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On November 15, 2017, Silicon Valley residents came together in conversation to talk about issues that impact the region and its quality of life. This conversation-oriented initiative known as On the Table was an opportunity for friends, families, neighbors, colleagues, and even people who were meeting for the first time to gather around a shared meal and have a real dialogue about what is important to them with the intention of fueling meaningful change.

Silicon Valley Community Foundation (SVCF) convened residents in On the Table conversations to discuss, share, and brainstorm ideas to help solve the region’s housing challenge. As invitation materials for the event noted, the housing challenge affects every resident in the region by contributing to high rents and affordability challenges, homelessness and displacement, and lengthy commutes on congested roadways. Guided by the idea that when residents come together and listen to each other they have the power to increase their influence and improve lives, SVCF invited participants to convene and discuss their own housing-related challenges, to share struggles they have faced as a result of the housing challenge, and to indicate their level of optimism about the region’s ability to address housing affordability. Most importantly, SVCF sought to use On the Table as an opportunity for residents across the region to come together in solution-oriented conversations to discuss ideas and actions that could make significant progress in confronting Silicon Valley's housing affordability challenge.

SVCF organized On the Table with support from The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Knight Foundation brought On the Table to 10 sites across the country in 2017: Lexington, KY (March 15); Philadelphia, PA (May 23); Long Beach, CA (September 23); Gary, IN (September 26); Akron, OH (October 3); Southeast Michigan (October 4); Miami, FL (October 17); Charlotte, NC (October 25); Columbus, GA (November 7); and across Silicon Valley, CA (November 15). This On the Table replication project draws from an initiative that originated in Chicago in 2014 as part of The Chicago Community Trust’s Centennial celebration. Since its inception and expansion into other cities, On the Table has been an occasion for residents of a city or region to convene and discuss local opportunities and challenges while focusing on strategies to make their communities safer, stronger, and more dynamic.

All 10 cities designated their own specific day in 2017 to convene residents in mealtime conversations for discussions on how to make their city a better place to live, work, and play. Following the conversations, participants had the opportunity to take a survey about their On the Table experience. This survey featured 27 questions that were standard across all 10 cities, plus up to five additional questions that were unique to each city. Following the collection of survey data, all cities receive a report summarizing and analyzing the survey data and a link to a data exploration tool. Community foundations can use insights from the data to inform strategic planning, and local decision-makers, organizations, and residents can use the data to collaborate around improving the quality of life in their cities. A national report incorporating data from all 10 cities and exploring correlations and comparisons in the full data set will be produced in early 2018.
Research Methodology

Knight Foundation invited the University of Illinois at Chicago’s (UIC) Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) to serve as the research partner for this On the Table initiative. We set out to gain a deeper understanding of the conversations through results gathered from a survey of On the Table participants. This report presents the results of the survey and incorporates analyses to provide insight into the summary data. The data can be accessed and explored through ipce.shinyapps.io/ottsv17.

The central questions guiding this research include: Who responded to the survey? How did the conversations go? How did the conversations impact respondents? SVCF chose to focus their On the Table conversations on the housing challenge facing their region. For the purpose of this report, Silicon Valley refers to the following counties: San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, and San Francisco County. SVCF was interested in respondents’ relationship to and opinions on the region’s housing issues, as well as learning more specifically about what respondents like most about living and working in Silicon Valley. SVCF also wanted to know actions respondents have had to take recently if they were struggling to pay their rent or mortgage, an idea they have to help address the region’s housing challenges, and how much they think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability. The research questions and learning objectives influenced the formatting of the survey, which included a total of 32 questions.

We collected survey data using four methods: a public web link to the Qualtrics survey, a text message containing the public web link to the Qualtrics survey, an e-mailed unique link to the Qualtrics survey, and distributed print surveys. To accommodate non-English speakers, the survey was translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese (Simplified). The collection of survey data began one week prior to the official day of On the Table in order to accommodate conversations that occurred early. The web link opened on November 8, 2017, the same day that print surveys were made available to participants. Following the November 15 On the Table conversations, participants for whom we had e-mail addresses received an e-mail invitation to take the survey. Additionally, SVCF sent a text message to a database of cell phone numbers inviting participants to complete the survey. Surveys were collected through December 6, 2017.

The respondent population discussed in this report is a self-selected sample of participants who partially or fully completed the survey. All three survey sources yielded a total of 1,391 responses (305 through the e-mailed link, 173 through the web link, 249 through the web link via SMS, and 664 through the

---

1 See Appendix A for the full survey.
2 We had e-mail addresses only for those who provided it through the registration process or during sign-in on the day of the conversation. Registration and signing in were not required for participation, and those who did not register or sign in were able to access the survey through the public web link shared by SVCF or through print surveys.
3 See Appendix B for a summary report featuring visualizations of responses for all survey questions.
Because this group constitutes a non-random sample of total participants, conclusions cannot be scientifically generalized beyond the respondent group. However, the data and analysis provide useful insight into the opinions, habits, and backgrounds of a number of engaged Silicon Valley residents.

THE CONVERSATIONS

Who Responded?
Given that the perspectives, ideas, and experiences of over 1,300 respondents inform this report, it is worth exploring what we know about who responded to the survey. This section summarizes data about respondent demographics such as gender, age, educational attainment, race and/or ethnicity, geography, length of residence, and homeownership status; it also presents information about respondents’ civic attitudes and engagement behaviors. Additionally, it incorporates Silicon Valley comparison data and national comparison data, where available. When comparing On the Table data to Silicon Valley resident data, only those respondents who live in Silicon Valley (which includes San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Francisco Counties) and not the full set of respondents are compared to the regional data; therefore, the percentages representing the full respondent group show slightly different than the percentages for Silicon Valley respondents, as not all respondents live in Silicon Valley.

Without having survey data for everyone who participated in the On the Table initiative, we are unable to explain differences, if any, between our respondent group and regional and national comparison groups. While we have survey data for respondents, this data does not fully reflect participation in On the Table. This study represents a subset of On the Table participants—itself a subset of the Silicon Valley population—who self-selected to respond to the survey.

Demographics
Each demographic subsection opens with a presentation of noteworthy findings with regard to all respondent data. The subsections then transition to a comparison of data from Silicon Valley respondents (which includes San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Francisco Counties) to data on all Silicon Valley residents. Only for length of residence are all respondents compared to national rates.

