Fall 2015

Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI)

Oscar Inzunza
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects

Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Inzunza, Oscar, "Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI)" (2015). *Master's Projects*. 461.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.ux4g-gzr8>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects/461

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI)

By

Oscar Inzunza

Research Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Public Administration

Frances Edwards, Ph.D.
Adviser

The Graduate School
San Jose State University

December, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	6
Research Question/ Problem Statement.....	6
Methodology	13
Methods to obtain data.....	13
Data analysis.....	13
Literature Review	15
Findings	21
SNI Program Implementation	22
Total Neighborhood Investment	25
SNI Program by Neighborhood (19 Neighborhoods).....	27
Blackford	30
Burbank/Del Monte	33
Delmas Park	36
East Valley/680 Communities	39
Edenvale/Great Oaks	42
Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace	45
Gateway East	49
Greater Gardner	52
Hoffman/Via Monte	55
K.O.N.A.	58
Market/Almaden	61
Mayfair	64
Spartan/Keyes	67
Thirteenth Street	70
Tully/Senter	73
University	76
Washington	79
West Evergreen	82
Winchester	85
Analysis and Summary	88
Threats to Data Validity.....	88
Threats to Instrumentation Validity.....	88
Issues Encountered	89
Program Comparisons	90
Goal Completion & Monetary Value	91
Neighborhood Data	93
Civic Engagement	95
Conclusion	
Recommendations.....	97

Conclusion..... 98

Attachments

Attachment 1: SNI 19 Neighborhoods Map 99
Attachment 2: Seifel Report on Investment100

Sources Consulted 101

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: SNI by Council District	8
Table 2: Summary of Total Investment	26
Table 3: SNI Expenditure by Initiative	27
Table 4: Investment by Neighborhood per Objective	29
Table 5: Blackford Neighborhood Data	30
Table 6: Blackford Investments	31
Table 7: Blackford Top Ten Priorities	32
Table 8: Burbank/Del Monte Neighborhood Data	34
Table 9: Burbank/Del Monte Investments	35
Table 10: Burbank/Del Monte Top Ten Priorities	35
Table 11: Delmas Park Neighborhood Data	37
Table 12: Delmas Park Investments	38
Table 13: Delmas Park Top Ten Priorities	38
Table 14: East Valley/680 Communities Neighborhood Data	40
Table 15: East Valley/680 Communities Investments	41
Table 16: East Valley/680 Communities Top Ten Priorities	41
Table 17: Edenvale/Great Oaks Neighborhood Data	43
Table 18: Edenvale/Great Oaks Investments	43
Table 19: Edenvale/Great Oaks Top Ten Priorities	44
Table 20: Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Neighborhood Data	46
Table 21: Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Investments	47
Table 22: Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Top Ten Priorities	48
Table 23: Gateway East Neighborhood Data	50
Table 24: Gateway East Investments	50
Table 25: Gateway East Top Ten Priorities	51
Table 26: Greater Gardner Neighborhood Data	53
Table 27: Greater Gardner Investments	53
Table 28: Greater Gardner Top Ten Priorities	54
Table 29: Hoffman/Via Monte Neighborhood Data	56
Table 30: Hoffman/Via Monte Investments	56
Table 31: Hoffman/Via Monte Top Ten Priorities	57
Table 32: K.O.N.A. Neighborhood Data	59
Table 33: K.O.N.A. Investments	60
Table 34: K.O.N.A. Top Ten Priorities	60
Table 35: Market/Almaden Neighborhood Data	62
Table 36: Market/Almaden Investments	62
Table 37: Market/Almaden Top Ten Priorities	63
Table 38: Mayfair Neighborhood Data	65
Table 39: Mayfair Investments	65
Table 40: Mayfair Top Ten Priorities	66
Table 41: Spartan/Keyes Neighborhood Data	68
Table 42: Spartan/Keyes Investments	69
Table 43: Spartan/Keyes Top Ten Priorities	69
Table 44: Thirteenth Street Neighborhood Data	71

Table 45: Thirteenth Street Investments	72
Table 46: Thirteenth Street Top Ten Priorities	72
Table 47: Tully/Senter Neighborhood Data	74
Table 48: Tully/Senter Investments	75
Table 49: Tully/Senter Top Ten Priorities	75
Table 50: University Neighborhood Data	77
Table 51: University Investments	78
Table 52: University Top Ten Priorities	78
Table 53: Washington Neighborhood Data	80
Table 54: Washington Investments	81
Table 55: Washington Top Ten Priorities	81
Table 56: West Evergreen Neighborhood Data	83
Table 57: West Evergreen Investments	84
Table 58: West Evergreen Top Ten Priorities	84
Table 59: Winchester Neighborhood Data	86
Table 60: Winchester Investments	86
Table 61: Winchester Top Ten Priorities	87

INTRODUCTION

The Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI) was created in 2002 to revitalize the City of San Jose's most blighted neighborhoods, and promote civic engagement between city government and the residents. The SNI program has been credited with building cleaner, safer and stronger communities around the city. These were accomplished by engaging community residents, property owners and businesses in establishing neighborhood improvement goals as well as becoming involved in the decision making processes for future projects. In 2012, redevelopment agencies across California were eliminated by the State due to a budget crisis (Woolfolk, 2012). However, because of their profound impact to local communities, programs such as SNI should be examined for efficiency and their impact on the communities they served, to determine if they achieved an acceptable level of targeted cost/benefit for continued investment of scarce public funds.

The development of the SNI program began in May of 2000 as a result of neighborhood blight studies and community feedback. The San Jose Redevelopment Agency (RDA) had previously focused its efforts on the revitalization of downtown San Jose. However, then Mayor Ron Gonzales wanted to use redevelopment funding to improve conditions in blighted neighborhoods, as well. Mayor Gonzales planned to shift tens of millions of dollars in redevelopment money into the city's poorest neighborhoods calling it a "first investment in neighborhoods" (Levey, 2001). On June 25, 2002, the City Council approved the Mayor's proposal, creating what is now known as the Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI). The neighborhoods were throughout the City of San Jose which can be seen on Attachment 1. Three existing programs were merged to create SNI: (1) Project Crackdown, (2) Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (NRS), and (3) Redevelopment Neighborhood Investment District

program (SNI, 2002). The City of San Jose, through its Redevelopment Agency (RDA), wanted to create a long-term approach to the revitalization of San Jose's neighborhoods, eliminating blight, and creating more community engagement with the city through a thirty-year plan.

The SNI plan originally created twenty-two (but later settled on nineteen) designated "neighborhoods", geographical boundaries defined within the city that were considered blighted, and that could not be corrected solely on minimal City funding, thus redevelopment funding was to be used. However, some city council members found their districts without an SNI neighborhood and demanded that each council district have at least one SNI neighborhood. After the council members made their demands, the areas of need were examined and it was concluded that not all districts had blighted areas in need, so the new SNI neighborhood list was created as shown in Table 1 (Pereira, 2011).

Table 1: SNI by Council District

District	SNI
1	Blackford
	Winchester
2	Edenvale/ Great Oaks
3	Delmas Park
	Five Wounds/ Brookwood Terrace
	Greater Gardner
	Market/ Almaden
	Spartan/Keyes
	13th
	University
	Washington
4	None
5	East Valley/ 680
	Gateway East
	Mayfair
6	Burbank/ Del Monte
	Greater Gardner
	Winchester
7	KONA
	Tully/Senter
	Washington
	West Evergreen
8	KONA
	West Evergreen
9	None
10	Hoffman/ Via Monte

Sources of Data: Strong Neighborhoods: Neighborhood Improvement Plan, 2002 (individual neighborhoods)

The lead departments for the program were the RDA and the Department of Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services (PRNS). Each SNI program included Team Leader positions to be liaisons between the defined neighborhoods and the City. The team leaders interacted with the community to create the Neighborhood Advisory Committee or

Neighborhood Action Coalition (NAC), made up of local stakeholders such as landlords and business owners which would advise on neighborhood-specific matters, and the Resident Action Committees (RAC), made up of residents within the community. The NAC and RAC then met to develop the neighborhood's action agenda, which provided a range of voices leading to the creating of the "top ten" priorities for change and improvement in each neighborhood (SNI, 2002).

The boundaries for each of the nineteen SNI neighborhoods were determined by the presence of physical blight, low income and often minority residents, and crime problems such as drug-related activity, a legacy from the Project Crackdown program. SNI neighborhoods such as Blackford had 24% Latino and 21% Asian residents, while other neighborhoods like Washington were 84.5% Latino and 2.7% Asian (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The Washington neighborhood had a poverty rate of 21% compared to 9% citywide (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). These demographics illustrate the diversity within SNI areas and the areas' lower income levels. The program would attempt to alleviate the blighted areas with certain objectives.

The SNI plan had eight components and objectives: (1) prevention and elimination of blight, (2) site improvements to strengthen the economy, (3) effectively using redevelopment processes for the long-term, (4) redesign of blighted areas, (5) promotion of new investments, (6) improvements with drainage and lighting, (7) job creation, and (8) creation of new low-income housing or improvements to existing housing (SNI, 2002). Each neighborhood created its own "top ten" goals or priorities through NAC and RAC meetings, and other city meetings. Funding for these goals were provided by the RDA, City of San Jose's General Fund, and private funding (SNI, 2002).

The SNI plan did not originally lay out specific projects or priorities that it wanted to accomplish. These goals and priorities were created by the residents of each neighborhood through the NAC and RAC, and were implemented using RDA funding for non-traditional redevelopment projects, a model unique to the SNI program. A few examples of the SNI program's goals were to create parks and community centers, and redevelop streets to make them safer and more attractive. The development of parks, community centers, and street redevelopment had a cost of \$59 million, which accounted for two-thirds of SNI expenditures for key initiatives (Seifel, 2007). The remaining one-third went to individual neighborhood programs. The overall investment by SNI in the community was also designed to strengthen the ties between government and residents.

SNI aimed to complete as many of the 190 "top ten" priorities established by the neighborhoods as possible. The priorities and their completion status can be seen under each individual neighborhood progress status. Over a five year period from 2002-2007, \$2.7 billion in private and public funds were invested in the 19 neighborhoods (Seifel, 2007). Of this amount, \$75.7 million went directly to the neighborhoods' "top ten" priorities or goals, while \$2.6 billion went to new development, affordable housing, and public projects such as libraries, schools, parks, and community centers (see Attachment 2). For example, the Blackford neighborhood and the Greater Gardner neighborhood have received the most direct SNI funding in comparison to the remaining neighborhoods (Seifel, 2007). The Blackford neighborhood has fully completed four of the ten priorities, while the Greater Gardner neighborhood has fully completed three of the ten priorities. The Blackford neighborhood spent \$7.8 million on street repair, landscape and community center improvement. Greater Gardner spent \$5.6 million on street improvements,

sidewalks to a school, and a park (Seifel, 2007). These two neighborhoods had the most direct SNI expenditure, but with the fewest priorities completed.

Several types of blight-related projects appeared as top priorities within each neighborhood's top ten goals, including sidewalk repair, street light additions or repairs, and cleaner neighborhoods. The existence of blight can be explained by the broken windows theory, wherein if someone breaks one window at a house and no one repairs it, then the next person may think it is acceptable to do the same, leading to an increase in both blight and crime (Kelling & Wilson, 1982). These neighborhoods were seeing this theory played out with illegal dumping and deterioration in the physical condition of the properties. SNI attempted to prevent the domino effect that the theory suggests by getting the communities to take ownership of their neighborhoods through the use of community engagement through the NAC and RAC.

Analyzing what SNI has accomplished through its specific goal completion and civic engagement has led to the ability to determine if the program met its goals. This research gathered data on the SNI program and its accomplishments, analyzed the benefits, and created suggestions for changes in the program to provide better services. One point of analysis is examining the funding allocation for individual neighborhoods throughout the program to understand whether its basis represents good public policy and the best use of funds.

Cities such as Minneapolis, Minnesota and Seattle, Washington provided comparison communities with similar programs. The Minneapolis program was launched in 1991 and was known as the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). The NRP envisioned citizens of the community being involved in the decision making process about spending funds and the revitalization of their community (Filner, 2006). The Seattle “Urban Village” project, which

began in 1994, also provides a comparison to SNI. (Sirianni, 2007). The SNI program envisioned the community neighborhoods setting their own priorities, which follows the general idea that the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program and the Seattle “Urban Village” project had a decade earlier.

SNI changed its goals in 2011 due to the elimination of the Redevelopment Agency and eventually the elimination of the SNI program, but the City of San Jose still had a goal to provide more communication between the city and its residents for services and projects in these neighborhoods (Pereira, 2011). The city currently works with non-profits and other community based organizations to provide services to these neighborhoods. Cities like Minneapolis have discontinued city provision of some neighborhood services, and now rely on non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to provide them (Filner, 2006). San Jose followed this model by using NGO and contract services to gain greater cost efficiency in program delivery (Pereira, 2011).

METHODOLOGY

This research looked at the SNI program data from its implementation in 2002 through the closure of the Redevelopment Agency and SNI in 2011. An outcome analysis was completed on the effectiveness of the SNI program in achieving its goals of civic engagement and community improvement in nineteen specific neighborhoods in the City of San Jose. This was evaluated on the number of the neighborhood's top ten projects that were completed, and the effectiveness of expenditure in SNI funding towards the achievement in the program's eight overall goals. The evaluation matched the most expensive completed projects per neighborhood with the eight overall goals of SNI listed in the SNI Redevelopment Plan Priorities (SNI, 2002) to determine the effectiveness in the distribution of the funding per goal. Also, an outcome evaluation was conducted examining the original goal set by SNI to engage the community and provide services and projects that the community wanted, thus measuring the consistency between the program's intent and the actual outcome (Silvia and Silvia, 2004).

Information was gathered through multiple sources. The majority of the SNI information was drawn from the review and document analysis of public records from the City of San Jose as well as the RDA. These documents include amendments and program changes over time as approved by the city council. Interviews with members of the SNI staff, such as the previous director and neighborhood team managers, provided information on civic engagement, past goal setting, completion, and priorities.

A third analytical track is benchmarking in which other programs were looked at for comparisons. Many cities around the country had revitalization programs, which were different than the SNI program but had successful plans. The other programs demonstrated the provision

of similar services on a contractual basis with outside agencies at a lower cost to the city. Other program achievements could also be integrated into SNI, taking into account shortcomings that these agencies had in order to prevent SNI from making the same mistakes.

