying to do this for eight years. It doesn't get any easier. Really appreciate the time and effort you all put into this. No doubt that the maximum number of housing units but have to balance that with other work we do.

Ms. Sanchez thanked everyone for their comments. Mr. Glick pointed out that there were some numbers that jumped out at me. The overall 142 score for Hillsdale stood out as a top choice. On the other side, the River Glen score is high and stands out. Was thinking about the number of units and types of units. Hillsdale is a great site with a number of units. Some concern about types of units. Would say that if we do go with that site to make recommendations to re-look at the types of those units. Hillsdale is proposing 204 one-bedroom/one-bath units which is above the demand. Need to be careful about thinking about the demand and preferences.

Ms. Amin stated she was thinking along the same lines. Hillsdale meets criteria in many ways but types of units don't necessarily match up. Another consideration that was coming to mind is that perhaps when we are making the recommendation that potentially with the cost of Hillsdale you could develop Lenzen and possibly another site. As a teacher, I've seen the impact of vacancies and student teachers who chose to go to other districts. Feel the strain of not having staff. No solution will be perfect but can seek creative solutions.

Mr. Barry stated he agrees with Ms. Sanchez that recommendation should include considering types of units in the mix. Mr. Barry described other projects that involved multiple school districts. It is big enough and flexible enough to have other opportunities.



Ms. Calhoun stated that she really went back and forth on this. Described her history in the Pine Hill neighborhood. Stated that the open space cannot go away and that is why the plans are what they are. Big problem is the traffic. Recommends the Hillsdale site but with an exploration of the types of units. Want the most units we can get but considering the location and how it might impact the MetroEd program that it could be modified.

Mr. Glick asked Mr. Park about insight on attracting new teachers to the area from outside our region. Does he feel a one-bedroom unit would be an attractive unit type? Is this the opportunity here that we may have in attracting new employees?

Mr. Park stated that for years and years all of the interviews that we have done were traditionally in-person because most people were local. However, in the last 10 years it is harder and harder to recruit from Santa Clara County because there are so many districts vying for talent. For many years we have gone beyond the county, beyond the city, and when we go beyond CA to other states and even international candidates. That is the state that we are in. To your question, if I had to guess, based on when we enroll people and turn on benefits there are individuals who come to San José on their own but also have people who have families already. Referenced the employee survey and their input and one of the lowest ranking was one-bedroom. 2-bedroom was 40% and 3 bedrooms was 39%. All of those are factors that we weighed and studied. Use the data that we have and information that we have. Usually there is need, could be 1 bedroom but also beyond that.

Mr. Glick stated he was curious if we needed a lot of one-bedrooms so if we as a committee are leaning towards what the results show.

Mr. Coppola stated that this is a lot of information to do in five meetings. He does not want to pick a site that involves tearing down an existing school.

Ms. Sanchez reiterated that the proposed employee housing has always been for all employees, not just teachers. She recognized the impact the cost of living and housing has on the classified staff.

Ms. Luna stated that she is happy to hear input from everyone and the different neighborhoods. She stated that she knows that there is a struggle with housing for many in our community. She stated a desire to spend more time and review additional information.

Mr. Reddy stated that while he understands this is a lot of information this project has been under development for over 8 years and there was a long process to narrow down all the possible properties in the district's portfolio.

Ms. Douat spoke about the importance of the River Glen program and the unique nature of the program. She discussed her considerations for what the future of the program may look like with this opportunity and wanted, through this process, to consider what the future may look like and opportunities for that program.

Mr. Glick stated that the brick and mortar aspect of the River Glen site and that its community focus is such a valuable resource for the community that without any type of plan for what would happen next it is #4 on his list (i.e. his least favorite site). Mr. Glick stated that there is revenue that is currently brought in by the Pine Hill site.

Ms. Amin expressed her opinion on the River Glen site and the considerations this process has brought up on the TWBI program. Understands the impact on the MetroEd site. Appreciates the



public comment from the community and insights into the dynamics of the community. Wonders if there is any possibility that with a collaborative approach that Lenzen and Bouret could be developed at the same time. Discussed the unit type preferences from the survey.

Ms. Case stated that the recommendation to the Board should likely include a more in-depth look at parking.