Gender and Age
At 70%, the majority of respondents identified as female, and 29% of respondents identified as male (see Figure B.1). With regard to age, the largest proportion, or 28%, of respondents were those 60 years

---

4 The estimated survey participation rate is 20%. This is calculated by dividing the total number of survey respondents (1,391) by the estimated number of On the Table participants (7,000). SVCF provided the estimated number of On the Table participants.

5 For example, the respondent group is 70% female and 29% male. While it is possible that this accurately reflects participant make-up, it is also possible that the participant breakdown was closer to 50/50, but females responded to the survey at disproportionately higher rates. Without having data for all participants, we cannot know if the rate at which certain groups participated was proportional or disproportional.
old and up. The smallest age group was made up of respondents who were 18 to 29 years old, which was 16% of respondents; similarly, 17% of respondents were in their 40s. Twenty percent of respondents were in their 30s, and another 20% were in their 50s (see Figure B.2).

Compared to Silicon Valley resident data, Silicon Valley respondents were overrepresented in the oldest age group and underrepresented in the youngest age group. While 29% of Silicon Valley respondents were 60 years old and up, 23% of all Silicon Valley residents are in this age group. Furthermore, 15% of Silicon Valley respondents were 18 to 29 years old, compared to 21% of Silicon Valley residents (see Figure B.3).

Educational Attainment

Respondents reported high levels of educational attainment. Both respondent data and Silicon Valley data reflect highest degree obtained. Thirty-eight percent of respondents reported having earned a graduate degree, and 31% reported having earned a bachelor’s degree (see Figure B.4).

When compared to Silicon Valley resident data as a whole, almost twice the percentage of Silicon Valley respondents said they were in possession of a graduate degree; the percentage of Silicon Valley respondents who said they hold a bachelor’s degree was just a few percentage points higher than Silicon Valley resident data. Whereas 21% of all Silicon Valley residents have a graduate degree, 41% of Silicon Valley respondents reported earning the same. Additionally, 28% of Silicon Valley residents have a bachelor’s degree, compared to 31% of Silicon Valley respondents. With regard to completion of an associate or vocational degree, some college, a high school diploma or GED, and less than high school, Silicon Valley respondents were underrepresented (see Figure B.5).

Race

In terms of race and/or ethnicity, 47% of respondents identified as White, and 27% identified as Hispanic or Latino/a. Additionally, 11% of respondents identified as Asian, 7% as Multiracial, 4% as Black or African American, and 3% as Other (see Figure B.6).

Compared to all of Silicon Valley where 40% of the population is White, 51% of the Silicon Valley respondent pool reported being White. Similarly, whereas 21% of all Silicon Valley residents are Hispanic or Latino/a, 27% of Silicon Valley respondents identified as Hispanic or Latino/a. Silicon Valley respondents who identified as Asian were largely underrepresented; 33% of Silicon Valley residents are

---

6 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).
7 For the education variable, in addition to including only those respondents who live in Silicon Valley when comparing to representative data, only those 25 years of age or older are included as well (as opposed to the full data set).
8 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).
9 Unlike census data, the On the Table race variable features an “Other” response option. Because of this, the On the Table race percentages are very modestly lower than they would be if the “Other” was not a featured category.
Asian, which is three times as many as the 11% of Silicon Valley respondents who identified as Asian. The 4% of Black or African American Silicon Valley respondents was nearly on par with the 3% of Silicon Valley residents who are Black or African American (see Figure B.7).  

**Geography**  
Over one-half (54%) of respondents said they currently live in Santa Clara County, and 33% said they currently live in San Mateo County. Smaller percentages of respondents reported living in Alameda County (6%) and San Francisco County (5%) (see Figure B.8). The top ZIP codes where respondents said they live include 94303 (6%), 95112 (4%), 94025 (4%), 94306 (3%), 94019 (3%), 94063 (3%), 94061 (3%), 95123 (2%), 94301 (2%), and 95111 (2%) (see Figure B.9). With regard to city of residence, 28% of respondents said they are from San Jose. Other cities where respondents currently live include Palo Alto (8%), Redwood City (7%), San Francisco (5%), East Palo Alto (5%), Sunnyvale (4%), Menlo Park (4%), San Mateo (3%), Mountain View (3%), and Half Moon Bay (3%) (see Figure B.10).  

**Length of Residence**  
Forty-one percent of respondents indicated they were long-term residents who have lived in their local community for 20 or more years. Behind long-term residents were newcomers, or those who have lived in their local community for zero to four years; newcomers made up 28% of the respondent pool. Compared to national rates, long-term resident respondents were an overrepresented group, as 32% of people in the U.S. have lived in their community for 20 or more years (see Figure B.11).  

**Homeownership**  
Regarding homeownership, 49% of respondents indicated they own their primary residence, and 44% said they rent. Additionally, 7% of respondents reported some other living situation (see Figure B.12). Silicon Valley respondent homeowner percentages and Silicon Valley respondent renter percentages were nearly equivalent to the percentages for all Silicon Valley residents. Over one-half (53%) of Silicon Valley respondents reported owning their primary residence, compared to 51% of all Silicon Valley residents. Nearly one-half (47%) of Silicon Valley respondents reported renting their primary residence, compared to 49% of all Silicon Valley residents (Figure B.13).  

**Relationship to SVCF**  

10 U.S. Census Bureau; 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, Voting Age Population by Citizenship and Race (CVAP), published 02/01/2017.  
12 Just like the race variable, the *On the Table* homeownership variable also features an “Other” response option (unlike in the Census data), which has slight implications for the *On the Table* homeownership percentages showing lower than they otherwise would.  
When asked about their relationship to SVCF, 38% of respondents said they had not heard of the Foundation, while 34% said they have attended one of the Foundation’s events. Additionally, 19% of respondents said they are a grantee of SFCV, 13% indicated having some other relationship to SVCF than that which were listed, 5% said they have volunteered with SFCV, 4% said they work there, and 3% said they are a funder (see Figure B.14).

**Civic Attitudes and Activities**

Each subsection incorporates noteworthy findings with regard to all respondent data. Where applicable, each subsection also includes comparisons of all respondent data to national data.