Previous studies have looked at revitalization programs across the country, but SNI is unique in that redevelopment funding is used for non-traditional city redevelopment and the communities truly choose their “top ten” goals. A majority of the analysis in this report will use qualitative information such as individual goals or priorities set by neighborhoods, since they all vary from one another, and community engagement. A quantitative analysis will also be conducted on the number of completed goals versus targeted top ten goals and the overall dollar amount that went into goals and neighborhoods. The analysis will specifically look at the first seven years of the SNI program to evaluate the first set of “top ten” priorities and analyze their completion or lack thereof.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public policy has been created and implemented by governments at all levels, whether it be federal, state, county or city. At the local level, cities historically have not involved the community to make decisions because the government made them for the residents (Sirianni, 2007). However, in recent years, citizen involvement is sought after by local governments to gain first-hand knowledge regarding whether services the government is providing meet citizens' standards, and if not, seek alternative ways in which they can then better address the community's issues. Citizen involvement is defined as the efforts by the government to involve its citizens in administrative decision making and management processes (Yang & Callahan, 2005). Getting the citizens involved helps local governments with the decision making process, as well as building a trusting relationship with their constituents. Residents on the other hand feel empowered since their opinions matter and they feel included in the process (Yang & Callahan, 2005). Local government closely examined whether to involve community participation in the decision making process.

Local governments had to figure out how much community participation would be beneficial, and whether civic engagement is an effective way to create policy. Choices that local governments and citizens made in public policy benefit both governments and citizens. The advantage to both citizens and governments in the decision making process is the education in learning from one another, enlighten citizens and government, building trust, and breaking down barriers (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004). Disadvantages were also considered in that citizens in the process may feel the process was uninteresting and lengthy, also pointless if their decision or recommendation is ignored. The government may have extra costs associated with the process, and the process may create hostility toward the government, which is opposite of their intentions

(Irvin & Stansbury, 2004). The process to include the community in the decision making process is a tool for social change.

The decision in 1955 that Rosa Parks made to not sit in the back of the bus not only opposed segregation policies, but influenced local public policymakers throughout the country (Gerston, 2002). In this situation, local governments saw how a single act of civic engagement can help change policy. Local government was the easiest way for citizens to enter and see the workings of politics and creating policy (Gerston, 2002).

Creating Civic Engagement

Civic engagement begins with people and the role they choose to take. Citizenship is the status of being a member of a given society which was seen by the founding fathers of the United States as an essential part of the republic's growth, recognizing that it would be hard to succeed without an engaged citizenry (Gerston, 2002). Citizens that are involved in the civic engagement process can link their individual needs with the community's common needs while having identifiable results in their efforts (Gerston, 2002). Citizen involvement is defined as the efforts by the government to involve its citizens in administrative decision making and management processes which specifies goal setting and evaluating government services by the community. This includes activities such as public hearings, citizen panels, neighborhood meetings, and citizen surveys (Yang & Callahan, 2005).

Citizen involvement in local government can build trusting relationships with citizens while making their opinions matter which makes them feel included in the process (Yang & Callahan, 2005). Community residents benefit through civic engagement because their opinions and ideas become tangible goals and in the end of the process they see how they helped create

policy, structures, or break down barriers. Residents learn through the education of the decision making process as well as persuading and enlightening government (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004). The government can benefit from civic engagement in that it can listen to the citizens' opinions and concerns. The process breaks down barriers and builds trust between the citizens and local government and open up different perspectives that policy makers may have not considered previously (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004). Governments involving the community in the decision making process allows them to use funds specific to what is important to community needs, creating an appreciative citizenry (Pereira, 2011).

Models of Civic Engagement

The Seattle "Urban Villages" project was also another city driven civic engagement initiative that encouraged neighborhood inclusion in the planning processes. This project began in 1990 with the State of Washington's Growth Management Act which then created the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) (Sirianni, 2007). DON created neighborhood councils and groups to participate in future planning issues. The city of Seattle created the Neighborhood Planning Office (NPO) which reports to the mayor and works with neighborhood leaders, and empowers local citizens to participate in the planning process (Sirianni, 2007).

In 1995, the NPO hired ten neighborhood project managers from different backgrounds, planners by trade, to work with the neighborhood leaders. The Urban Village project began with 37 neighborhoods, and the initial phase included a \$10,000 grant for each neighborhood. As part of the requirements, each neighborhood had to include all major community groups in the planning process, or they would have their funds withheld (Sirianni, 2007). In 1998, funds were

depleting for the project so the mayor created bonds to be placed as a ballot measure to pay for the project.

The Urban Village project was seen by local governments as a first of its kind to involve the community. The idea to get the community involved in resource allocation policy decision making has been a goal espoused by the government since the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, which is said to be the beginning of the participatory empowerment movement (Fagotto & Fung, 2006). This act can be seen as the birth of the citizen participation movement. The project in Seattle attempted to involve the community and with that it introduced a new way for local government to engage its citizens.

Looking at the Seattle model, the city of Minneapolis felt that their citizens were not involved enough with the local government's processes to improve the community (Filner, 2006). Minneapolis wanted to improve community engagement while repairing and building an improved city. In 1991, Minneapolis created the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) in an effort to create more civic engagement with the community and revitalize the city (Filner, 2006).

Minneapolis wanted to give community leaders more of a say in what projects would be undertaken, and where funding would go in their neighborhoods. The program had four goals, including (1) building neighborhood capacity, (2) redesigning public services, (3) increasing government agency collaboration, and (4) creating a sense of community (Filner, 2006). The city was divided into neighborhoods and examined for needs specific to those areas. The NPR gave residents the ability to work with local government to create long-term plans to revitalize the city and have a say in what projects will be completed within their neighborhoods (Filner, 2006).

The Minneapolis project learned from its predecessor. In its efforts to include their citizens in creating public policy, the city learned that there were different avenues to include the community in, and as Minneapolis created new community engagement methods the use of trial and error lead to more interactive programs (Filner, 2006).

The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) was launched in 1991 on the premise that the community must be involved in the decision making process for local policy (Fagotto & Fung, 2006). This program was seen as the first major movement to involve neighborhood associations in civic engagement with their local government (Filner, 2006). Being the first program of this magnitude and nature, it was not without its shortcomings. The program was not successful in getting the right groups to the table, with only the most affluent of society representing the community as a whole (Filner, 2006). This program made great strides to include the community, laying out the framework for the Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI).

In an effort to develop more effective communication with the community, the City of San Jose staff looked at the NRP, as well as the Seattle “Urban Village” project, and analyzed how they could take those programs further. The City of San Jose and the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) wanted to involve its citizens in creating public policy, similar to Seattle and Minneapolis. The Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI) was adopted and approved by the Mayor and Council of San Jose on June 25, 2002. This project originally began with an area of twenty-two neighborhoods covering 16 square miles within the 145 square miles of the City of San Jose (SNI, 2002). The neighborhood total was later reduced to nineteen by the city council.

The staff wanted to involve as many community members and associations in each neighborhood as possible, while understanding the difficulty in reaching out to members of the community who normally do not participate in civic engagement (Pereira, 2011). In previous city driven projects like Seattle's, Latino neighborhoods were underrepresented despite active outreach efforts (Sirianni, 2007). Similar to the City of Seattle, San Jose's population was 34.7% Hispanic, so overcoming this barrier was critical for the success of the evolving SNI initiative (Pereira, 2011).

Prior to the creation of SNI, the redevelopment agency approved a plan known as the Neighborhood Investment District (NID) which was designed to revitalize specific neighborhoods within the City of San Jose. This plan later was changed into the SNI plan, which added to and expanded the original geographic areas. This new plan was to incorporate new boundaries, blighted areas, and the notion that these areas were unable to be corrected without the help of the Redevelopment Agency and the community (SNI, 2002).

SNI had meetings with community members, including property owners and residents, to inquire about their neighborhood concerns. The SNI Program Advisory Committee (PAC), which consisted of twenty-seven members drawn from residents, advised the Redevelopment Agency Board about the implementation of the SNI plan, as well as policy issues in the neighborhoods. Each neighborhood also had a Neighborhood Action Coalition (NAC) which consisted of local stakeholders who advised on issues specific to each neighborhood (Seifel, 2007). The plan did not lay out specific projects or potential programs since the idea was for the community to create them.

FINDINGS

The Strong Neighborhood Initiative (SNI) program used the Minneapolis approach - the first nationally recognized program to implement community involvement in local government policy formation - as a model. The purpose of the SNI was to build community engagement between local government and its citizens, while diminishing the blight around the city. Many of the original goals that the SNI set out to complete, as requested by the community, have shown significant progress.

SNI and Civic Engagement

The SNI program created Neighborhood Advisory Committees (NAC) to engender community engagement. These committees consisted of local stakeholders like business owners and landlords, existing neighborhood association leaders, and residents of the neighborhood. Recognizing that the Minneapolis NRP struggled to include everyone in the community, the SNI staff consistently went out in search of neighborhood members that could be seen as a voice for their community, even if they had to go door-to-door (Linder, 2011). The Neighborhood Advisory Committee is now known as the Neighborhood Action Coalition. NACs were communicating with other NACs and community members to create a stronger voice for their neighborhoods, which was not seen prior to the SNI program.

The Residents' Advisory Committee (RAC) was made up of all residents of the neighborhood. The goal was to empower the people who lived in the neighborhood to express their concerns and priorities to the SNI staff without the filter of landlords, business owners, neighborhood association leaders or others who were viewed by the residents as powerbrokers (Edwards, 2012)

A significant portion of San Jose's resident population – 51% - spoke another language at home other than English (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). In 2005, the County of Santa Clara had an estimated 180,000 undocumented people, which was about 10.2% of the total population (Salinas, 2011), which would translate to about 90,000 people in San Jose. Language and legal status issues caused residents to be reluctant to participate in local government activities, and to fear authority figures (Pereira, 2011). The RAC meetings were organized for large, impersonal venues to create anonymity, which would encourage open participation by all residents, including those who were undocumented. Meetings were conducted with simultaneous translation so that even non-English speaking residents could express their concerns directly to the SNI team. Common issues like poor maintenance of driveways and fences were raised in the RAC (Edwards, 2012). Residents became more engaged over time within their community.

The Brookwood Terrace neighborhood within the SNI program is an example of increased community engagement resulting from the program's community outreach. The first goal-setting neighborhood meeting had forty-three community members attend, while the second phase portion of the SNI goal setting meeting had ninety members, more than double since the creation of SNI (Pereira, 2011).

Program Implementation

Each SNI Neighborhood was assigned a Team Manager, whose job it was to bring the stakeholders to the table, organize the community in creating the Neighborhood Action Plan and its top ten goals, and begin implementing those goals by coordinating with departments and community partners needed for project success. The Team Manager concept came from the Seattle "Urban Village" project where they created neighborhood project managers to

communicate with residents (Sirianni, 2007). The SNI team managers were originally from PRNS and Project Crackdown staffs, while some may have been new to the community organizing effort (Pereira, 2011). The SNI program began in PRNS, which later joined with RDA staff when project funding began. These neighborhood managers would go to meetings, walk around the neighborhood, participate in community events, and be the liaison between the community and the city.

Department heads from the city's twenty-seven departments and three offices were also part of the neighborhood development process. The city manager ordered each department and office director to select one SNI program to partner with. These senior staff members attended NAC and RAC meetings, helped organize neighborhood events like clean-up days and holiday celebrations, and advised the neighborhood team members on legal and procedural issues. (Edwards, 2012)

The City of San Jose became a pioneer when it allowed the community to create its own revitalization policy with no interference from the mayor or council. Giving the community autonomy over the goals for each neighborhood to that degree gave the program national recognition (Linder, 2011). The mayor and council were involved in the completion process of each neighborhood goal. Each council member made his best effort to get all the accessible goals completed, while still working on the more demanding ones. Most council members did not interfere with the community goals, except for one that felt the community center rehabilitation should be a higher priority than at the bottom of the community's list. The council member met with the NAC and raised the priority of the center. The council member had the local school district donate some land and a local non-profit would be able to operate the center, which at that point made it feasible for RDA to complete the center (Linder, 2011).

The San Jose city staff was also innovative in conducting surveys and creating reports to determine the best use of funds for each neighborhood prior to SNI. Engineers and other staff were hesitant to give the development authority to the community since they were educated and accustomed to setting priorities for the community (Pereira, 2011). The SNI program created a new process for community engagement as well as the modification of employee relationships with residents in providing services.

Total Neighborhood Investment

Since the implementation of SNI in 2002, the SNI program has directed the investment of \$2.7 billion in the community. This investment was mainly within the 19 SNI neighborhoods, and included public and private funds. These funds came from the City of San Jose General Fund, RDA, federal grants (Community Development Block Grant funds), and private funding that were all used in the SNI program (Linder, 2011). The City of San Jose and the RDA specifically invested \$75.7 million in the neighborhoods' priority projects, and also invested another \$670.7 million in other public projects in the SNI neighborhoods (Seifel, 2007). The remaining funds of \$2 billion were investments in private development, such as housing (see Table 2). The private development created 5,428 new housing units, with almost half of those units being affordable housing, as well as a million square feet of commercial space (Seifel, 2007). The San Jose Housing Department invested \$147.6 million specifically for affordable housing.

Table 2 is a summary of the total investments associated with the 19 SNI neighborhoods. Public projects consists of SNI expenditures, housing rehabilitation, and other public projects. SNI expenditures were funds allocated towards the fulfillment of the top ten goals. The monies

came from RDA and City of San Jose funds set aside for completing the top ten goals. The San Jose Housing Department invested into the SNI neighborhoods with housing rehabilitation. The other public project category was funding for RDA public projects, San Jose public projects, and funding from other public entities. These were projects such as schools, parks, libraries, community centers, student housing, and flood control. These projects were deemed necessary for the community by the RDA, City of San Jose, Housing Department, and other public entities. These were projects outside of the NAC and RAC top ten goals (Seifel, 2007).

Table 2 also indicates the development funding allocation for developer incentives, affordable housing, and private investment. The developer incentives were public funds used to attract developers to build within the neighborhoods. Affordable housing and private investment brought apartments, condos, townhomes, senior living, and retail spaces throughout the SNI neighborhoods. The table indicates spending by neighborhoods for public project categories of SNI, city housing funds, and other public projects. Private investment funding was estimated (Seifel, 2007).

Table 2: Summary of Total Investment

Public Projects	Amount
SNI Expenditures	\$75,727,000
RDA SNI (\$52,515,000)	
San Jose SNI (\$23,212,000)	
Other Public Projects	\$670,706,000
Housing Rehabilitation	\$8,559,000
Subtotal	\$754,992,000
New Development	Amount
RDA Developer Incentives	\$50,166,000
San Jose Affordable Housing	\$147,629,000
Private Investment (Est.)	\$1,771,161,000
Subtotal	\$1,968,956,000
Public Projects	\$754,992,000
New Development	\$1,968,956,000
Total	\$2,723,948,000

Source: (Seifel, 2007)

The RDA invested approximately \$35,026,856 from July 2007 through December 2009, which is not shown on Table 2 (RDA Report, 2010). The City of San Jose had allotted the RDA approximately \$21 million for 2007-2008 (SJ Budget, 2007). Additionally, the RDA was allotted approximately \$22 million for 2008-2009 (SJ Budget, 2008). Both budgets included approximately \$4 million each year for neighborhood projects. Table 3 below shows how the funding was allocated among the programmatic categories within SNI through June 2007: affordable housing, clean neighborhoods, parks and community centers, safe and attractive streets, and vital business districts (Seifel, 2007). Each of these components was funded through the SNI program (see Table 3).