Mr. Reddy stated that he understands this has raised questions about the River Glen program but recommendations on that are beyond the scope of the committee. He stated that while the committee could consider 2 projects it would be a tremendous burden on the staff to move forward with two projects.

Ms. Sanchez stated with the Hillsdale property there is potential for commercial space. Ms. Sanchez stated that she brought up the possibility of childcare in the building. She stated that maybe there are synergies there with the existing program. Ms. Sanchez stated that she knows it is not something that can be promised. She stated that with the Bouret site she thinks a lot about the open space. Regarding the Broadway campus, I've shared a lot about the opportunity of what could happen at River Glen and what it would take to grow the program. This may take possibly 10 more classrooms.

Ms. Douat spoke about the River Glen K-8 program.

Trustee Magaña described the process. He reflected back on the committee that he sees coalescing on the Hillsdale property. River Glen seems to be 4 and we have some work to do in the middle.

Trustee Castellanos stated it caught her attention the possibility of another district.

Mr. Glick stated that other districts are considering this.

Trustee Magaña stated that he would entertain a motion on the priority of sites 2-3. Mr. Glick stated he would put forward a motion that the Bouret site be 2 and the Lenzen site be 3. Ms. Sanchez seconded. Trustee Castellanos stated that less controversy is always good but respects the vote of the committee.

Trustee Magaña called for a vote. Motion passes 11-1-1.

Trustee Magaña stated that a tentative motion, based on the discussion, would be Hillsdale, Bouret, Lenzen, River Glen. Committee discussed possible recommendations including cost and number of units.

Mr. Coppola and Ms. Amin stated they had both ranked Bouret second because of the number and type of units.

Discussion of the recommendation including parking and the parking ratio. Ms. Sanchez stated that the parking ratios are similar for all sites except Lenzen.

Trustee Magaña summarized the input on the recommendations and the prioritization. Mr. Glick made a motion to prioritize the sites as follows: Hillsdale, Bouret, Lenzen, Broadway.

Mr. Reddy summarized the proposed written recommendation to the Board of Education that incorporated the discussion and recommendations of the committee.



Mr. Glick stated that this is a committee that involves compromise. He would propose removing b and e but he would vote to move forward with those included.

Ms. Sanchez stated that, for b, while Hillsdale is the most expensive, we balance that with the facilities upgrades identified in preparation for Measure R.

Mr. Coppola stated that the numbers are a few years old and we should expect to see higher costs.

Mr. Reddy stated that the estimated costs were last updated a year ago in March 2024.

Trustee Magaña stated that there is a motion on the table for the priority and the letter. Trustee Magaña took a hand vote. Motion passed unanimously, 13-0-0.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 8:15pm.

Motion: Trustee Castellanos

Second: Mr. Glick

Staff Recommendations

V. Follow Up and Questions from Last Meeting

The committee shall discuss follow up items and questions from last meeting, including but not limited to:

- Legal considerations and analysis of future sale of projects funded using general obligation bond proceeds

VI. Review of Criteria for Employee Housing Prioritization

To prioritize the four potential sites for employee housing, the Committee has established criteria. The criteria are:

- the estimated cost, including total, per unit, make-ready, and opportunity costs, of developing employee housing at the site and relationship with non-employee housing construction funded by Measure R;
- location of the site and the employee preferences and work locations;
- the number of units and the employee demand;
- the type of units and the employee preferences;
- the impact of the site on San José Unified school programs, objectives, and Master Plan for San José Unified properties; and
- the current zoning designation and the entitlement risk.

VII. Recommendation to Board of Education

The committee shall use the agreed upon Process for Using Criteria for Employee Housing Prioritization process (below), including an objective analysis of each potential site, to begin the deliberations to make a recommendation to the Board of Education using, if desired, the previously discussed [proposed format](#).

Process for Using Criteria for Employee Housing Prioritization

- By February 2, 2025 at 5pm, each member shall independently force rank the sites for each criterion 1 to 4 with 1 being that the site best satisfies that criterion and 4 being that the site least satisfies the criterion;



- Each member shall submit the rank for each criterion to the Chair;
- The Staff Designee shall sum the results from each committee member to create a single score for each site and provide to the Chair; and
- The Chair shall present the summed results for each site and anonymized data on the distribution of rank for each site (ex: the number of committee members that ranked the site 1, 2, 3, and 4 for a particular site) at the February 4, 2025 meeting.