**Housing-Related Issues**

When respondents were asked about the actions they have personally had to do in the past three years if they were struggling to pay their rent or mortgage, at 38% each, the top two responses were stop saving for retirement and take on an additional job or work more at their current job. Additionally, 32% of respondents indicated they had accumulated credit card debt; 28% said they cut back on healthy, nutritious food; and 17% said that they cut back on healthcare. Sixteen percent indicated an “other” response not included in the response options, with the top three being cut back on overall spending (2%), received help from family and friends (2%), and stopped saving (1%). Fourteen percent of respondents were unsure, and 12% said they had moved to a neighborhood that they feel is less safe. Finally, 7% of respondents said they had moved to a place where the schools are not as good (see Figure B.44).

Respondents reported being largely optimistic about how much they think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability. Just under two-thirds (65%) of respondents think “a fair amount” to “a great deal” can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability. Furthermore, 25% of respondents think “just some” can be done. When compared to U.S. percentages, respondents were nearly, if not entirely, on par with how optimistic U.S. residents are about solving the problem of housing affordability. At 32%, both respondents and people nationally think “a great deal” can be done. One-third (33%) of respondents think “a fair amount” can be done, compared to 31% of people nationally, and 25% of respondents think “just some” can be done, compared to 24% of people nationally (see Figure B.45).14

Respondents also provided ideas that could help address the region’s housing issues. At 31%, the most frequently appearing ideas had to do with building more housing, especially affordable housing. Fifteen percent of respondents proposed rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases, and 14% of respondents suggested government policies, support, and regulation. Furthermore, 9% brought up changing zoning, density, and land use laws, and 8% suggested that the corporate and private sector take responsibility and find solutions. While these first five ideas have to do with organization and institutional support, the next two ideas propose community and individual action. Eight percent of respondents indicated wanting to see community involvement, organizing, and advocacy around

---

14 Hart Research Associated, April – May 2016, 'MacArthur Housing Matters Survey.'
housing, and another 8% suggested raising awareness, sharing information, and educating others on the issue (see Figure B.46).  

Build More Housing, Especially Affordable Housing

Many respondents had the idea to build more housing, especially affordable housing. A number of respondents said they want to see more houses built overall, with one respondent suggesting that this will help “drive price[s] down” and another respondent saying that there needs to be enough housing to “meet demands of all residents.” They especially said they want to see more “high density housing” and “low income housing,” including “below market and Section 8 housing.” As one respondent noted, there is a need for “more housing that is actually lived in by low[-] and mid-income people.” In terms of how this is accomplished, one respondent suggested that the region “build taller buildings and . . . make this housing available to service people and not just those [who] earn a lot or can buy a lot.” Another respondent provided a similar idea, suggesting more “housing for teachers and other public service professionals who are being forced to leave the Silicon Valley because they cannot afford to live here.” Relatedly, one respondent proposed “build[ing] more high rise housing with a [percent] of it being designated low income.” That same respondent went on to suggest that cities be mandated “to add housing when they add jobs.” Other respondents supported this suggestion, with one respondent wanting to ensure that “increased housing and community resources, jobs, and infrastructure are all growing at the same rate.” Some respondents indicated wanting to see the region “increase the supply of housing by strictly linking residential and commercial construction,” as well as “be more creative about where to add housing options that does not include building more houses.”

For those respondents who called for “building” and “increasing” affordable housing, many recognized a “need [for] more affordable housing for low [to] medium income people.” As one respondent said, “Build more affordable housing for people with certain income (the limit should be adjusted based on the cost of living in [Silicon Valley]).” Another respondent noted, “Change [the] definition of ‘affordable' or 'below market rate' housing—this housing is typically not at all affordable.” These respondents focused on affordable housing primarily want to see “the creation of programs for affordable housing,” the “construction of affordable housing,” and “affordable housing options.” As one respondent said, “Build affordable housing NOT market[-]rate housing.” Some respondents talked about “creat[ing] a greater percentage of affordable housing,” such as by “incentiviz[ing] property owners to make more units affordable for rent” and “encourag[ing] developers with tax breaks to set aside an increased amount of affordable apartments in their new developments.” One respondent suggested “having a quota for ‘luxury’ housing so it is limited to a certain number of units [and] imposing affordable housing quotas on each development.” This respondent went on to propose “higher density,” which would be supported by “building more apartments and less townhouses and houses.” Other respondents focused on “leverage[ing] funding[—]public, private, philanthropic[—]to build more affordable housing,” and a few respondents suggested the use of “public funds” to build affordable housing, such as through a

15 Definitions for these seven themes and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in Appendix C.
“small property tax paid by all [that] go[es] to affordable housing.” Several respondents also noted the importance of “transportation hubs” as sites to “build more affordable and below market rate housing.”

Rent Control, Cheaper Rent, and Slower Rent Increases
A number of respondents suggested rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases. With regard to rent control and rent stabilization, respondents mentioned a need to “expand” and “better” rent control, as well as a need to “legislate” it. Some respondents want to see government “pass a rent control law” that is “strict.” A few respondents also called for the “rollback” of Costa-Hawkins.\footnote{Read more about the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (Costa-Hawkins), a California State law: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=CIV&division=3.&title=5.&part=4.&chapter=2.7.&article.}

Respondents also largely called for “lower rent,” with one respondent saying, “stop increasing rent [and] help the people.” In addition to “reduc[ing] rent,” other respondents suggested “somehow controlling rent increases” and “not increas[ing] rent every year.” As one respondent said, “Limiting rent increases . . . create stability and predictability in renter’s lives.” A number of respondents proposed “regulat[ing] the rent,” “hav[ing] fixed rent,” and/or “set[ting a] limit on rent being raised” so “that rent wouldn’t be so expensive.” Overall, respondents want to see “more affordable rent” and perhaps even a way to “incentivize property owners to make more units affordable for rent.”

Government Policies, Support, and Regulation
A similar number of respondents indicated wanting to see more government policies, support, and regulation. Some respondents reported what they think city government should do with regard to legislation. For example, numerous respondents suggested the following: pass “city legislation to require more housing for modest income folks”; “reduce regulation[s] that hold down construction of more housing”; “pass policies to protect people from speculation”; pass “inclusionary housing ordinances”; enact “more housing laws”; “repeal Prop. 13 and focus on low[-] income rentals with property tax proceeds”\footnote{Read more about Proposition 13 (the People’s Initiative to Limit Property Taxation), an amendment of the Constitution of California: http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=CONS&division=&title=&part=&chapter=&article=XIII%20A.}; and “get rid of policy protections for developers that allow them to pick and choose when and where to build affordable housing in the region[, as well as] strengthen inclusionary zoning laws and stop giving developers all the power when building housing here.” Other respondents put forward ideas that have local government supporting “infill with affordable housing,” “provid[ing] property[-] purchasing programs for low-income residents,” and requiring “each new apartment complex . . . to reserve a number of units for low[-]income workers.”