Table 3: SNI Expenditures by Key Initiative Component

Initiative Area	Amount
Affordable Housing	\$1,025,000
Clean Neighborhoods	\$706,000
Parks and Community Centers	\$24,109,000
Safe and Attractive Streets	\$35,505,000
Vital Business Districts	\$2,461,000
Other/Not Categorized	\$11,921,000
Total	\$75,727,000

Source: Seifel, 2007

SNI worked with non-profits and the community to invest \$1 million into existing affordable housing paid through SNI “top ten” funding (Seifel, 2007). The clean neighborhoods component had a goal of eliminating blight through neighborhood cleanups, campaigns targeting graffiti and litter, and working with code enforcement. The safe and attractive streets made up over a third of the “top ten” goals in every neighborhood. These goals included street trees, street traffic calming, street lights, sidewalk improvements, landscape, and storm drain improvements. Lastly, the vital business district component worked with property owners on facade improvements, street landscape improvements, and with established business associations.

SNI Program by Neighborhood

As of 2007, the SNI program invested a total of \$2.7 billion into the San Jose community. SNI was composed of 19 neighborhoods for which funding varied by neighborhood due to the goals created by the residents and the required funding to complete specific goals. There was a twentieth neighborhood on Union Avenue and Curtner Avenue, but that was commercial land use only (RDA Report, 2010). Hoffman/Via Monte had the lowest investment at \$1.87 million,

while the Burbank/Del Monte neighborhood had a total of \$524 million, of which \$495 million went to housing development (see Attachment 2).

Each neighborhood had similarities, such as demographics that indicate the neighborhoods' characteristics. Each neighborhood summary below will indicate specific demographics in comparison with the city as a whole, demonstrating that the SNI neighborhoods generally have a much higher poverty rate than the city as a whole, along with a somewhat lower average household income, and higher percentage of other-than-English household language use.

The SNI program had eight components and objectives: prevention and elimination of blight (P&E), site improvements to strengthen the economy (SI), effectively using redevelopment processes for the planning and implementation of framework that ensures proper long-term development in the project areas (Redev) , redesign of blighted areas (Redesign), promotion of new investments (Invest), improvements with drainage and lighting (Infrastructure), job creation (Job), and creation of new low-income housing (Housing) or improvements to existing housing (SNI, 2002). Table 4 indicates the SNI expenditure per neighborhood according to its respective objective. It is notable that while residents selected their "top ten" goals, many neighborhoods did not fund the objectives of job creation and prevention blight. Elimination of existing blight did get support.

Table 4: Completed Projects Analysis Chart: Neighborhood Expenditure by Goal through 2007.

		Revitalization					Blight	
<i>8 Objectives</i>	SI	Redev	Invest	Job	Housing	P&E	Redesign	Infrastructure
<i>Neighborhood</i>								
Blackford	\$7,421,616	\$30,000	\$11,486,343	\$72,000	\$314,889	\$56,177	\$9,500	\$331,524
Burbank	\$996,755	\$320,000	\$487,523,551	\$24,008,193	\$8,603,780	\$4,616,356	\$4,300,000	\$500,000
Delmas Pk	\$400,000	\$50,000	\$50,898,707	\$0	\$10,931,053	\$1,303,459	\$84,310	\$626,606
E. Valley	\$27,900,000	\$5,000,000	\$106,974,062	\$42,920,000	\$57,936,718	\$25,000	\$629,807	\$1,000,000
Great Oaks	\$1,501,159	\$243,614	\$6,838,863	\$670,845	\$1,592,880	\$175,000	\$462,260	\$554,058
Five Wounds	\$55,000,000	\$3,118,921	\$185,311,574	\$1,258,724	\$7,750,784	\$230,000	\$3,039,456	\$3,486,317
Gateway	\$1,459,656	\$10,000,000	\$13,565,000	\$0	\$385,256	\$0	\$26,000	\$1,170,761
G. Gardner	\$5,100,000	\$130,000	\$13,550,000	\$105,987	\$113,211	\$746,000	\$608,029	\$3,988,853
Hoffman	\$443,520	\$865,931	\$0	\$0	\$311,083	\$50,000	\$250,000	\$200,000
KONA	\$500,000	\$66,133	\$11,765,352	\$5,274,000	\$1,098,830	\$10,230	\$1,875,000	\$275,000
Market	\$1,058,376	\$50,287	\$9,226,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,000,000	\$200,027
Mayfair	\$22,000,000	\$676,530	\$69,482,714	\$2,500,000	\$14,615,593	\$0	\$1,288,612	\$343,470
Spartan	\$913,662	\$1,054,188	\$152,704,923	\$99,388	\$21,592,900	\$174,310	\$155,245	\$68,000
13Th St	\$9,446,453	\$19,795,104	\$130,354,586	\$5,000,000	\$6,750,000	\$1,523,950	\$3,000,000	\$3,363,478
Tully	\$13,300,000	\$12,412,019	\$92,304,067	\$0	\$42,344,595	\$65,000	\$120,237	\$150,000
University	\$175,659,029	\$206,000,000	\$74,976,230	\$0	\$2,035,000	\$7,200	\$340,873	\$786,000
Washington	\$783,198	\$6,500,000	\$119,648,830	\$1,460,000	\$18,200,000	\$2,400,000	\$553,336	\$3,507,728
West Evergreen	\$834,476	\$1,670,000	\$85,298,522	\$700,000	\$0	\$85,000	\$84,000	\$187,000
Winchester	\$688,991	\$120,000	\$149,251,439	\$2,720,000	\$274,836	\$0	\$2,811,253	\$0

Source: RDA 06/07; RDA 07/08; RDA 08/09; Siefel, 2007

SNI Neighborhoods

Blackford

The Blackford neighborhood is located in the southwest area of the City of San Jose. Blackford is a multi-cultural neighborhood with multiple nationalities. Since the implementation of SNI, the Blackford area has gained street lights, improved shopping options and recreation areas for youth. The Blackford Neighborhood Improvement Plan (Blackford Plan) includes the unique top ten goals for this community. The SNI Blackford plan was adopted in 2002.

A. Blackford Neighborhood Information

1. Blackford Location and Demographic Information

The Blackford neighborhood is located within City Council District 1. The boundaries are Blackford Avenue to the north, San Thomas Expressway to the east, Payne Avenue to the south, and Saratoga Avenue to the west. The Blackford SNI neighborhood is within Santa Clara County census tracts 5063.04 and 5063.05. The neighborhood is composed of 402 acres of predominantly residential development, with single family and multi-family structures.

Table 5: Blackford Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Blackford Data	San Jose Data
Population	12,000	894, 943
Average household size	2.68	3.2
Median household income	\$56,000	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	93.5%	100%
% renters	78%	38.35%
% in labor force	71.2%	66.9%
Poverty	11.7%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	51.7%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 24% Hispanic, 21% Asian, 52% white alone and 3% other ethnicities. The residents of the Blackford SNI neighborhood are approximately 41% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Blackford Investments

The neighborhood investment consists of money used specifically for the SNI top ten goals, public investment, and housing expenditures. Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as youth and teen recreation, improved lighting, and storm drain issues. The funding that went into public investment was allocated by RDA or the City of San Jose for overall community projects such as the one that went in to the West San Jose Community Center. The neighborhood also had housing investments that consisted of rehabilitation, affordable housing and private investment which was seen with the new private development of St. James Place. The following table indicates the dollar amount that went into each investment rounded to the nearest tenth of a million (Seifel, 2007).

Table 6: Blackford Investments

Blackford Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$7.8 million
Public investment	\$2.2 million
Housing & Commercial	\$14.1 million
Total	\$24.1 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Blackford Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 7: Blackford Top Ten Priorities

Blackford Top Ten	Progress
1. Enhance Public Lighting	Completed with 9 street lights on Boynton Ave.
2. Access to Recreation for Youth and Teens	Completed with West San Jose Community Center (WSJCC) renovation completed 2006; Starbird Park youth center completed 2007.
3. Improvements to the Maple Leaf Shopping Center	Completed with Federal grant awarded to owner to re-stripe parking, façade and landscape improvements
4. Williams Road/Boynton Avenue Improvements	Completed with façade repair and landscaping
5. Street Tree Planting	Completed 2007
6. Traffic Calming in specific areas	Completed 2009
7. Joint Use Agreements for Dog Park and Garden Plot	Not completed
8. Colonial Gardens Apartment Improvement	Completed 2007- Phase I
9. Analyze and Repair Storm Drains	Completed 2007- Phase I
10. Underwood Apartments Improvements	Completed 2007

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Burbank/Del Monte

The Burbank/Del Monte neighborhood is located in the central-west area of the City of San Jose within reach of downtown San Jose. The Burbank/ Del Monte area is rich in agricultural history since the Del Monte cannery once resided there. Like much of San Jose, this area had vast amounts of farmland in the late nineteenth century. Now the area consists of residential and commercial neighborhoods, which led to the residents' desire for more open land (SNI Burbank/Del Monte, 2002). In 2002, the city council approved the Burbank/Del Monte plan and began to implement the top priorities with the cooperation of the NAC (SNI Burbank/Del Monte, 2002).

A. Burbank/Del Monte Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Burbank/Del Monte neighborhood is located within City Council District Six. The boundaries for Burbank/Del Monte are Park Avenue and Forrest Avenue to the north, Bird Avenue to the east, Highway 280 and Fruitdale Avenue to the south, and Bascom Avenue and Interstate 880 to the west (See Figure 1). The Burbank/Del Monte neighborhood is located within Santa Clara County census tracts 5003, 5019, 5020.01, 5020.02, 5022.02. The area is less than 1,200 acres and consists of predominately residential dwellings, businesses and commercial buildings (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). A majority of businesses are located on West San Carlos Street.

Table 8: Burbank/Del Monte Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Burbank/Del Monte Data	San Jose Data
Population	13,700	894, 943
Average household size	3.02	3.2
Median household income	\$48,513	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	100%	100%
% renters	60%	38.35%
% in labor force	71%	66.9%
Poverty	18%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	51.7%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 37% Hispanic, 5.8% Asian, 51% white alone and 6.2% other ethnicities. The residents of the Burbank SNI neighborhood are approximately 29.8% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Burbank/Del Monte Investments

The neighborhood investment consists of money used specifically for the SNI top ten goals, public investment, and housing expenditures. Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as strengthen code enforcement, Buena Vista park development, and Auzerais improvements. The funding that went into public investment was allocated by RDA or the City of San Jose for overall community projects such as the Los Gatos Creek trail, Cahill park, and O'Connor park. The neighborhood also had housing investments that consisted of rehabilitation, affordable housing and private investment which was seen mainly through private investment of multiple condo and apartment developments (Seifel, 2007).

Table 9: Burbank/Del Monte Investments

Burbank/Del Monte Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$2.3 million
Public investment	\$25.6 million
Housing & Commercial	\$495.9 million
Total	\$523.8 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Burbank Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 10: Burbank/Del Monte Top Ten Priorities

Burbank/Del Monte Top Ten	Progress
1. Buena Vista Park /Scott Street Park	Completed with youth lot, picnic tables, fountains, new lighting, and landscape
2. Scott Street/ Auzerai Ave Improvements	Completed including streetlights, trees, and new sidewalks
3. Freeway Park	Not completed- Analysis only
4. Recreational Facilities/Community use	Not completed
5. Program/Service inventory & Facility needs assessment	Completed 2007
6. Annual bulk waste pick up program	Completed 2007
7. Code enforcement & housing programs	Completed 2007
8. W. San Carlos/Bascom Avenue Economic development	Completed 2007
9. Specialty Trolley Service	Not Completed- Not feasible
10. Park along Los Gatos Creek	Completed- Del Monte Park

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Delmas Park

The Delmas Park neighborhood is located west of downtown San Jose within reach of the HP Pavilion arena. This neighborhood is one of the older areas of San Jose consisting of residential housing, commercial properties and businesses. The Delmas Park neighborhood borders to the north the Greater Gardner SNI neighborhood. The residential housing is predominantly of the early 1900s design, with a mixture of single family and multi-unit dwellings in the southern portion of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is predominantly businesses and commercial properties. The majority of businesses are located adjacent to West San Carlos Avenue and are automotive based. In this neighborhood you can see an automotive businesses next door to residential housing.

In late 2000 the residents, City of San Jose representatives and RDA staff worked together to evaluate what the neighborhood was in need of based on their collaborations of ideas and priorities. The residents felt that parking, traffic, streetscape, and land use were the top issues they wanted to act on. In 2002 the city council approved the Delmas Park plan and began to implement the top priorities with the cooperation of the NAC.

A. Delmas Park Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Delmas Park neighborhood is located within City Council District Three. The boundaries for Delmas Park are Santa Clara Street to the north, Highway 85 to east, Interstate 280 to the south, and Bird Avenue to the west (See Attachment 1). The Delmas Park neighborhood is located within the Santa Clara County census tract 5008. The area is less than

113 acres and consists of residential dwellings, businesses and commercial buildings in the area (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). A majority of businesses are located on West San Carlos Street.

Table 11: Delmas Park Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Delmas Park Data	San Jose Data
Population	1,900	894, 943
Average household size	2.32	3.2
Median household income	\$36,364	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	95%	100%
% renters	81.4%	38.35%
% in labor force	64.3%	66.9%
Poverty	20.4%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	62%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 54.6% Hispanic, 10% Asian, 26.3% white alone and 9.1% other ethnicities. The residents of the Delmas Park SNI neighborhood are approximately 41% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Delmas Park Investments

The neighborhood investment consists of money used specifically for the SNI top ten goals, public investment, and housing expenditures. Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as streetscape improvements on Auzerais Avenue, Gifford Avenue, and West San Carlos Avenue. The funding that went into public investment was allocated by RDA or the City of San Jose for overall community projects such as for the Discovery Dog Park, while the neighborhood

housing investment through private investment developed units at the Legacy at Museum Park (Seifel, 2007).

Table 12: Delmas Park Investments

Delmas Park Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$2 million
Public investment	\$400,000
Housing & Commercial	\$62.2 million
Total	\$64.6 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Delmas Park Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 13: Delmas Park Top Ten Priorities

Delmas Park Top Ten	Progress
1. Improve Residential Parking Conditions	Completed by implementing residential parking permit program
2. Create a Neighborhood Traffic Plan	Completed- \$50,000 investment for study by DOT.
3. Modify Current Land Use Policy	Completed with 3 projects- Lower Residential Density from 25+ to 8-16 dwelling units per acre
4. Improve West San Carlos Street Streetscape	Completed- Median island and streetscape
5. Improve Gifford Avenue Streetscape	Completed 2007
6. Improve Auzeais Avenue Streetscape	Completed 2007
7. Improve General Conditions of Streets and Sidewalks	Completed 2009- in combination with #6
8. Improve the Pedestrian Route to Gardner Academy	Completed 2008
9. Mitigate Neighborhood Noise Levels	Not Completed
10. Develop Neighborhood Open Space	Not Completed

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

East Valley/680 Communities

The East Valley/680 Communities neighborhood is located in the east part of San Jose, neighboring the KONA and Mayfair SNI neighborhoods. Since the implementation of SNI one of the biggest victories for the neighborhood was the development of the Plaza de San Jose off of Story Road and King Road. The residents now have more shopping options in that neighborhood outside of the Tropicana shopping center (Seifel, 2007). The East Valley/680 Communities neighborhood is the largest of the 19 SNI neighborhoods in both acreage and population. In November 2001, the East Valley/680 Communities' SNI plan was adopted by the San Jose City Council.