Some respondents who want to see more government support proposed ideas around taxes, fines, incentives and government funding. “Increase taxes on corporations and build more affordable housing,” suggested one respondent, and another respondent expressed a need for “rent control in the short term and progressive taxation of the rich and corporations to meet housing and other needs in the long term.” Other respondents proposed ideas around fines as well as incentives, such as “a
combination of fines on long[-]term residential vacancies combined with incentives to rent to marginalized populations disproportionately affected by housing insecurity”; “encourag[ing] developers with tax breaks to set aside an increased amount of affordable apartments in their new developments”; and providing “incentives to landlords to rent to lower income people or not raise rents as high or to market values.” A few respondents looked to government funding in their ideas, with one respondent suggesting that the “government help to fund low-income housing.” Another respondent proposed “returning to public housing” that would be “well maintained [and] well supervised.”

Additionally, one respondent noted that government should “redefine low-income requirements in the Silicon Valley that are representative of what low-income families are actually earning and match rental properties based on that new status quo.” Finally, another respondent put forward an idea around “redesigning public engagement processes to ensure that those most impacted by our housing issues are able to participate and have their voices heard.”

Change Zoning, Density, and Land Use Laws
Respondents also expressed interest in changing zoning, density, and land use laws. A number of these respondents brought up “zoning law reform” and “changes in zoning law.” Examples of the changes include “pass[ing] inclusionary housing zoning requirements”; “chang[ing] the zoning codes to allow more housing, including ‘older’ models of housing: duplexes, quadplexes, flats, co[-]housing, boarding houses, etc.”; “chang[ing] zoning for housing, such as getting rid of our rigid height and density limits”; “chang[ing] zoning to allow in-law units”; “chang[ing] zoning from single family homes to duplexes or triplexes to maximize the square footage”; and “allow[ing] greater zoning density in residential areas.” With the last proposed change, one respondent said, “I could rebuild my house into a small apartment building.” Relatedly, respondents further indicated wanting to see a change in “local zoning to facilitate the development of affordable housing,” as one respondent said. Another respondent said he/she wanted a change in “local zoning and entitlements processes to stimulate affordable housing instead of promoting building just for the most profit.”

Respondents additionally said they want to see policies created “that favor density and inclusionary housing” and that “enable urban growth and higher density housing.” According to respondents, it is important to “prioritize dense housing on all redevelopment new sites (over all other building types)” and to “require new commercial construction to include housing onsite [and] put housing over strip malls.” They had numerous ideas for high-density housing, such as “transit[-]oriented housing with minimal or zero parking,” “more density and high rises along public transit corridors,” and “more density in clustered areas [with] people living near work and[/]or transit.” Respondents also expressed interest in “mixed zoning[,] mixed use, higher density dwellings.”

Corporate and Private Sector Responsibility and Solutions
According to some respondents, corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions were important ideas for addressing housing issues. According to these respondents, demand needs to be placed on “Silicon Valley companies to contribute to affordable housing.” Put another way, “large
corporations need to participate and support building much more affordable housing.” For example, several respondents put forward the idea to “require large companies to pay for building homes for their employees.” Relatedly, respondents said, “Make building housing, and affordable housing in particular, and/or providing funding for this, a required condition for building more office space, especially for major employers” and “Require tech companies and other businesses to directly create affordable housing for the communities in which they are located.” As one respondent suggested, “dot com companies [should] build housing on their campuses and house their workers.” Another respondent stressed the importance of “[tying] new job creation to the availability of housing for the new employee.” “We need to make sure,” said one respondent, “that the companies that are creating jobs are also creating housing. It's crazy that companies like Facebook can hire and hire without a plan for where all those people are going to live—otherwise where [are] the people who are being priced out by those workers are going to live[?]”

Furthermore, within the theme of corporate and private sector responsibility, one respondent said, “Require companies to contribute to a solution. They are creating part of the problem by driving up real estate costs and salaries (because of demand) and widening the pay inequality gap. Although these jobs are helpful to the economy as a whole, they are resulting in making this area impossible to afford, and pushing the original community out. The companies in the Bay Area should be part of the solution, not just for their employees[.] but for the community as a whole.” Another respondent said, “The cost of housing in the area, I believe[,] is majorly caused by the presence of the major tech company based in the region. Their presence is more than welcome as it generates revenue. However, I believe that now that they have grown so much, they need to be more involved in addressing the issues of high cost of housing which their presence created.” One respondent also agreed that “large businesses [should] buy and manage housing for employees,” but also suggested that “unions purchase apartment buildings for employees in lower paying careers like teaching, law enforcement, etc.”

Finally, corporate and private sector responsibility could even go as far as “tech companies . . . expand[ing] and open[ing] secondary facilities in less populated locations to strengthen the economy and infrastructure there and to relieve housing and transportation pressures here,” as one respondent noted.” Overall, though, many respondents think the region needs to “work with tech companies to find a better housing solutions for their employees who are moving here for work, kicking out existing residents from their neighborhoods because housing costs have skyrocketed.”

Community Involvement, Organizing, and Advocacy
Several respondents put forward ideas around community involvement, organizing, and advocacy. Some of these respondents spoke generally, saying they want to see more “community involvement in decision making,” more “community organizing,” and “more listening.” Examples of these methods include “encourage people to work with local governments to solve housing issues [and] pilot different approaches to housing”; practice “community activism to put pressure on politicians in different cities to work together to fix housing”; and “encourage policymakers in local jurisdiction to adopt rent control and build more affordable housing.” Some respondents called for more “community meetings,” with
one respondent suggesting that “more of the community should get together and we should all express how we feel and make our voices loud and speak out to the world.”

Some respondents expressed wanting to focus specifically on underrepresented voices: “get more of the middle and low-income folks politically engaged,” one respondent said. This respondent went on to say, “If there is more social consciousness and political activism by those that are most affected by the crisis, officials and local housing committees will have to listen.” Another respondent suggested “redesigning public engagement processes to ensure that those most impacted by our housing issues are able to participate and have their voices heard.” A third respondent indicated wanting to see “better representation of the community as a whole (younger people, immigrants, blue collar workers, those who [have] many people to a household, commuters)—those who are most directly affected by the housing issues. . . . Exclusion is a massive root to this massive problem.” Additionally, one respondent suggested that people actively work to “change the perception of people with housing issues,” adding that, “we see these folks as the 'other', people that will change our neighborhoods and hurt our community[,] rather than people who are already part of [the] community.”