A. East Valley/680 Communities Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The East Valley/680 Communities neighborhood is located within City Council District Five. The boundaries for East Valley/680 Communities are Interstate 680 to the west, Alum Rock Avenue to the north, South White Road to the east, Ocala Avenue and King Road to the south (see Figure 1). The East Valley/680 neighborhood is within Santa Clara County census tracts 5035.04, 5035.06, 5035.07, 5037.03, 5040.01, 5040.02, 5041.02. The neighborhood is the biggest SNI neighborhood, with the area roughly being 1,450 acres (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The biggest business areas for this neighborhood include businesses on Story Road, King Road, and Alum Rock Avenue.

Table 14: East Valley/680 Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	East Valley/680 Data	San Jose Data
Population	37,329	894, 943
Average household size	5.33	3.2
Median household income	\$48,513	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	99%	100%
% renters	32.8%	38.35%
% in labor force	58.6%	66.9%
Poverty	12.9%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	76.5%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 67.8% Hispanic, 8% Asian, 21% white alone and 4% other ethnicities. The residents of the East Valley/680 SNI neighborhood are approximately 48.3% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. East Valley/680 Investments

Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as noise mitigation, side walk repair, and street sweeping. Public investment funding went into projects such as the Alum Rock branch library and the Hillview branch library. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of senior affordable housing and family apartment buildings (Seifel, 2007).

Table 15: East Valley/680 Investments

East Valley/680 Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$1.7 million
Public investment	\$34.9 million
Housing & Commercial	\$199.8 million
Total	\$236.4 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. East Valley/680 Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 16: East Valley/680 Top Ten Priorities

East Valley/680 Top Ten	Progress
1. Tropicana Shopping Center Revitalization	Completed
2. Traffic Calming	Completed- Dorsa neighborhood with Level 1 Traffic Calming
3. Develop Affordable Housing	Completed- 295 New units
4. Noise Mitigation	Completed
5. Sidewalk Installation and Repair	Completed- \$1 Million invested- Phase one completed
6. Community Facilities	Completed- Mayfair Center, Capital Park
7. Community Policing Initiative	Completed- Weed-n-Seed program
8. Improve and Expand Homework Center	Not completed
9. Remove Abandoned/Inoperable Vehicles	Completed- Code enforcement
10. Street Sweeping	Completed 2008- Sign installation

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Edenvale/Great Oaks

The Edenvale/Great Oaks neighborhood is located on the east-south part of San Jose. The Edenvale/Great Oaks SNI plan was approved by the City Council in 2000. The SNI plan process quickly showed the residents importance to community priorities by engaging them in the creation of the top ten goals. The Edenvale Elementary School and the Great Oaks Park were seen as strong community treasures. The location of the Edenvale/Great Oaks neighborhood gives the residents quick access to major highways within San Jose (See Attachment 1).

A. Edenvale/Great Oaks Neighborhood Information**1. Location and Demographic Information**

The Edenvale/Great Oaks neighborhood is located within City Council District Two. The boundary for the Edenvale/Great Oaks neighborhood is Roeder Road to the west, Highway 101 to the east, Coyote Road to the north and Monterey Highway to the south (See Attachment 1). The Edenvale/Great Oaks neighborhood is within Santa Clara County census tracts 5120.17 and 5120.18. The neighborhood spans about 450 acres comprised of residential homes and businesses, mainly located near Monterrey Highway.

Table 17: Edenvale Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Edenvale/Great Oaks Data	San Jose Data
Population	13,000	894, 943
Average household size	3.89	3.2
Median household income	\$64,149	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98%	100%
% renters	40.6%	38.35%
% in labor force	67%	66.9%
Poverty	10.3%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	60.8%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 42% Hispanic, 25.9% Asian, 22.1% white alone and 10% other ethnicities. The residents of the Edenvale/Great Oaks SNI neighborhood are approximately 41.1% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Edenvale/Great Oaks Investments

Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as community centers, skatepark, and a community garden. Public investment funding went into projects such as the Great Oaks and Edenvale community centers. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of special needs affordable housing as well as retail development (Seifel, 2007).

Table 18: Edenvale/Great Oaks Investments

Edenvale/Great Oaks Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$1.9 million
Public investment	\$770,000
Housing & Commercial	\$8.1 million
Total	\$10.77 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Edenvale/Great Oaks Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 19: Edenvale/Great Oaks Top Ten Priorities

Edenvale/Great Oaks Top Ten	Progress
1. Great Oaks Neighborhood Association (GONA) Neighborhood Center	Completed- GONA/ERCA center
2. Edenvale Roundtable Community Association (ECRA) Neighborhood Center	Completed- ERCA/GONA center
3. Edenvale/Great Oaks Community Center	Completed- Edenvale Community Center on Branham Lane
4. Community Garden	Completed 2007
5. Skatepark	Completed 2006
6. Tree Planting	Completed
7. Traffic Improvements	Completed- DOT implemented measures
8. ADA Accessible Curb Ramps	Completed
9. Traffic Calming	Completed- DOT implemented measures
10. Street Light Improvements	Completed

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace

The Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace SNI neighborhood is located on the eastern portion San Jose, just outside the downtown. Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace neighborhood has three SNI neighborhoods (KONA, Gateway East, 13th Street) bordering alongside it. The residents wanted to revitalize their neighborhood with streetscape and business improvements. The residents now have more shopping options and improved store fronts because of the cooperation of business owners and efforts from residents (Seifel, 2007). The Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace is located in a culturally diverse neighborhood with residents willing to volunteer for their neighborhood (Linder, 2011). The neighborhood has Highway 101 and Interstate 280 going through it, which are key commuting corridors for the area.

In 2002, the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace SNI plan was adopted by the San Jose City Council. Prior to the adoption of the SNI Plan for the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace neighborhood, SNI and city representatives met with the residents to see what they felt were priorities that needed to be addressed. These priorities included issues such as business corridor improvements, traffic calming, affordable housing and community facilities (SNI Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Plan, 2007). The Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace SNI plan had investments from SNI, RDA and public investments from other public entities for projects such as capital improvement flood protection which all contributed to revitalize the neighborhood (Seifel, 2007).

A. Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace neighborhood is located within City Council District Three. The boundaries for the neighborhood are Interstate 280 to the south, Highway 101 to the east, King Road to the north and Coyote to the west (See Attachment 1). The Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace neighborhood is located within the Santa Clara County census tracts 5014, 5015.01, 5015.02, and 5036.01 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace SNI neighborhood is one of the larger SNI neighborhoods, with 900 acres (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace area is mainly residential, with most businesses located on Santa Clara Street, Alum Rock Avenue and McKee Road. This neighborhood also has the highest Portuguese population of San Jose, concentrated around the Portuguese Five Wounds Roman Catholic Church.

Table 20: Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Data	San Jose Data
Population	18,282	894, 943
Average household size	3.85	3.2
Median household income	\$43,206	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98%	100%
% renters	62%	38.35%
% in labor force	62.4%	66.9%
Poverty	15.6%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	78%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 65.12% Hispanic, 5.6% Asian, 16.67% white alone and 12.6% other ethnicities. The residents of the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace SNI neighborhood are approximately 52.6% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as streetscape improvements, Selma Olinder park, and pedestrian and traffic improvements. Public investment funding went into projects such as Hacienda/Bonita Park, Roosevelt community center, and multiple school improvements. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of condos and apartments including affordable housing (Seifel, 2007).

Table 21: Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Investments

Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$4.7 million
Public investment	\$64.1 million
Housing & Commercial	\$192.7 million
Total	\$261.5 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress**Table 22: Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Top Ten Priorities**

Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Top Ten	Progress
1. Redevelopment of Williams/24th Street	Completed- Retail Center
2. Streetscape Improvements on McLaughlin Avenue	Completed- Streetlights and Planted Trees
3. 33rd Street and McKee Road Pedestrian and Traffic Improvements	Completed
4. Redevelopment of 33rd Street and McKee Road	Not Completed
5. Selma Olinder Park	Completed- 13 acres of Picnic area added
6. Williams Street Traffic Calming	Completed 2007
7. Develop Coyote Creek Trail	Completed- in conjunction with Olinder Park
8. Housing Rehabilitation Programs	Not Completed
9. East Santa Clara Street/Alum Rock Avenue Parking Strategy	Not Completed
10. Increase Youth and Teen Activities	Completed 2009- Roosevelt Park community center and skate park

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Gateway East

The Gateway East neighborhood is located on the eastern side of Downtown San Jose. The Gateway East SNI plan was approved by the City Council in 2003. The residents had a unanimous issue of sanitation problems, and they saw SNI as the opportunity they needed to get that issue addressed. The Gateway East neighborhood is home to the Police Athletic League (P.A.L.) Stadium and the Mexican Heritage Plaza. The location of the Gateway East neighborhood gives the community access to major highways such as highway 680 and 101 (See Attachment 1).

A. Gateway East Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Gateway East SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Five. The Gateway East neighborhood has multiple boundaries based on how it was created since the neighborhood is two sections meeting at the intersection of Alum Rock Avenue and King Road, with the northern portion bordered by Five Wounds and Mayfair. The other portion of the SNI neighborhood has Alum Rock to the North, King Road to the east and Highway 680 to the south and highway 101 to the west (See Figure 1). The neighborhood is within Santa Clara County census tracts 5036.02 and 5037.07 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The neighborhood spans about 280 acres comprised of residential homes and businesses, with the businesses concentrated on the bigger roadways such as Alum Rock Avenue and King Road.

Table 23: Gateway East Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Gateway East Data	San Jose Data
Population	7,850	894, 943
Average household size	4.1	3.2
Median household income	\$54,000	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98%	100%
% renters	44%	38.35%
% in labor force	56%	66.9%
Poverty	14.5%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	82%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 54% Hispanic, 20% Asian, 7.4% white alone and 18.6% other ethnicities. The residents of the Gateway East SNI neighborhood are approximately 60% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Gateway East Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as community garden, street improvements and park and recreation improvements. Public investment funding went into projects such as the Silver Creek flood protection capital improvement. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of the Sienna housing units (Seifel, 2007).

Table 24: Gateway East Investments

Gateway East Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$2.6 million
Public investment	\$10 million
Housing & Commercial	\$13.5 million
Total	\$26.1 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Gateway East Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 25: Gateway East Top Ten Priorities

Gateway East Top Ten	Progress
1. Neighborhood Center for Children and Adults	Completed- Co-Op w/Mexican Heritage Plaza
2. Sanitary Sewer Improvements	Completed
3. Storm Drain Improvements	Completed- Improving curbs and gutter drainage
4. Housing Improvements	Not Completed
5. Park and Recreation Improvement	Completed- Installing walking paths, basketball courts, and exercise stations at Zolezzi Park
6. Community Garden	Not Completed
7. Street Improvements	Completed 2008
8. Traffic Calming	Completed 2007- Traffic signal, wheelchair ramp, street lighting
9. Streetscape Improvements	Completed- King and Melrose
10. Enhance Public Lighting Levels	Completed 2007- Basch Ave, St James street

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Greater Gardner

The Greater Gardner SNI neighborhood is located south-west of downtown San Jose, neighboring the Burbank/Del Monte, Delmas Park, and Washington SNI neighborhoods. When SNI began meeting with Greater Gardner residents, they stated that illegal dumping on Fuller Avenue was going to be a top priority (Linder, 2011). The Fuller Avenue area is now serving the neighborhood as a park (Seifel, 2007). The Greater Gardner SNI neighborhood is one of the smallest of the 19 SNI neighborhoods mainly due to its dense population. In January 2002, the Greater Gardner SNI plan was adopted by the San Jose City Council in an effort to improve community safety, community involvement, and neighborhood conditions

A. Greater Gardner Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Greater Gardner SNI neighborhood is located within City Council Districts Six and Three. The boundaries for Greater Gardner are Interstate 280 to the north, highway 87 to the east, Willow Street to the south, and Los Gatos Creek to the west (See Figure 1). The neighborhood was within the Santa Clara County census tract 5018 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The Greater Gardner SNI neighborhood has an area of roughly 284 acres and approximately 5,200 residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The business areas are limited to some businesses on Virginia Street, Delmas Street, and Willow Street.

Table 26: Greater Gardner Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Greater Gardner Data	San Jose Data
Population	5,200	894, 943
Average household size	3.13	3.2
Median household income	\$58,611	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	97.9%	100%
% renters	41%	38.35%
% in labor force	65.7%	66.9%
Poverty	14.3%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	49.8%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 55.9% Hispanic, 3.8% Asian, 36% white alone and 4.3% other ethnicities. The residents of the Greater Gardner SNI neighborhood are approximately 26.4% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Greater Gardner Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as street and sidewalk improvements, open space, and streetscape improvements. Public investment funding went into projects such as the Gardner community center. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of the New Brighten and Willow/Prevost homes (Seifel, 2007).

Table 27: Greater Gardner Investments

Greater Gardner Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$5.7 million
Public investment	\$5.1 million
Housing & Commercial	\$13.5 million
Total (SNI, Private, RDA)	\$24.3 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Greater Gardner Original Top Ten and Progress**Table 28: Greater Gardner Top Ten Priorities**

Greater Gardner Top Ten	Progress
1. Street and Sidewalk Improvements	Completed
2. Improve Pedestrian Access to Gardner Academy	Completed
3. Fuller Avenue Open Space	Completed
4. Initiatives to Improve Housing Conditions	Completed 2008- Rehab projects on single family homes
5. Retail Development	Completed 2007- Facade projects
6. West Virginia Street Streetscape	Completed 2007 - 40 new street lights, crosswalks
7. Delmas Avenue Streetscape	Completed 2007- see #6
8. Residential Traffic Calming	Not Completed
9. Bird Avenue Streetscape and Traffic Calming	Completed
10. Neighborhood Open Space Program	Not Completed

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Hoffman/Via Monte

The Hoffman/Via Monte neighborhood is located in South San Jose. The Hoffman/Via Monte SNI plan was approved by the City Council in April, 2002. The residents of the Hoffman/Via Monte SNI neighborhood are very active in getting their community revitalized. When the SNI program began working with the Hoffman/Via Monte NAC, they soon realized they had a community that began the process of repairing their neighborhood by writing to the city about issues (Pereira, 2011).

A. Hoffman/Via Monte Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Hoffman/Via Monte SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Ten. The boundary for the Hoffman/Via Monte SNI neighborhood is Croydon Avenue to the west, Almaden Expressway to the east, Blossom Hill Road to the north and Guadalupe Creek to the south (See Figure 1). The neighborhood sits within Santa Clara County census tract 5119.01 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The neighborhood spans approximately 100 acres comprised of single family and multi-family homes. The Hoffman/Via Monte area also has retail locations and a new shopping center at Blossom Hill Road and Almaden Expressway (Hoffman/Via Monte, 2002).

Table 29: Hoffman/Via Monte Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Hoffman/Via Monte Data	San Jose Data
Population	2,200	894, 943
Average household size	3.4	3.2
Median household income	\$45,500	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98%	100%
% renters	85%	38.35%
% in labor force	67%	66.9%
Poverty	10%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	48.8%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 65% Hispanic, 25% Asian, 8% white alone and 2% other ethnicities. The residents of the Hoffman/ Via Monte SNI neighborhood are approximately 30% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Hoffman/Via Monte Investments

Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as the neighborhood center, alleyway enhancements, and landscape improvements. City of San Jose public investment funding paid for projects such as the neighborhood center. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the rehabilitation of existing homes (Seifel, 2007).

Table 30: Hoffman/Via Monte Investments

Hoffman/Via Monte Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$859,452
Public investment	\$700,000
Housing & Commercial	\$311,000
Total	\$1.87 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Hoffman/Via Monte Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress**Table 31: Hoffman/Via Monte Top Ten Priorities**

Hoffman/Via Monte Top Ten	Progress
1. Neighborhood Center	Not Completed - \$600K invested for land
2. Community Policing Initiatives	Completed- Police attended meetings and meet with property owners
3. Inoperable/Broken Streetlights	Completed- Community involvement and reporting
4. Alleyway Enhancements	Completed- \$100,000 worth of wrought iron fence off of Via Monte and the repaving of alleyways with fire lane stripping
5. Joint Towing Agreements	Completed- Property owners signed agreement
6. Residential Landscape Improvements	Completed- Repairing driveways, installation of sod grass, and the planting of trees
7. Neighborhood Watch	Completed 2009- SJPd increased patrols and NAC meetings. Workshops on Immigration & Naturalization.
8. Neighborhood Cleanups	Completed 2008- Community Action and Pride Grant, Clean up twice a year
9. Improved access to Pioneer High School	Completed- In Conjunction with priority four
10. Lighting in Neighborhood Alleyways	Completed- Lighting added

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

K.O.N.A.

The King Ocala Neighborhood Association (K.O.N.A.) SNI neighborhood is located in East San Jose. The K.O.N.A. SNI plan was approved by the City Council in 2002. The K.O.N.A. SNI neighborhood is in the vicinity of a major retail shopping center (Eastridge Mall) and Lake Cunningham Park which holds a water park within it. The SNI program gave the K.O.N.A. residents an opportunity to expand the Boys & Girls Club, upgrade neighborhood parks, and achieve housing improvements (SNI K.O.N.A., 2008). The K.O.N.A. SNI Neighborhood has two neighborhood associations, with Lanai Cunningham Neighborhood Association (LCNA) and the Tully Ocala Capital King Neighborhood Association (TOCKNA) representing the residents.

A. K.O.N.A. Neighborhood Information**1. Location and Demographic Information**

The K.O.N.A. SNI neighborhood is located within City Council Districts Seven and Eight. The boundary for the K.O.N.A. SNI neighborhood has Highway 101 to the west, King Road and Reid-Hillview Airport to the east, Story Road and Ocala Avenue to the north and Tully Road to the south (See Figure 1). The boundaries for the LCNA are Highway 101, Story Road, King Road, and Tully road. The TOCKNA boundaries are King Road, Ocala Avenue, Capital Expressway, and Tully Road. The neighborhood sits within Santa Clara County census tracts 5033.06, 5034.02, and 5035.04 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The neighborhood spans approximately 695 acres comprised of single family and multi-family homes, with retail and commercial properties located on Tully, King, and Story Roads (Seifel, 2007).

Table 32: K.O.N.A. Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	K.O.N.A. Data	San Jose Data
Population	17,000	894, 943
Average household size	5.4	3.2
Median household income	\$60,607	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98%	100%
% renters	67%	38.35%
% in labor force	57%	66.9%
Poverty	12.5%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	51.7%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 64.6% Hispanic, 25.3% Asian, 7.1% white alone and 3% other ethnicities. The residents of the K.O.N.A. SNI neighborhood are approximately 52.9% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. K.O.N.A. Investments

Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as the Boy and Girls Club improvements, Welch Park improvements, and sidewalk improvements. Public investment funding went into projects such as the Tropicana shopping center improvements and the sports field campus. The neighborhood had new development with the investments in the Tropicana shopping center, Holy Trinity school gym, and Lanai Garden Inn (Seifel, 2007).

Table 33: K.O.N.A. Investments

K.O.N.A. Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$1.5 million
Public investment	\$7.1 million
Housing & Commercial	\$12.1 million
Total	\$20.7 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. K.O.N.A. Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 34: K.O.N.A. Top Ten Priorities

K.O.N.A. Top Ten	Progress
1. Housing Improvements	Completed- Housing Improvement Plan (HIP)
2. Reduce Bulk Waste	Completed 2008- Voucher program and mini clean-ups
3. Boys and Girls Club Improvements	Completed- \$500,000 invested in fields
4. Traffic Calming	Completed- Speed bumps installed
5. Partnership with Schools	Not Completed
6. Strengthen Code Enforcement	Not Completed
7. Welch Park Improvements	Completed- Tree planting, irrigation installation, lighting, fountains, picnic tables
8. Street Tree Planting	Not Completed
9. Repair Sidewalks and Install ADA Curb Ramps	Completed- 100 New Curb Cuts/ADA ramps
10. Interim Security and Aesthetic Improvements on Story/King	Completed 2006- Property owners paid for extra SJPd patrols, Completed short-term at Tropicana Shopping Center

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Market/Almaden

The Market/Almaden SNI neighborhood is located in the downtown area of San Jose. The Market/Almaden SNI plan was approved by the City Council in 2003 (SNI Market/Almaden, 2003). The Market/Almaden SNI neighborhood is full of history which can be seen by the numerous Victorian homes within the neighborhood. The SNI program gave the Market/Almaden residents an opportunity to preserve their community by attempting and later succeeding in securing historic conservation status (SNI Market/Almaden, 2003). The Market/Almaden SNI neighborhood is the smallest of all 19 SNI neighborhoods based on population and acreage.

A. Market/Almaden Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Market/Almaden SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Three. The boundary for the Market/Almaden SNI neighborhood has Almaden Blvd to the west, Market Street to the east, Balbach Street to the north and Highway 280 to the south (See Figure 1). The Market/Almaden neighborhood sits within the Santa Clara County census tract 5017. The neighborhood spans approximately 34 acres comprised of mainly residential homes and minimal businesses along Market Street (Seifel, 2007).

Table 35: Market/Almaden Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Market/Almaden Data	San Jose Data
Population	1,400	894, 943
Average household size	4.29	3.2
Median household income	\$43,614	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	99%	100%
% renters	77%	38.35%
% in labor force	62.3%	66.9%
Poverty	19%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	80 %	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 84.5% Hispanic, 2.4% Asian, 9.5% white alone and 3.6% other ethnicities. The residents of the Market/Almaden SNI neighborhood are approximately 52.2% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Market/Almaden Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as the pedestrian and bike safety improvements. Public investment funding went into projects such as the residential acoustical treatment program. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of the Emerald Village condos (Seifel, 2007).

Table 36: Market/Almaden Investments

Market/Almaden Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$1.1 million
Public investment	\$8 million
Housing & Commercial	\$9.2 million
Total	\$18.3 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Market/Almaden Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 37: Market/Almaden Top Ten Priorities

Market/Almaden Top Ten	Progress
1. Neighborhood Park on Caltrans easement Hwy 280/Reed Street	Not Completed - Concluded not feasible
2. Neighborhood Design Guidelines	Completed- Historic Conservation Area keeping Victorian Home style
3. Acquire and Rehabilitate 75 W William Street	Not Completed
4. Historic Conservation Area	Completed- Made Historic Conservation Area
5. Ensure Convention Center expansion follows Design Guidelines	Completed
6. Pedestrian and Bike Safety Improvements	Completed
7. Install Pedestrian Safety Improvements	Completed
8. Traffic Calming Study	Completed
9. Pedestrian Safety Improvement	Completed in conjunction with #6
10. Underground Utilities	Completed 2009

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Mayfair

The Mayfair SNI neighborhood is located in East San Jose. The Mayfair SNI plan was approved by the City Council in 2002. The Mayfair SNI neighborhood has a lot of history with the Mexican migrant residents of San Jose. The SNI program gave the Mayfair residents an opportunity to work with city staff to get priorities they felt needed to be done, and not just what city staff thinks the residents need (Mayfair, 2002). The Mayfair SNI neighborhood has one of the largest Latino cultural centers in the country, which complements the predominantly Latino/Hispanic population (SNI Mayfair, 2002).

A. Mayfair Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Mayfair SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Five. The boundary for the Mayfair SNI neighborhood has Highway 280/680 to the east and south, Alum Rock Avenue to the north, and King Road to the west (See Attachment 1). The neighborhood spans approximately 320 acres comprised of residential homes and minimal businesses along Alum Rock Avenue, Jackson Street, and King Road (Seifel, 2007). The Mayfair neighborhood sits within the Santa Clara County census tract 5037.02.

Table 38: Mayfair Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Mayfair Data	San Jose Data
Population	8,349	894, 943
Average household size	4.84	3.2
Median household income	\$53,833	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	99.2%	100%
% renters	59.8%	38.35%
% in labor force	56.4%	66.9%
Poverty	16.8%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	84.2%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 80.1% Hispanic, 13.7% Asian, 2.7% white alone and 3.5% other ethnicities. The residents of the Mayfair SNI neighborhood are approximately 59.2% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Mayfair Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as traffic calming, new adult learning center, and street light upgrading. Public investment funding went into the Silver Creek flood protection capital improvement project. The neighborhood had new development through affordable housing funding for senior apartments and Tierra Encantada. The neighborhood had private investment in St. Paul Baptist Church and residential housing (Seifel, 2007).

Table 39: Mayfair Investments

Mayfair Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$1.5 million
Public investment	\$23.3 million
Housing & Commercial	\$83.8 million
Total	\$108.6 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Mayfair Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 40: Mayfair Top Ten Priorities

Mayfair Top Ten	Progress
1. Establish an Adult Learning Center	Completed- Expanding Mayfair Center
2. Construct a New Library	Completed- Alum Rock Branch Library and the Hillview Branch Library
3. Build Affordable Housing	Completed- 170 new units built
4. Upgrade Street Lights	Completed
5. Enhance Community/Police Communication	Not Completed
6. Increase Gang Prevention	Not Completed
7. Traffic Calming	Completed 2007- New signals installed
8. Implement Neighborhood Cleanliness Program	Completed
9. Improve Employment Assistance Programs	Not Completed
10. Support Increase of Homeowners (prior renters in neighborhood)	Completed in conjunction with #3

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Spartan/Keyes

The Spartans/Keyes SNI neighborhood is located in the downtown area of San Jose. The Spartans/Keyes SNI plan was approved by the City Council in 2002. The Spartans/Keyes SNI neighborhood is rich in San Jose history, being one of the first residential locations extending out from downtown. The SNI program gave the Spartans/Keyes residents a voice to better their community. The Spartans/Keyes SNI neighborhood includes the San Jose State University Spartan Stadium and other recreational fields held by the school.

A. Spartans/Keyes Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Spartans/Keyes SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Three. The boundary for the Spartans/Keyes SNI neighborhood has Highway 280/680 to the North, First Street to the West, Spartan Stadium to the South, and Coyote Creek to the East (See Attachment 1). The neighborhood spans approximately 1,140 acres comprised of residential homes and many businesses in zones along First Street (Seifel, 2007). The neighborhood demographic information consists of census tracts 5031.12 and one-quarter of tract 5016 because of the inconsistent census information breaking down tract 5016 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Table 41: Spartans/Keyes Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Spartans/Keyes Data	San Jose Data
Population	5,380	894, 943
Average household size	3.4	3.2
Median household income	\$39,000	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98%	100%
% renters	60%	38.35%
% in labor force	68%	66.9%
Poverty	14.7%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	60%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 58.8% Hispanic, 12% Asian, 24% white alone and 5.2% other ethnicities. The residents of the Spartans/Keyes SNI neighborhood are approximately 40.2% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Spartans/Keyes Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as traffic calming, mitigate noise levels, and streetscape projects. Public investment funding was not used in this neighborhood. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of apartments (Bella Castillo, Kelley Park, Siena Court), condos (Brickyard and The Works), and commercial development in the Keyes Commercial Plaza (Seifel, 2007).

Table 42: Spartans/Keyes Investments

Spartans/Keyes Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$1.6 million
Public investment	\$0
Housing & Commercial	\$175.6
Total	\$177.2 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Spartans/Keyes Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 43: Spartan/Keys Top Ten Priorities

Spartans/Keyes Top Ten	Progress
1. Open space at Story Road Landfill	Not Completed - Unattainable with the funds and time available
2. Traffic Calming	Completed- Lighted crosswalks, lights, bumps
3. Improve Keyes Street Streetscape	Completed- Street trees and sidewalk repair
4. Revitalize and Attract Businesses	Completed 2008- Facade projects
5. Neighborhood Park in East Gardner Area	Not completed
6. Art-Oriented Uses in East Gardner Area	Not completed
7. Mitigate Neighborhood Noise Levels	Completed- Noise study completed
8. School Traffic Calming	Not completed
9. Explore Elementary School	Completed - Concluded not feasible
10. Martha Street Pedestrian/Bike Corridor	Completed

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Thirteenth Street

The Thirteenth Street SNI neighborhood is located in the downtown area of San Jose. The Thirteenth Street SNI plan was approved by the City Council in March of 2002. The Thirteenth Street SNI neighborhood has historically been home to some of the oldest Victorian homes in San Jose known as the Hensley District and is recognized in the National Register of Historic Places (SNI Thirteenth Street, 2002). It also includes one of the oldest Japantowns in the United States. The SNI program was created to find out what the neighborhood felt were its highest priority needs. This was accomplished through NAC meetings with city officials and representatives which ultimately became the Thirteenth Street SNI plan.

A. Thirteenth Street Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Thirteenth Street SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Three. The boundary for the Thirteenth Street SNI neighborhood is Highway 101 to the North, North First Street to the West, Santa Clara Street to the South, and Coyote Creek to the East (See Figure 1). The Thirteenth Street SNI neighborhood sits between the University SNI and Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace SNI Neighborhoods. The neighborhood spans approximately 850 acres comprised mainly of residential homes, with businesses concentrated along North 13th Street, along Santa Clara Street, in Japantown along Taylor and Jackson Streets, and along North First Street (Seifel, 2007). There is also scattered industrial activity, including a large regional brewery on 9th Street.