Raise Awareness, Share Information, and Educate
Finally, several respondents provided ideas for raising awareness, sharing information, and educating others. Many of these respondents shared ideas on “educat[ing] people.” For example, they expressed wanting to see more “education about low[-]-cost housing options.” A few respondents were very specific in the types of education they want to be available the community. They suggested “educat[ing] potential consumers on programs that will help with down payment assistance and giving them resources to know where to go if they are in need of financial aid if they can’t make their mortgage payments” and holding “workshops to educate locals of how to go about buying a home and what legitimate programs are available to help.” A few other respondents saw educating others as a means to influence development: “[educate] influential community members who can then educate their stakeholders about the need and process for building new housing” and “[educate] citizens about the benefit of mixed-income, high[-]-density housing and [show] data around the benefits of communities that have economically diverse populations” were a couple of the ideas shared.

Other respondents shared ideas for increasing “community awareness.” They suggested “talk[ing] about housing” in order to “bring awareness” and “increase[ing] awareness of who needs housing.” One respondent called for “more conversations” in order to “help residents (who may oppose affordable housing polices) better understand the people who would be served by them.” Another respondent suggested an “anti[-]-stigma public service campaign around affordable housing.” Overall, these efforts would be to improve “how informed everyone is about the housing challenges and causes” and to “increase awareness of the issue to more people so that folks understand that it [affects] everyone’s quality of life—[and] hopefully reduce NIMBYism.” “When people know the facts, they tend to care more,” explained one respondent.

*Living in Silicon Valley*

*Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement*
A great majority (89%) of respondents reported living in Silicon Valley (which includes San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Francisco Counties) (see Figure B.40). When asked what they like most about living in Silicon Valley, respondents said they like the diversity, the weather and climate, and the culture of the region (see Figure B.41).¹⁸

Nearly one-third (31%) of respondents who live in Silicon Valley said they like the region’s diversity the most. Respondents typically referenced the “diversity of the people” and the “diversity of community,” with some respondents mentioning, for example, “the rich mix of people,” “the many, varied people,” “the dynamic mixture of people in the area,” and “the people from all over the world.” As one respondent said, “we are diverse.” Respondents who said they like the diversity of the people also brought up appreciating the “cultural, religious, linguistic, immigrant,” and “ethnic” diversity of the population. A few respondents mentioned other diverse aspects of Silicon Valley, including “activities,” “opportunit[ies],” “ideas,” and “interests.” Several respondents spoke generally about diversity in Silicon Valley, saying they like “the rich diversity” and that the region is “authentically diverse.” “There is a great amount of diversity,” said one respondent, and another respondent said, “diversity is a treasure.” Respondents indicated that they like the “embrace of diversity” in Silicon Valley, as well as the “diverse, dynamic community.”

The weather and climate was what 29% of respondents who live in Silicon Valley said they like the most about the region. Respondents brought up the weather more frequently than climate, describing the weather in very positive terms, such as “nice,” “good,” “beautiful,” “wonderful,” “great,” and “perfect.” Some respondents indicated that they like “living by the ocean [for] the weather,” and others mentioned the “diversity [the weather] offers.” As one respondent indicated, he/she likes that “the weather is more stable—[there is] no snow and [it] does not get as cold.” With regard to climate, respondents described it as “great” and said they like the “diversity of climate” and that it is a “temperate climate.”

Twenty percent of respondents who live in Silicon Valley reported liking the region’s culture the most. Several respondents cited the “cultural diversity” of Silicon Valley, with many acknowledging the easy “access to culture.” For example, respondents mentioned “opportunities for culture and recreation,” a “breadth of [cultural] opportunities,” a “vibrant . . . cultural life,” the “access to a wide variety of cultural . . . activities,” and the “variety of cultural attractions.” Silicon Valley is “a lively place with . . . culture,” said one respondent, and another respondent said it has a “thriving arts [and] culture scene.” It is a “multi-cultural . . . community” with “many cultural opportunities,” “cultural institutions,” and “cultural richness.”

Working in Silicon Valley

¹⁸ Definitions for these three themes and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in Appendix D.
Seventy-one percent of respondents said they work in Silicon Valley (which includes San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Francisco Counties) (see Figure B.42). When asked what they like most about working in Silicon Valley, respondents said they like the work and job opportunities, the community and people, and the diversity of the region (see Figure B.43).  

Just over one-third (34%) of respondents who work in Silicon Valley said they like the work and job opportunities the most. Many respondents referenced their own work. Statements like, “My job and the work I do,” “can do . . . work that I like,” and “having a good job that I am grateful for,” demonstrate how pleased many respondents are with regard to their current positions. They have jobs that are “fulfilling,” as well as “good [and] stable,” and the jobs feature a respectable “salary and benefits.” “I love my job” and “my job is awesome” were two sentiments expressed by respondents. Respondents also expressed liking not only that “there is work” available, but also “the opportunities in regard to work.” According to respondents, there is “lots of work,” “diversity in terms of work,” “interesting places to work,” “interesting work,” “challenging work and well-paid work,” a “critical mass of companies in my work field,” “the opportunity to work for well-known organizations,” and “stimulating work with lots of opportunity.” They like the “variety of job opportunities,” as well as the “many,” “excellent,” and “amazing” job opportunities, and they appreciate having “access to job opportunities in [the] tech sector.” Finally, respondents also reported liking that they “can do meaningful work that [they] love,” and that they can not only “[make] a difference through nonprofit work themselves, but can also “[see] all those in the nonprofit sector doing great work.” As one respondent noted, Silicon Valley is “a diverse, dynamic, creative, intellectually stimulating place to work.”  

Twenty-one percent of respondents who work in Silicon Valley indicated they like the community and the people the most. With regard to people, respondents find others in Silicon Valley to be “good,” “friendly,” “kind and educated,” “caring,” “bright and engaging,” “smart,” “thoughtful,” “creative,” and “interesting.” Several respondents noted, “There are great people out here,” and one respondent said, “The people are awesome [and] we understand each other’s struggles.” Other respondents commented on appreciating the “diversity of people,” as there is “so much diversity of cultures and people” and they are able to “meet people from all over the world.” A few respondents brought up liking the “possibilities of connecting with so many different people,” “connect[ing] with like-minded people and finding interesting projects,” and “connecting and collaborating with diverse, engaged[,] and talented people.” “People are engaged,” said one respondent, and another respondent brought up the “people and energy around improving our community.” Relatedly, some respondents mentioned the people with whom they work, with one respondent saying, “I enjoy the people I work with.” There was one respondent who said he/she likes “working for dynamic[,] brilliant people,” and two respondents who described the people they work with as having “good values, leading[-]edge thinking,” as well as “incredible hearts, resiliency[,] and dedication.”

---
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In terms of community, respondents who work in Silicon Valley said they also liked that the community is “active” and that there is a “level of collaboration and openness in the community.” As one respondent said, “the community seems incredibly motivated, accomplished, and innovative.” Others mentioned liking the “nice” and “enthusiastic” community, as well as the “progressive” nature of the community.

Finally, respondents indicated liking the diversity of Silicon Valley, as 17% of respondents who work in the region brought up this theme. “I love the diversity that [Silicon Valley] has to offer,” said one respondent, with others agreeing that they “love” and “enjoy” the region’s diversity. Respondents reported liking the “diversity of races,” as well as the “cultural diversity” and “cultural richness,” with one respondent describing Silicon Valley as a “melting pot” and another respondent describing how there is “so much diversity of cultures and people around me.” They like the “diverse population” and the “diverse community,” especially in that it contributes to a “diverse workforce” and a “large, diverse talent pool.”

**Personal Impact and Community Attachment**

Respondents reported largely positive attitudes toward their own potential for influencing change and toward their local community. With regard to how much impact respondents think people like themselves can have in making their community a better place to live, 42% said they believe they can have a big impact, and 34% said they believe they can have a moderate impact. The 42% of respondents who think they can have a big impact was greater than the 32% of people in the U.S. who believe they have this level of efficacy, and the 34% of respondents who think they can have a moderate impact was slightly smaller than the 37% of people in the U.S. who said the same (see Figure B.15).

Respondents also reported high levels of attachment to their local community. Nearly one-half (45%) of respondents indicated they are very attached to their local community, and 38% of respondents said they are somewhat attached. In comparison, 19% of U.S. residents are very attached to their local community, and 48% of U.S. residents are somewhat attached (see Figure B.16).

**Social Issues**

When respondents were asked to identify the social issues that are most important to them, 59% said housing and homelessness, 39% said economic issues and poverty, 35% said education and youth development, and 31% said equity and social inclusion (see Figure B.17). Following this, using the same set of issue areas, respondents were asked to identify the social issues to which they primarily contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources. Over one-third (36%) of respondents said education and youth development, 34% said housing and homelessness, 28% said family, 25% said economic issues and poverty, and 24% said equity and social inclusion (see Figure B.18).

---


21 Ibid.
Engagement Habits
Respondents reported high levels of engagement across all measures considered. One-quarter (25%) of respondents said they are very involved in community and neighborhood activities where they live; in comparison, only 11% of people nationally indicate this level of involvement. An even larger percentage (42%) of respondents reported that they are somewhat involved, which is slightly higher than the 39% of people nationally who say the same (see Figure B.19).

With regard to how they engaged with their community over the past year, respondents were most likely to have donated, volunteered, or attended a public meeting. Over two-thirds (69%) of respondents said they donated more than $25 to a charitable organization within the past year; 67% said they did volunteer activities through or for an organization within the past year; and 63% said they attended public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs within the past year. Additionally, 38% said they worked with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something in the past year.

With regard to how respondents compare to U.S. averages, respondent involvement exceeded national involvement for all activities. Nationally, 50% of people donated this past year (compared to 69% of respondents), and 24% volunteered this past year (compared to 67% of respondents). Only 8% of people in the U.S. attended a public meeting about community affairs within the last year (compared to 63% of respondents), and 8% worked with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something (compared to 38% of respondents) (see Figure B.20). When it comes to voting in local elections, 61% reported that they always vote (see Figure B.21).

Places to Connect
Respondents reported connecting with others in a variety of places. Nearly one-half (45%) of respondents said they like to connect with others at schools, and 39% indicated they like to connect with others at religious institutions. Additionally, 33% cited a community rec center, 30% named parks, 30% selected a library, and 26% specified a place other than those provided in the response options, with the top three “other” responses being community events and meetings (7%), community service activities (4%), and restaurants (4%). Finally, 24% of respondents chose public squares, 12% selected community garden, and 11% said shopping centers (see Figure B.22).

Engagement with News Sources
Respondents also reported the frequency with which they get information about their local community from common online and offline sources. Over one-half (55%) of respondents said they receive information about their local community through word of mouth several times a week to every day, which was greater than the 31% of people who rely on word of mouth this frequently nationally (see Figure B.29). In terms of local television news, 46% of respondents said they watch the news several times a week to every day, which was greater than the 27% of people who rely on local television news this frequently nationally (see Figure B.28).

---

times a week to every day, which was less than the 51% of people nationally who watch the news this frequently (see Figure B.24). The 45% of respondents who reported tuning in to local radio for information about their community several times a week to every day was higher than the 35% of people nationally who listen to the radio for news this frequently (see Figure B.25). Nearly one-half (44%) of respondents indicated they rely on social networking sites several times a week to every day to consume information about their local community, which was four times the percentage at which people nationally use social media sites to get local information this frequently (11%) (see Figure B.27). With regard to local newspapers, 43% of respondents said they consult a newspaper for information about their community several times a week to everyday, while 28% of people nationally do the same (see Figure B.23). One-third (33%) of respondents reported gathering information from newsletters or e-mail listservs several times a week to every day, which was over four times greater than the 8% of people nationally who rely on a newsletter or e-mail listserv this frequently (see Figure B.28). Finally, 18% of respondents indicated they read blogs for information about their local community several times a week to every day, which was over three times greater than the national percentage of 5% for this level of frequency (see Figure B.26).

How Did the Conversations Go?
An essential aspect of this research is exploring the conversations themselves. This section groups data on why respondents were drawn to the conversations, their relative familiarity or unfamiliarity with other participants in the conversation, and where the conversations took place. It also uncovers the range of issues respondents raised in conversation, and it describes solutions or next steps that respondents reported were generated from their conversations. Finally, it discusses content shared about On the Table on social media.