Table 44: Thirteenth Street Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Thirteenth Street Data	San Jose Data
Population	22,550	894, 943
Average household size	3.06	3.2
Median household income	\$44,178	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98%	100%
% renters	68%	38.35%
% in labor force	63%	66.9%
Poverty	15.5%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	64%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 61.1% Hispanic, 14.2% Asian, 18.7% white alone and 6% other ethnicities. The residents of the Thirteenth Street SNI neighborhood are approximately 41% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Thirteenth Street Investments

Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as the antique-style streetlight replacements, streetscape improvements, and Beckesto Park renovation. Public investment funding went to projects such as the Horace Mann School, Joyce Ellington Branch Library, and the Watson Park renovation. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of the Mabuhay Court senior apartments and new residential development (Seifel, 2007).

Table 45: Thirteenth Street Investments

Thirteenth Street Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$4.9 million
Public investment	\$38.5 million
Housing & Commercial	\$137.4 million
Total	\$180.8 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Thirteenth Street Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 46: Thirteenth Street Top Ten Priorities

Thirteenth Street Top Ten	Progress
1. Couplet Conversion	Completed - 3rd & 4th street
2. 13th Street Mixed Use/Business Corridor	Completed- Facade improvements
3. 13 Street Streetscape Improvements	Completed- Streetlights, Trees, Sidewalks
4. Residential Speeding and Traffic Mitigation	Completed- 18th street
5. Pedestrian-Friendly Corridors	Completed- Corridors on St John
6. Medical Services Availability	Not Completed- Trying to bring Gardner Clinic
7. Initiatives to Improve Housing/Code Enforcement	Not Completed
8. Backesto Park Renovation	Completed 2007- Parking, lighting, & fountain
9. Coyote Creek Bike/Trail Improvements	Not Completed
10. Historic Preservation and Infill Opportunities	Not Completed

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Tully/Senter

The Tully/Senter SNI neighborhood is located in the Eastside of San Jose. The Tully/Senter SNI plan was approved by the City Council in June of 2002. The Tully/Senter SNI neighborhood is home to Happy Hollow Park which is the biggest park and zoo in the San Francisco South Bay. The area has many recreational options with Kelly Park, History San Jose and the Japanese Friendship Garden to name a few within the neighborhood (SNI Tully/Senter, 2002). The SNI program got together the many neighborhood organizations to work with city officials to create the SNI plan. The program held NAC meetings with SNI representatives which then decided on the top priorities for the neighborhood.

A. Tully/Senter Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Tully/Senter SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Seven. The boundary for the Tully/Senter SNI neighborhood has Story road to the North, Senter Road to the West, Tully Road to the South, and Highway 101 to the East (See Attachment 1). The Tully/Senter SNI neighborhood sits between the Spartan Keys SNI and KONA SNI Neighborhoods. The neighborhood spans approximately 1,100 acres comprised mainly of residential homes with businesses along the main roads such as Tully, Keyes, Story and Senter Roads (Seifel, 2007). The neighborhood sits in Santa Clara County census tracts 5031.03, 5031.05, 5031.06, and 5031.11, and demographics were averaged among the four for this research (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The Tully/Senter SNI neighborhood consists of Latin/Hispanic and Vietnamese residents. This is one of the highest concentrations of Vietnamese residents in San Jose.

Table 47: Tully/Senter Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Tully/Senter Data	San Jose Data
Population	25,123	894, 943
Average household size	3.9	3.2
Median household income	\$51,839	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98.3%	100%
% renters	60.6%	38.35%
% in labor force	62%	66.9%
Poverty	14.85%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	73.6%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 42.9% Hispanic, 37.5% Asian, 13.2% white alone and 6.4% other ethnicities. The residents of the Tully/Senter SNI neighborhood are approximately 53.7% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Tully/Senter Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as right-of-way improvements, traffic calming, and Nisich Park. Public investment funding went into projects such as the Coyote Creek trail and the Tully Branch Library. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of private residential housing as well as affordable senior living development (Seifel, 2007).

Table 48: Tully/Senter Investments

Tully/Senter Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$4.6 million
Public investment	\$17.7 million
Housing & Commercial	\$134.6 million
Total	\$156.9 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Tully/Senter Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 49: Tully/Senter Top Ten Priorities

Tully/Senter Top Ten	Progress
1. Establish a "School Hub"	Completed- Community facility on Santee Elementary School
2. Improve McLaughlin Ave Right-Of-Way	Completed- Sidewalk, signals, crossings, islands, traffic signals
3. Nisich Park	Completed 2009- park created off Nisich Drive
4. Traffic Calming	Completed- Signs, curbs, crosswalks
5. Joint School/City Park at Meadows Elementary School	Not Completed
6. Provide Code Enforcement Coordinator	Completed- Funding later cut
7. Build Pedestrian Bridge over Coyote Creek	Not Completed
8. Maintain Street trees	Completed- In conjunction with # 2- trees planted
9. Replace Chain Link fence along 101	Completed- Concrete sound wall installed
10. Lucretia Avenue Right of Way Improvements	Completed- Lucretia expansion, sidewalks, lighting, crosswalks, upgraded utilities

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

University

The University SNI neighborhood is located in the downtown area of San Jose. The University SNI plan was approved by the City Council in May of 2002. The University SNI neighborhood is home to the largest university in the south bay, San Jose State University. The area is best known for the university and the Victorian homes (SNI University, 2002). The SNI program used the platform of a neighborhood plan created in 1998 for the University neighborhood. The residents held NAC meetings with city officials and SNI representatives who collectively decided on the top priorities for the neighborhood.

A. University Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The University SNI neighborhood is located within City Council District Three. The boundary for the University SNI neighborhood is Santa Clara and San Fernando Street to the North, Third Street to the West, Highway 280 to the South, and Coyote Creek to the East (See Figure 1). The University SNI neighborhood sits between the Spartan Keys SNI and Thirteenth Street SNI Neighborhoods. The neighborhood spans approximately 560 acres comprised mainly of residential homes in Victorian and Craftsmen styles, and the university campus including student housing for the university (Seifel, 2007). The neighborhood sits in Santa Clara County census tracts 5009.02, 5013, and 5016, which demographics were averaged among the three for this research (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Table 50: University Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	University Data	San Jose Data
Population	15,296	894, 943
Average household size	2.95	3.2
Median household income	\$41,756	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98.8%	100%
% renters	78%	38.35%
% in labor force	64.83%	66.9%
Poverty	29.4%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home than English	52.6%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 36.5% Hispanic, 21.4% Asian, 32.5% white alone and 9.6% other ethnicities. The residents of the University SNI neighborhood are approximately 36.3% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. University Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as the O'Donnell's Garden Park, Coyote Creek Trail expansion, and pedestrian corridor enhancements. Public investment funding went into projects such as the MLK Library, Lowell Elementary School, and the SJSU Campus Village project. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of residential housing with the 101 San Fernando Apartments being the biggest project (Seifel, 2007).

Table 51: University Investments

University Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$2.3 million
Public investment	\$385.7 million
Housing & Commercial	\$82.7 million
Total	\$470.7 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. University Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 52: University Top Ten Priorities

University Top Ten	Progress
1. O'Donnell's Garden Park	Completed
2. Alleyway Reconstruction	Completed- Alleyway between 5th & 6th
3. Coyote Creek Trail Expansion	Completed- Conjunction with other SNI projects
4. 10th and 11th Street Couplet Conversion	Not completed
5. Pedestrian Corridor Enhancements	Completed- 6th and Reed Street
6. Residential Permit Parking	Completed- Permit process created
7. Commercial Rehabilitation (10th and William St)	Completed- Facade projects
8. Antique-style Pedestrian-scale Streetlights	Completed
9. Historic Conservation District	Completed
10. Neighborhood Cleanups	Completed- Dumpster days

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Washington

The Washington SNI neighborhood is located in the downtown area of San Jose. The Washington SNI plan was approved by the City Council in September of 2002. The Washington SNI neighborhood is one of the oldest neighborhoods in San Jose (SNI Washington, 2002). The residents felt their neighborhood was run-down and needed some revitalization. Many of the homes are among the oldest in San Jose. To accomplish the goals of the residents, they held NAC meetings with city officials and SNI representatives who collectively decided on the top priorities for the neighborhood.

A. Washington Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Washington SNI neighborhood is located within City Council Districts Three and Seven. The boundary for the Washington SNI neighborhood is Highway 280 to the North, Guadalupe Parkway to the West, Bellevue Avenue to the South, and Monterey Road to the East (See Attachment 1). The Washington SNI neighborhood sits between the Spartan Keys SNI and Greater Gardner SNI Neighborhoods. The neighborhood spans approximately 491 acres comprised mainly of residential homes with a high rental unit population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The neighborhood demographic information is found in Santa Clara County census tracts 5017 and 5031.13, with the demographics averaged between the two for this research (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Table 53: Washington Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Washington Data	San Jose Data
Population	11,000	894, 943
Average household size	4.33	3.2
Median household income	\$43,769	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	97.8%	100%
% renters	71.9%	38.35%
% in labor force	63.3%	66.9%
Poverty	21.8%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	77.6 %	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 84.5% Hispanic, 2.7% Asian, 9.8% white alone and 3% other ethnicities. The residents of the Washington SNI neighborhood are approximately 48.9% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Washington Investments

Investment into the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as the Parque de Padre Mateo Sheedy, Alma Community Center improvements, and couplet conversion. Public investment funding went into projects such as Bellevue Park, residential acoustical treatment program, and Guadalupe River Trail. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of Italian Gardens Family Apartments, Little Orchard Houses, and other town home and condo development (Seifel, 2007).

Table 54: Washington Investments

Washington Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$5.1 million
Public investment	\$44 million
Housing & Commercial	\$137.8 million
Total	\$186.9 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Washington Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 55: Washington Top Ten Priorities

Washington Top Ten	Progress
1. Parque de Padre Mateo Sheedy	Completed
2. Alma Senior and Teen Center	Not Completed- Land purchased, stopped due to funding
3. Darby Court Storm Drain Improvements	Completed- Manholes, 1,800 Linear Feet of drainage and 5,000 feet of Gutter
4. Vine and Almaden Couplet Conversion	Not Completed- LED lights installed on Vine Street in 2007
5. Washington School Improvements	Completed
6. Rehabilitation of Commercial Property at 1st and Oak	Completed
7. Curb and Gutter Improvements	Completed
8. Alleyway Improvements/Closures	Completed
9. Traffic Calming	Completed
10. New Streetlights	Completed

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

West Evergreen

The West Evergreen SNI neighborhood is located southeast of central San Jose. The West Evergreen SNI plan was approved by the City Council in October of 2002. The West Evergreen SNI neighborhood is a diverse community with Hispanic/Latino and Asian residents making up most of the population (SNI West Evergreen, 2002). The SNI program gave the three neighborhood associations a voice to create a working plan to revitalize the area. The area is mainly residential, with businesses along the major roadways within the neighborhood.

A. West Evergreen Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The West Evergreen SNI neighborhood is located within City Council Districts Seven and Eight. The boundary for the West Evergreen SNI neighborhood is Tully Road to the North, Highway 101 to the West, Capital Expressway to the South, and Quimby Road to the East (Seifel, 2007). The West Evergreen SNI neighborhood is next to the KONA SNI neighborhood. The neighborhood spans approximately 917 acres comprised mainly of residential homes (West Evergreen, 2008). The neighborhood demographic information is found in Santa Clara County census tracts 5033.04 and 5033.05, with the demographics averaged between the two tracts for this research (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Table 56: West Evergreen Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	West Evergreen Data	San Jose Data
Population	14,512	894, 943
Average household size	4.52	3.2
Median household income	\$59,534	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98.9%	100%
% renters	40%	38.35%
% in labor force	63.7%	66.9%
Poverty	12.1%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	76.6%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 48.4% Hispanic, 37.1% Asian, 8.1% white alone and 6.4% other ethnicities. The residents of the West Evergreen SNI neighborhood are approximately 53.8% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. West Evergreen Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as Meadowfair Park improvements, strengthen code enforcement, and traffic calming. Public investment funding went into projects such as the Meadowfair Center Park play area renovation and the Tower Lane improvements. The neighborhood had new housing investment through the new development of Amberly and Camarena Place. Retail development was invested in the Silver Creek Plaza and Paloma Centre (Seifel, 2007).

Table 57: West Evergreen Investments

West Evergreen Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$1.2 million
Public investment	\$2.1 million
Housing & Commercial	\$85.2 million
Total	\$88.5 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. West Evergreen Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 58: West Evergreen Top Ten Priorities

West Evergreen Top Ten	Progress
1. Meadowfair Park Improvements and New Community Center	Completed- Meadowfair Park expansion
2. Satellite Community Center at Meadowfair Park	Not Completed
3. New Park at 1588 Aborn Road and Develop a Joint-Use Agreement with Evergreen School District	Not Completed
4. Sidewalks on Aborn Road, East and West on King Road	Completed- DOT installed crosswalks, ADA ramps, lighting on Aborn Road
5. Widen and Complete Sidewalk and Trail along Barberry Lane	Completed- Improvements to Barberry
6. Lower Silver Creek Improvements	Not Completed
7. Strengthen Code Enforcement	Completed
8. ADA Ramps	Completed- 68 New Ramps installed
9. Neighborhood Cleanups	Completed- dumpster days
10. KLOK Radio Station Property Improvements	Completed- sidewalks, park strips

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

Winchester

The Winchester SNI neighborhood is located in West San Jose. The Winchester SNI plan was approved by the City Council in October of 2001, making it one of the first neighborhoods approved by the council. The Winchester SNI neighborhood is a rapidly growing area in San Jose with a community largely representing the Hispanic/Latino and Asian members of the community (SNI Winchester, 2001). The SNI program was created to let the residents give their input on issues within their community. The Winchester area is primarily residential with small shop businesses and restaurants along Winchester Boulevard.

A. Winchester Neighborhood Information

1. Location and Demographic Information

The Winchester SNI neighborhood is located within City Council Districts One and Six. The boundary for the Winchester SNI neighborhood is Moorpark Avenue to the north, Eden Avenue to the west, City of Campbell Border to the south, and Winchester Boulevard to the east (See Figure 1). The Winchester SNI neighborhood is closest to the Blackford SNI neighborhood. The neighborhood spans approximately 470 acres comprised mainly of residential dwellings (Winchester, 2001). The SNI sits in census tracts 5064.02 and 5065.01, with the demographics averaged between the two tracts for this research (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Table 59: Winchester Neighborhood Data

1999-2000 Data	Winchester Data	San Jose Data
Population	13,000	894, 943
Average household size	2.67	3.2
Median household income	\$53,853	\$70,243
% housing units occupied	98.9%	100%
% renters	71%	38.35%
% in labor force	68.4%	66.9%
Poverty	10.7%	8.8%
Language other than English spoken at home	49.2%	51.2%

Source of Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The population consists of residents who identify themselves as 29.8% Hispanic, 16.8% Asian, 44.9% white alone and 8.5% other ethnicities. The residents of the Winchester SNI neighborhood are approximately 41.6% foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2. Winchester Investments

Investment in the SNI top ten goals has funding from RDA and the City of San Jose dedicated to SNI goals with neighborhood projects such as the Winchester Blvd. improvements and Eden Avenue traffic calming. Public investment funding went into the Even Start Family Literacy program. The neighborhood had new housing investment through new residential development of the Neal Avenue and Payne Avenue townhomes as well as Villa Cortina and Huff condos (Seifel, 2007).