Conversation Dynamics
Respondents reported participating in On the Table for a number of reasons. Nearly three-fourths (72%) of respondents said they participated to discuss and address important issues in their community, and 56% said they wanted to learn from and listen to others. Additionally, 37% participated to support the organizer of the conversation, 33% wanted to get more involved in their community, and 28% intended to meet and build relationships with new people (see Figure B.30).

In terms of how familiar respondents were with the other people at the conversation, 36% of respondents said the other participants were mostly people they did not know before the conversation, and 34% of respondents indicated that the other participants were mostly people they knew before the conversation. Furthermore, 30% of respondents said that there was an equal mix of both people they knew and did not know before the conversation (see Figure B.31).

Over one-half (58%) of respondents reported that their conversation took place in Santa Clara County, and 36% said their conversation occurred in San Mateo County. Smaller percentages indicated their conversations took place in San Francisco County (3%) and Alameda County (3%) (see Figure B.32).

---

ZIP codes where conversations took place include 94040 (9%), 95110 (9%), 95112 (5%), 94087 (5%), 94019 (4%), 94025 (4%), 95116 (3%), 95122 (3%), 95125 (3%), and 94303 (3%) (see Figure B.33). In terms of top cities where conversations occurred, the greatest proportion of respondents reported San Jose at 30%. Other top cities include Redwood City (11%), Palo Alto (10%), Mountain View (6%), San Mateo (5%), East Palo Alto (4%), Menlo Park (4%), Sunnyvale (4%), San Francisco (3%), and Half Moon Bay (3%) (see Figure B.34).

Issues Raised
On the Table provided an opportunity for participants to raise and discuss issues that impact the quality of life in and around Silicon Valley. A majority of respondents (83%) reported raising an issue of concern in their conversation. The issues that emerged help identify respondents’ priorities and concerns and where they would like to see their communities headed. As seen through survey responses, respondents touched on a range of issues, which are described in detail below. The top three issues include housing and homelessness, economic issues and poverty, and equity and social inclusion. However, given SVCF’s interest in community involvement, we also describe in further detail what respondents discussed regarding community development and community engagement. Finally, as issues of food access were raised least frequently, we look at the concerns respondents had who raised an issue related to this theme (see Figure B.35).

Housing and Homelessness
A majority of respondents (82%) raised an issue related to housing and homelessness in their conversations, which is not surprising, given that SVCF focused On the Table conversations on housing challenges. A large proportion of respondents brought up a “lack of affordable housing” in their communities, with one respondent saying that “it is a very difficult issue to solve” and one other respondent describing “the enormity of the problem.” According to another respondent, in addition to a lack of affordable housing, there is a lack of “recognition amongst multiple parts that there is an issue, along with a lack of response.” Respondents who mentioned affordable housing indicated wanting to see a “response,” as they specified a need for an increase in quantity and availability of affordable housing. One respondent suggested that their city “draw from other cities that have found positive solutions.” Another respondent expressed a belief that the region has a “duty” to provide housing that is affordable.

Several respondents highlighted some of the challenges and obstacles associated with obtaining more affordable housing in their conversations, such as a “lack of investment” and a “lack of significant public funding for [its] production”; “Nimbyism”; “expensive” land; “restrictive zoning and regulations against density”; “hi-[tech] companies in our regions [who] have not invested in affordable housing for residents”; and “getting newcomers to understand the need to prioritize affordable housing.” For one respondent, he/she perceives a challenge in “how the neighborhood is in transition, with long-time residents flipping their homes and selling them at very high prices.” This respondent explained, “There

25 Definitions for these six themes and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in our Issues Codebook in Appendix E.
has been a significant increase also in the rental market, where long-term rent-controlled tenants are being evicted using less-than-ethical reasons for the landlords to pocket more rent. This, in turn, is eliminating one of the last ‘affordable’ neighborhoods of [San Francisco] to working class and lower income professionals.” Another respondent said, “We need to put a moratorium on new business until there is enough available and affordable housing for workers.” Additionally, one respondent described “a feeling that the local governments are owned by the tech monopolies in the Bay Area.”

During their conversations, a number of respondents provided their opinion around affordable housing availability, with many expressing that there is “the need for a diverse community and affordable housing that includes all” and “there should be a higher percentage of affordable housing in new developments.” However, respondents also talked about how, currently, there is “insufficient affordable housing” and “new luxury housing [is] being built instead of affordable housing.” “There is not enough housing for low[-]income people,” one respondent explained. This respondent went on to say, “The high cost of living is driving people away or to the streets. The homeless population is increasing because it is difficult for people to find affordable housing.” Another respondent said, “There are people with full time jobs who cannot find an affordable place to live. People are leaving the area for more affordable places to live out of state. We cannot continue to not have enough places for people to live.” Relatedly, one of the respondents mentioned how “communities are no longer communities because most people work far away from their communities and do not develop a sense of belonging to a community[,] which lead[s] to more isolation and apathy to engage in any local issues.”

“Affordable housing and how it has affected me and my family” was an issue raised by one respondent during the conversations. Relatedly, some respondents talked about the “challenges of finding affordable housing” and how it impacts them currently or will impact them in the future. For example, one respondent explained, “I hosted a conversation with a group of mid-20 professionals who are unsure how they will afford to buy homes in the communities they love and are thinking about the sacrifices they might have to make in their future. With the affordable housing crisis, we are seeing longer and longer commutes that have huge impacts on people’s lives and is negatively impacting the environment.”

Respondents also talked about specific populations and community members who could benefit from affordable housing. A “lack of affordable housing means key community members like teachers, fire fighters, [and] store clerks cannot afford to live in or close by our community,” said one respondent. There is a need for “appropriate affordable housing for those who work in our community,” especially those in “support jobs,” “service workers,” and those who “have jobs that make the city function.” It is “difficult for low[-]paid workers to live in the area,” said one respondent, and other respondents described a lack of affordable housing for “people working in safety net programs and non-profits.” A few respondents also mentioned a need for “affordable and accessible housing for independent people with disabilities.”

Many respondents also reported talking about rent in their conversations. These respondents brought
up that “rent is too expensive,” “rent is too high[,] make[ing] it unlivable,” and the “rent increase every year is so much.” They also talked about their personal concerns, such as “not being able to pay my rent in my community” and “that we need to move to another city due to not being able to pay rent.” A number of respondents brought up the need for “rent control,” given the current “lack of comprehensive rent control” and the “instability of rental prices without rent control.”