Table 60: Winchester Investments

Winchester Investments	
SNI Top Ten	\$3.2 million
Public investment	\$120,000
Housing & Commercial	\$149.2 million
Total	\$152.5 million

Source of Data: Seifel, 2007; RDA Report, 2010

B. Winchester Original Top Ten Priorities and Progress

Table 61: Winchester Top Ten Priorities

Winchester Top Ten	Progress
1. Winchester Boulevard Improvements	Completed- New landscape island, trees, irrigation, facade projects
2. Eden Ave Traffic Calming	Completed- Lights, curb extension on Eden Ave
3. Even Start Family Literacy Program	Completed
4. Cooperative Agreements for Joint Use of School	Not Completed
5. Westside Branch Library	Completed- Bascom Avenue Library
6. Street Tree Planting	Completed- Winchester trees planted
7. Traffic Calming	Completed- in conjunction with #1 & 2
8. Public Telephone Nuisance	Completed
9. House Numbers on Curbs	Completed
10. Neighborhood Clean Up Effort	Completed

Source of Data: Blight Report 08-09; Pereira, 2011; RDA 06-07 Capital Budget; Seifel, 2007.

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

Validity Threats

Due to the current state of the SNI project and the elimination of the RDA, threats to data validity may exist. SNI and RDA have not updated SNI goals or budgets in numerous years due to cutbacks and the closure of RDA and elimination of the SNI project. Although the information was approved as a public record at the time it was issued, it may not reflect the current status of any program or budget. All the current information (2007 to present) and goal completion information was provided through interviews with current or previous city employees with direct knowledge of the SNI program, or through published budgets. Their expertise and firsthand experience makes them the most qualified to answer questions regarding the current state of SNI and SNI overall program information, but the validity is based on their memories rather than verifiable public records.

Threats to instrumentation validity were examined due to the turnover in staff for the SNI program. Change in staff could have caused variations in findings due to different program evaluations by different staff. These threats were minimized in this research by only examining the goal completion rate and general intent for the program. Completed goal data was found in SNI and RDA records, as well as through interviews.

SNI's general intent in creating civic engagement and interdepartmental collaboration can be measured through the level of completion of the Top Ten priorities for each neighborhood. The residents of each NAC created the priorities as intended, and depending on the project, multiple departments worked together to complete the required work. Outside consulting agencies were also used to analyze the SNI program's neighborhood financial information for

public records, as it was required by RDA law at the time, and this provided a basis for analyzing the allocation of funding among the overall program goals.

Issues Encountered

The methodology behind this research was a document analysis of public city and RDA records. The SNI program and the RDA were required to provide information about funding of their projects, but because of budget cuts and the elimination of the RDA in San Jose, the records were not updated, and some are no longer available. Most of the records from the SNI program were complete until 2007 when the program began making cuts. In 2011, the SNI program had its staff eliminated and the last team manager was moved to the Housing Department because the funding from RDA stopped due to the closure of the RDA. (Pereira, 2011). Most public record requests made to the city were futile because RDA held many of the SNI records and all their files were boxed and placed in storage, and most SNI staff were no longer available to provide information. The help of the previous SNI contacts now in different departments providing leads to public records helped to ease a difficult document collection process as well as helping to keep the RDA website up for historical purposes.

Demographics for each neighborhood were examined through the US Census data for 2000 for consistency. An issue occurred with the overlapping of census tracts between neighborhoods. The census tracts could not be examined at a block-by-block level because the census had missing information at that level. Some census tracts also did not have information on certain demographics so that information was left out, and the rest was averaged between the other remaining tracts per neighborhood. In the case where half a tract sits in a neighborhood, only half the demographic information was used and averaged into the neighborhood.

Comparisons

The SNI program had set out to improve areas of San Jose by revitalizing the neighborhood and creating community engagement. San Jose staff learned from two other communities in Minneapolis and Seattle. Each tried to accomplish many similar objectives with their respective programs, and SNI staff examined their successes and failures in developing the SNI program. Minneapolis broke down projects into neighborhoods, created agency collaboration, and wanted the community to make decisions about where funds will go through neighborhood priorities (Filner, 2006). The intensions began well, but records show that political issues of property owners and city officials making the decisions and not the residents eventually ended the program.

The Seattle project also incorporated citizen participation and engagement in setting community priorities. Seattle created neighborhood project managers who would access the residents and report their interests back to city hall. Each neighborhood had a set amount of funds available to them.

SNI modeled some of its structure on these two programs. SNI wanted civic engagement, but wanted to make sure that Minneapolis-style communication issues did not occur, with property owners dominating the discussions. SNI adopted the idea from Seattle of having neighborhood team managers who interact with the residents of each community. This is where the similarities from the Minneapolis and Seattle projects end, and SNI created a different approach.

SNI had a significant advantage over its predecessor programs in that it had support through the City of San Jose and was funded by the RDA for many of the SNI projects. The

RDA was able to use redevelopment funding because of the focus on eliminating blight in each neighborhood (ILG, 2012). SNI was able to get many departments within the city to collaborate to accomplish the program's priorities. A goal from one of the neighborhoods could require parks and recreations, code enforcement, public works, and transportation to work together, which some staff believed changed the way city business was managed (Linder, 2011). The collaboration was aimed at fulfilling the needs of the community rather than city-set priorities.

Another aspect that made SNI different was the cooperation of the RDA, one of the largest in the state. They were able to provide project based funding rather than a fixed amount like Seattle. The goal was to complete as many of the Top Ten priorities that the neighborhoods requested as time and funding permitted. The RDA invested over \$200 million into SNI projects and housing. This was a larger amount of money than had previously been used for a revitalization project (Pereira, 2011). The connection to the community and the resulting civic engagement across socio-economic lines represented the accomplishment of a core purpose for SNI, along with the implementation of the neighborhood priorities. The program helped build NACs, RACs and leaders that could represent all the neighborhood stakeholders, not just the property owners and voters, in creating neighborhood improvement projects.

Goal Completion and Monetary Value

The goals that were examined in this research were from the original SNI Neighborhood Plan from each of the nineteen neighborhoods which began implementation in 2001/2002, based on neighborhood and city council approval. Each neighborhood had set out to create ten priorities for the city to help them achieve. Unlike previous government-initiated neighborhood revitalization programs such as Minneapolis and Seattle, the SNI program kept records of

completed goals throughout the program's lifespan. The city planned to make an update in 2012 of the completed goals, but the SNI program became a victim of the local deficit that many cities were dealing with, as well as the loss of the RDA through state-level legislation (Harkness, 2011). The percentage of goals completed is one indicator of the success of the civic engagement and city/RDA collaboration.

The City of San Jose's SNI program had completed about 148 of the proposed 190 goals as of 2012, based on the data that was available. Additional projects were started but not completed as planned, often due to lack of funding toward the end of the RDA's existence. . Because there were no milestones set in the initial planning process for the Top Ten, it is impossible to determine if the progress made can be considered a completion of usable elements of the original program. For example, streetscape of a boulevard can have three trees planted and called complete or could have trees planted every two years and still not be complete because it is ongoing. That being said, SNI accomplished a great deal by completing 148 of the original 190 "Top Ten" goals, roughly making it a seventy-eight percent completion rate of the original goals (NLC Nomination, 2008). Visually more goals appeared to be completed throughout San Jose, but it is unknown to what degree they were funded by SNI and which may have been funded privately by developers or other neighborhood members (Pereira, 2011).

The SNI program was funded by the City of San Jose, the RDA, federal CDBG and housing funds, and private investment. The total amount invested in the nineteen neighborhoods through 2007 was over \$2.7 billion in funds on record (Seifel, 2007). The RDA invested approximately \$35,026,856 in addition from July 2007 through December 2009 (RDA Report, 2010).

Neighborhood Data

The neighborhood information collected can be looked at in different ways, but some demographic information stands out when looked at in the bigger picture. When the neighborhood information is averaged out, the total SNI area has a lower median household income at \$50,631 compared to San Jose's average of \$70,243 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The averaged poverty rate in the SNI areas is almost twice that of San Jose's 8.8% with 15.53% poverty rate to population. The City of San Jose had a 34.7% Latino population overall, but the SNI area had a 56.2% Latino population, with a slightly higher than average different language spoken at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). This data shows that the areas within SNI had poorer conditions and larger demographic disparities compared to San Jose as a whole.

The City of San Jose's initial goal in choosing an area was not necessarily to target the poor and disadvantaged areas, but to target the most blighted areas that would not be alleviated without assistance from the city (SNI, 2002). The targeted blight areas could have been private property or public land. Two neighborhoods did stand out in comparison to the other seventeen in that they had multiple top ten goals involving private property, such as apartment or shopping center revitalization (Seifel, 2007). The initial issue was whether there was an ability to use public funds to pay for private revitalization (Pereira, 2011). The community wanted private projects completed, so the city and RDA had to figure out how to go about doing so without using public funds. This meant the city had to work with private property owners to get these projects completed, so the city helped the owners apply for grants, and the residents got the local property owners to participate with the project (Pereira, 2007). Money devoted to SNI projects from the City or RDA went to a number of projects and not necessarily the biggest or most completed goals.

The East Valley/680 Neighborhood had the revitalization of the Story and King Roads intersection which was considered to be the largest redevelopment project within the SNI area. This neighborhood used approximately \$1.7 million of SNI funding, which included funding towards projects such as sidewalk installation and repair, noise mitigation, and street sweeping (Seifel, 2007). The City and RDA invested minimal funds in comparison to the \$200 million invested through private and public investment in that neighborhood (Pereira, 2011). The city and RDA were able to get these projects completed through other means outside of directly using top ten SNI allocated funds, which would include RDA and City of San Jose public project funding that was used towards branch libraries (Pereira, 2011).

The number of goals completed varied by SNI neighborhood. The Edenvale/Great Oaks neighborhood received about \$1.9 million in SNI funding while this neighborhood completed nine out of the top ten goals. The Blackford neighborhood used \$7.8 million of SNI funding and completed four goals. The dollar amount used depended on the priorities of the residents. The SNI program attempted to complete as many of the top priorities for each neighborhood as possible (Pereira, 2011). There is no direct correlation between the amount of money used in each neighborhood and the number of goals completed, since some SNIs had relatively inexpensive goals like landscaping, while others had expensive infrastructure projects as the focus. Also, Table 4 shows that funding did not fulfill all the SNI initial objectives for the program since residents had some other goals with more importance to them. Goals varied by the needs of the residents and their involvement in creating those goals.

The SNI program's initial goals had the residents create the top goals within their neighborhoods which in some way directly or indirectly affected their community. For example, the creation of community centers could have indirectly lead to jobs, since now there would be a

need to staff those centers. SNI did directly affect each neighborhood with its completion of goals. The SNI program had its initial goals of revitalizing, eliminating blight, and getting the community involved. All three goals were achieved by the program with the creation of the top ten goals using the community's involvement and then completing neighborhood goals such as facade repairs or landscape planting.

Civic Engagement

The SNI program had the intent to organize each neighborhood to create a mechanism for all members of the community to help establish community-wide goals for improvement and revitalization. The Seattle-style team managers gave the community a point of contact that represented the city. This person worked with neighborhood leaders, but also continuously looked for input from neighbors that otherwise may exclude themselves from the conversation (Harkness, 2011). The Hispanic community had been difficult to engage in previous outreach efforts, such as Seattle (Sirianni, 2007), but with SNI neighborhood demographics indicating high concentrations of Hispanics the team leaders did everything within their power to contact the Hispanic community and give them a voice. This was done by creating respect and trust between the residents and the SNI team managers (Pereira, 2011), including having bilingual team members and using interpreters at meetings. SNI later used this connection with the community to get non-profits involved in providing services that the city departments could no longer provide. Including residents in the planning process and leaving the goal creation to them was not normal business for government agencies, but SNI made it work and praised the community for their efforts.

Many SNI residents still have meetings, but there has been a transition to new formats and structures. (Figone and Mavrogenes, 2010). With the elimination of RDA, the SNI project

transferred to the City Manager's Office and then in 2010 to the Housing Department, where it was then terminated (Addendum 35, 2011). The City of San Jose wanted to continue its neighborhood success by creating the Place-based Neighborhoods of Mayfair, Santee, and the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace, which is funded by Community Development Block Grants (City of San Jose, 2012).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The SNI program had accomplished more than previous programs in other cities that tried to revitalize communities. The SNI program examined other city programs in Seattle and Minneapolis, and built on those limited successes. SNI stands out from other civic engagement and revitalization programs implemented by local governments for its success in engaging the whole community, including residents who often choose not to have a voice in civic affairs. SNI was able to complete roughly seventy-eight percent of the goals created by the residents to revitalize the neighborhoods through collaboration among the city, RDA, federal and private sources (NLC Nomination, 2008).

The SNI program should be a guide to other cities regarding a way to engage the community in planning its own revitalization and creating a neighborhood focus in a large and diverse city of over one million people. While California cities cannot use the RDA approach since the state has eliminated them, cities in other parts of the country might be able to reproduce what SNI did. The blueprint for the overall staffing structure, community engagement, and program intentions should be examined by local governments that plan to create any program with a similar focus on whole community involvement in priority setting for redevelopment and revitalization. The CDBG program also offers some funding for community revitalization projects.

CONCLUSION

The Strong Neighborhoods Initiative program wanted to revitalize San Jose's most blighted neighborhoods, with the intention of including the residents in the process, and engendering city department collaboration. The SNI project was successful in changing the image of many San Jose neighborhoods. The SNI program achieved its goal of organizing the neighborhoods to create goals to accomplish over time, resulting in a 78% completion rate of its initial projects throughout all SNI neighborhoods. The SNI plan invested more funding in the targeted neighborhoods than previous initiatives in other cities such as Seattle and Minneapolis, with over \$2 billion from all sources.

The Strong Neighborhoods Initiative program sought to change the way RDA funding was allocated, from a sole focus on central business district revitalization to whole community improvement, an approach now used by other cities. Unfortunately, RDA funding will not be available in California with the elimination of redevelopment agencies. This is not to say that other cities cannot use the SNI program as a platform to initiate civic engagement in neighborhood planning in future programs. The current financial challenges experienced by many of California's local governments will make it difficult to begin a community-wide priority setting initiative until funding is available to support the priorities. Overall, the program was a great success, in part because of its ability to engage the residents in creating neighborhood priorities, department collaborations, and completing a majority of the original goals set by the residents. The City of San Jose's Strong Neighborhoods Initiative was recognized by the National League of Cities when it won the Gold Award for Municipal Excellence in 2008 (NLC, 2008). The Strong Neighborhoods Initiative made an impact on the residents, policy makers and the community as a whole which will be appreciated by many for years to come.

Attachment 1: SNI 19 Neighborhood Map

Source: City of San Jose, 2007

Attachment 2:

Seifel Report on SNI Investment

Strong Neighborhoods Initiative
Summary of Total Investment by Neighborhood

	Public Projects							Housing and Commercial							Total Investment
	SNI Expenditures ^a			Public Investment				Rehab	New Development						
	SIRA SNI	SJ SNI	Subtotal SNI Expenditures ^a	SIRA Public Projects ^b	SJ Public Projects ^c	Other Public Entities ^d	Subtotal Public Investment		SJ HIP Rehab	SURA Developer Incentives	SJ Afford. Housing	Private Investment	Subtotal New Development Investment		
Neighborhood															
Blackford	\$ 4,911,974	\$ 2,936,843	\$ 7,848,817	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 2,272,000	\$ 314,889	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,486,343	\$ 11,486,343	\$ 21,922,050	
Burbank/Del Monte	\$ 1,370,648	\$ 945,188	\$ 2,315,836	\$ 4,616,356	\$ 4,616,356	\$ 20,569,096	\$ 425,000	\$ 25,610,452	\$ 211,780	\$ 500,000	\$ 7,892,000	\$ 487,523,551	\$ 495,915,551	\$ 524,053,618	
Delmas Park	\$ 1,987,172	\$ 77,516	\$ 2,064,688	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 55,931	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 9,375,122	\$ 50,898,707	\$ 61,773,829	\$ 64,294,448	
East Valley/680 Communities	\$ 1,115,500	\$ 582,307	\$ 1,697,807	\$ 10,181,474	\$ 10,181,474	\$ 24,800,000	\$ -	\$ 34,981,474	\$ 1,926,700	\$ 39,500,000	\$ 16,510,018	\$ 106,974,062	\$ 162,984,080	\$ 201,590,060	
Edenvale/Great Oaks	\$ 1,424,414	\$ 500,228	\$ 1,924,642	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 770,400	\$ -	\$ 770,400	\$ 317,880	\$ -	\$ 1,275,000	\$ 6,838,863	\$ 8,113,863	\$ 11,126,785	
Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace	\$ 2,555,773	\$ 2,118,921	\$ 4,674,694	\$ 1,166,934	\$ 1,166,934	\$ 3,139,000	\$ 59,861,000	\$ 64,166,934	\$ 401,506	\$ -	\$ 7,349,278	\$ 185,311,574	\$ 192,660,852	\$ 261,903,986	
Gateway East	\$ 1,565,781	\$ 1,090,635	\$ 2,656,417	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 385,256	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,565,000	\$ 13,565,000	\$ 26,606,673	
Greater Gardiner	\$ 3,958,328	\$ 1,700,541	\$ 5,658,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,100,000	\$ -	\$ 5,100,000	\$ 113,211	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,550,000	\$ 13,550,000	\$ 24,422,080	
Hoffman/Via Monte	\$ 859,452	\$ -	\$ 859,452	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ 311,083	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,870,535	
K.O.N.A.	\$ 1,086,363	\$ 394,361	\$ 1,480,724	\$ 5,274,000	\$ 5,274,000	\$ 1,875,000	\$ -	\$ 7,149,000	\$ 772,830	\$ 326,000	\$ -	\$ 11,765,352	\$ 12,091,352	\$ 21,493,906	
Market/Almaden	\$ 1,108,400	\$ -	\$ 1,108,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 8,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,226,000	\$ 9,226,000	\$ 18,334,400	
Mayfair	\$ 1,341,509	\$ 110,000	\$ 1,451,509	\$ 1,288,612	\$ 1,288,612	\$ -	\$ 22,000,000	\$ 23,288,612	\$ 310,693	\$ -	\$ 14,304,900	\$ 69,482,714	\$ 83,787,614	\$ 108,838,427	
Spartan/Keyes	\$ 1,635,724	\$ -	\$ 1,635,724	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 122,197	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 21,592,900	\$ 152,704,923	\$ 176,597,823	\$ 178,355,744	
Thirteenth Street	\$ 4,854,719	\$ 1,974	\$ 4,856,693	\$ 23,192,355	\$ 23,192,355	\$ 15,298,450	\$ 50,000	\$ 38,540,805	\$ 1,203,618	\$ 290,000	\$ 6,750,000	\$ 130,354,586	\$ 137,394,586	\$ 181,995,703	
Tully/Senter	\$ 2,804,031	\$ 1,824,766	\$ 4,628,797	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,895,290	\$ 825,000	\$ 17,720,290	\$ 326,545	\$ -	\$ 42,344,595	\$ 92,304,067	\$ 134,648,662	\$ 157,324,295	
University	\$ 1,913,379	\$ 431,274	\$ 2,344,653	\$ 74,015,000	\$ 74,015,000	\$ 99,200	\$ 311,600,000	\$ 385,714,200	\$ 180,842	\$ 5,750,000	\$ 2,035,000	\$ 74,976,230	\$ 82,761,230	\$ 471,000,925	
Washington	\$ 3,260,647	\$ 1,829,288	\$ 5,089,935	\$ 9,251,951	\$ 9,251,951	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 32,400,251	\$ 44,052,202	\$ 394,787	\$ -	\$ 18,200,000	\$ 119,648,830	\$ 137,848,830	\$ 187,385,754	
West Evergreen	\$ 1,190,649	\$ -	\$ 1,190,649	\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 1,550,000	\$ -	\$ 2,120,000	\$ 934,551	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85,298,522	\$ 85,298,522	\$ 89,543,722	
Winchester	\$ 2,502,045	\$ 711,727	\$ 3,213,772	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 274,836	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 149,251,439	\$ 149,251,439	\$ 152,860,047	
Subtotal	\$ 41,446,509	\$ 15,255,568	\$ 56,702,077	\$ 129,556,681	\$ 129,556,681	\$ 95,396,436	\$ 445,753,251	\$ 670,706,368	\$ 8,559,137	\$ 50,166,000	\$ 147,628,813	\$ 1,771,160,763	\$ 1,968,955,576	\$ 2,704,923,158	
SNI Area-wide ^e	\$ 11,068,144	\$ 7,956,328	\$ 19,024,472	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,024,472	
Total	\$ 52,514,652	\$ 23,211,896	\$ 75,726,548	\$ 129,556,681	\$ 129,556,681	\$ 95,396,436	\$ 445,753,251	\$ 670,706,368	\$ 8,559,137	\$ 50,166,000	\$ 147,628,813	\$ 1,771,160,763	\$ 1,968,955,576	\$ 2,723,947,629	

Source: Seifel Report 2007

- a. Includes Agency and City funding directed towards SNI neighborhoods' top ten projects and SNI area-wide projects.
b. Includes Agency money spent in SNI neighborhoods on projects such as parks, libraries, community centers, and neighborhood business district improvements.
c. Includes City money spent in SNI neighborhoods on projects such as parks, libraries, and community centers.
d. Includes money spent by other organizations in SNI neighborhoods on public projects such as schools, parks, libraries, community centers, student housing, acoustical treatments, flood control, etc.
e. Includes money spent to benefit SNI neighborhoods projects such as street resurfacing, the Union-Corner SNI area, code enforcement, and attractive neighborhoods.

SOURCES CONSULTED

- City of San Jose. (2007). *Adopted Operating Budget 2007-2008*. Retrieved August 3, 2015 from <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/2073>
- City of San Jose. (2008). *Adopted Operating Budget 2008-2009*. Retrieved August 3, 2015 from <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/1607>
- City of San Jose SNI Map. (2009). Strong Neighborhoods Initiative map. Retrieved June 12, 2011 from <http://www.sjredevelopment.org/Maps/SNIMap071409.pdf>.
- City of San Jose. (2010, May 24). *Strong Neighborhoods Business Plan Update*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/BusPlan/SNBusinessPlanUpdateMemo0510.pdf>
- City of San Jose Addendum 35. (2011). Memorandum: Strong Neighborhoods Initiative. Retrieved June 12, 2011 from <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/documentcenter/view/2842>
- City of San Jose. (2012). Place-Based Neighborhoods. Retrieved June 10, 2015 from <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?nid=4007>
- Edwards, F. (2012, December 11). Personal communication.
- Fagotto, E. & Fung, A. (2006). Empowered Participation in Urban Governance: The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research*, 30(3), 638-655. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2006.00685.x
- Figone, D. and Mavrogenes, H. (2010). Strong Neighborhoods Business Plan Implementation. City of San Jose Council Memo, September 27, 2010.
- Filner, M.F. (2006). The limits of participatory empowerment: Assessing the Minneapolis neighborhood revitalization program. *State and local government review*, 38(2), pp. 67-77. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4355420>
- Gerston, L. (2002). *Public Policymaking In A democratic Society: A Guide To Civic Engagement*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Harkness, K. (2011, September 22). Personal communication
- ILG (Institute for Local Government). (2012). *The City of San Jose involves diverse residents to build strong neighborhoods*. Retrieved August 2, 2012 from <http://www.ca-ilg.org/post/city-san-jose-involves-diverse-residents-build-strong-neighborhoods>
- Irvin, R.A. & Stansbury, J. (2004, Jan/Feb.). Citizen participation in decision making: Is it worth the effort?. *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), pp. 55-65. Retrieved from Proquest January 12, 2011.

- Kelling, G. L., & Wilson, J. Q. (1982, March). Broken Windows: The police and neighborhood safety. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>
- Levey, N. (2001, March 7). City to invest in neighborhoods. *San Jose Mercury News*, p. 1B.
- Linder, M. (2011, September 15). Personal communication
- NLC (National League of Cities). (2008). Past program: Awards for municipal excellence. Retrieved from <http://www.nlc.org/about-nlc/award-programs/past-program-awards-for-municipal-excellence>
- NLC (National League of Cities). (2008). Nominations: 2008 San Jose nomination. Retrieved <http://www.nlc.org/Documents/Utility%20Navigation/About%20NLC/Awards/2008%20San%20Jose%20Nomination.pdf>
- Pereira, P. (2011, September 9). Personal communication
- RDA (Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose). (2006). *Adopted 2006-2007 Capital budget*. Retrieved June 10, 2015 from <http://www.sjredevelopment.org/Finance/AdoptedCIP0608Budget.pdf>
- RDA (Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose). (2007). *Adopted 2007-2008 Capital budget*. Retrieved June 10, 2015 from http://www.sjredevelopment.org/Finance/AdoptedFY07-08CapitalBudgetFY08-12CIP_web.pdf
- RDA (Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose). (2008). *Adopted 2008-2009 Capital budget*. Retrieved June 10, 2015 from <http://www.sjredevelopment.org/Finance/Adopted%20FY08-09%20Budget%20Two%20Year.pdf>
- RDA (Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose). (2009). *2008-2009 Blight progress report*. Retrieved June 10, 2015 from <http://www.sjredevelopment.org/Finance/2009BlightProgressReport.pdf>
- RDA. (2010). SNI progress report: SNI implementation plan progress memorandum, Retrieved January 28, 2011 from <http://www.sjredevelopment.org/Agendas2010/092810/31SNIImplementationPlanProgress.pdf>
- Salinas, C. M. (2011, August 2). Monterey, San Benito counties have highest percentage of undocumented immigrants in state. *Monterey County Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.mercurynews.com/breaking-news/ci_18602889
- Seifel Consulting Inc. (2007). *Report on investment in the Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI) area*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from http://www.sanjoseca.gov/clerk/CommitteeAgenda/NSE/091307/NSE091307_05a_att.pdf

- Sirianni, C. (2007, Autumn.). Neighborhood planning as a collaborative democratic design. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73(4), pp. 373-387.
- SNI (Strong Neighborhoods Initiative). (2002). *Redevelopment plan chronology: Strong neighborhoods initiative*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.sjredevelopment.org/PublicationsPlans/StrongNeighborhoodsInitiative.pdf>
- SNI Blackford. (2002). *Blackford neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/Blackford/BlackfordPlan.pdf>
- SNI Burbank/Del Monte. (2002). *Burbank/Del Monte neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/BurbankDelMonte/BurbankDelMontePlan.pdf>
- SNI Delmas Park. (2002). *Delmas Park neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/DelmasPark/DelmasParkPlan.pdf>
- SNI East Valley/680 Communities. (2001). *East Valley/680 Communities neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/EastValley680/EastValley680CommunitiesPlan.pdf>
- SNI Edenvale/Great Oaks. (2001). *Edenvale/Great Oaks neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/Edenvale/EdenvaleGreatOaksPlan.pdf>
- SNI Five Wounds. (2002). *Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/FiveWounds/FiveWoundsPlan.pdf>
- SNI Gateway East. (2002). *Gateway East neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/GatewayEast/GatewayEastPlan.pdf>
- SNI Greater Gardner. (2002). *Greater Gardner neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/GreaterGardner/GreaterGardnerPlan.pdf>
- SNI Hoffman/Via Monte. (2002). *Hoffman/Via Monte neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/Hoffman/HoffmanPlan.pdf>
- SNI K.O.N.A. (2008). *K.O.N.A neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/kona/KONANeighborhoodImprovementPlanAmendment.pdf>

- SNI Market/Almaden. (2003). *Market Almaden neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/MarketAlmaden/MarketAlmadenPlan.pdf>
- SNI Mayfair. (2002). *Mayfair neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/Mayfair/MayfairPlan.pdf>
- SNI Spartan Keyes. (2002). *Spartan/Keyes neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/SpartanKeyes/SpartanKeyes.pdf>
- SNI Thirteenth. (2002). *Thirteenth street neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/13thSt/13thStreetPlan.pdf>
- SNI Tully/Senter. (2002). *Tully/Senter neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/TullySenter/TullySenter.pdf>
- SNI University. (2002). *University neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/University/UniversityPlan.pdf>
- SNI Washington. (2002). *Washington neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/Washington/WashingtonPlan.pdf>
- SNI West Evergreen. (2002). *West Evergreen neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/WestEvergreen/WestEvergreen.pdf>
- SNI Winchester. (2001). *Winchester neighborhood improvement plan*. Retrieved January 3, 2011 from <http://www.strongneighborhoods.org/Winchester/WinchesterPlan.pdf>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *State & county Quickfacts: Santa Clara County, CA*. Retrieved October 18, 2012, from <http://quickfacts.census.gov>.
- Woolfolk, J. (2012, January 24). San Jose moves to end redevelopment agency. *San Jose Mercury News*, San Jose - Valley; News; Local. Retrieved from http://www.contracostatimes.com/california-budget/ci_19814483
- Yang, K. & Callahan, K. (2005, Dec.). Assessing citizen involvement efforts by local governments. *Public performance & management review*, 29(2), pp. 191-216. Retrieved from <http://www.jstore.org/stable/20447516>