A number of respondents talked about the “extremely high cost of living” where they live and work in Silicon Valley “due to housing prices.” These respondents mentioned the “high cost of housing and [the] financial pressures it creates in our community.” According to one respondent, “The high cost of living is driving people away or to the streets. The homeless population is increasing because it is difficult for people to find affordable housing.” Another respondent said, “High home prices prevent buyers from ‘moving up[,]’ which limits the inventory and prevents new buyers from entering market.” A third respondent mentioned how “the cost of housing negatively impacts our ability to attract and retain staff. Consequently[,] we have a couple open and unfilled positions. The cost of housing may also determine whether those approaching retirement will be able to stay in their community after retiring.” Some respondents reported discussing how “the high housing prices are impacting our diversity.” As one respondent noted, the “cost of housing displaces many people in the community,” and as another respondent said, “The increasing cost of housing [and] rental will make [the] community more homogenous.” Additionally, one respondent explained, “Diversity and culture will be lost due to large corporations moving in. Housing prices go up and [the] whole area becomes gentrified.” According to one respondent, “solutions seem impossible” with regard to the high housing prices.”

Respondents who talked about housing in their conversations also raised the issue of homelessness. According to one respondent, there are “many layers” to the “increased homelessness” that respondents are seeing in their communities. For one, the “lack of access to housing is exacerbating homelessness rates” explained one respondent. “People [are] being displaced from their homes and unable to find another place to live,” said another respondent. According to a third respondent, there is also the issue of “lack of access to ‘bottom rung’ housing[,] i.e.[,] housing that is attainable to those exiting homelessness or at least those who would be but for a lack of housing options.” Some respondents talked about how “people need to be educated on the issues of the homeless.” One respondent pointed out the “ever increasing rents, increase in homeless community, [and the] disconnect between people affected and those who are not.” With homelessness, another respondent noted, comes “institutional racism and criminalization of homeless[ness] and stigma of being homeless.” One respondent sees a “lack of compassion in the general population regarding the homeless and homeless issues.” There is a “fear of homeless,” said another respondent. A few respondents said they talked about “how to help with the homeless” and how to provide “housing for the homeless.”

Overall, respondents who discussed housing and homelessness in their conversations talked about the “housing crisis” and its effects on the community. “What is the tipping point that will make a change in housing[,]” one respondent asked. Another respondent asserted, “We need to stabilize the housing crisis—we cannot afford to lose our neighbors [and] community members.”
Economic Issues and Poverty

Over one-half (53%) of respondents named an issue related to economic issues and poverty. This theme overlaps to a large extent with housing and homelessness, as respondents discussed economic insecurity issues related to the lack of affordable housing, the high cost of living, and housing for low- and middle-income individuals and families.26 Many respondents’ concerns with regard to economic issues and poverty are reflected in the following statements provided by one respondent: “skyrocketing housing costs . . . make for extremely difficult housing choices for people in low [and] medium socioeconomic situations.” Relatedly, according to another respondent, “the income gap [is] becoming a canyon.” A third respondent said, “Poverty [is] going down . . . not because we lifted people up[,] but because they couldn’t afford to live here so had to move out.”

Several respondents brought up the relationship between housing issues and employment. According to some of these respondents, it is “hard for low[-]paid workers to live in the area” and “people work low-income jobs [around] the clock, [seven] days[,] and yet still cannot afford housing.” Other respondents mentioned that there are also “middle[-]income people contributing to the workforce that can’t afford to rent or buy.” According to another respondent, “people who work in the community can’t afford to live in the community (teachers, law enforcement, fire fighters, etc.).” Respondents looking for jobs said they factor in housing—“Housing is a factor in my salary negotiations. I often ask myself how much I can afford to pay towards housing and is it worth taking the job to do so?”—as do respondents who are hiring—“I’m concerned about the people in our service industry being able to live in our area. When we seek to hire maintenance staff, we’re getting applications from two hours away. That’s not sustainable.”

Equity and Social Inclusion

One-half (50%) of respondents mentioned an issue related to equity and social inclusion. Similar to economic issues and poverty, equity and social inclusion overlaps heavily with housing and homelessness since many respondents were talking about affordable housing, the high cost of living, and housing for low- and middle-income individuals and families from an equity and inclusion standpoint.27 In addition to the aforementioned areas of concentration for many respondents, other respondents were concerned with a lack of diversity, as well as the affordability difficulties in Silicon Valley, especially for young people.

A number of respondents noted that “diversity [is] declining [and] people [are] being pushed out” of their communities. Several respondents brought up gentrification and its effects, with one respondent mentioning that there is “displacement of long[-]term residents[, which] . . . [threatens] . . . community culture, tradition, and history.” Additionally, respondents talked about how “housing is separated” and how they would like to see low-income residents integrated within the community through housing “for

---

26 Refer to the ‘Housing and Homelessness’ section above for more detail on what respondents talked about with regard to these topics.
27 Refer to the ‘Housing and Homelessness’ section above for more detail on what respondents talked about with regard to these topics.
a better sense of community." However, “many people,” said one respondent “do not want people that are ‘not like them’ moving into the neighborhood.” Another respondent said, “Yes[,] we do have diversity here[,] but does that mean acceptance of diversity or just many diverse people are [residents] of the Bay Area?”

Other respondents talked about the difficulty young people have finding places to live and staying in Silicon Valley. There is a “lack of opportunity for young people to live here,” said one respondent, and another pointed out the “inability of young people to stay here after graduation.” Similarly, other respondents mentioned how young people face “difficulty” finding and affording “a suitable home.”

Community Development
At 4%, only a handful of respondents raised an issue related to community development. A number of these respondents brought up community economic development, such as the “need for more land to be developable,” the lack of “mixed-use space,” “loss of open space due to urban sprawl and poor city planning,” “opportunities for more housing downtown,” “construction for commercial office space instead of housing,” “engagement [around] land use in local government,” and “land use reform.” Respondents also reported talking about “the need to plan for the urbanization of our city in a way that promotes sustainability and shortened commutes” and “the need for accessible housing around transit hubs and in walkable communities.” Some respondents discussed NIMBYism, with one respondent describing the “inability of the community to get over its NIMBY mentality and build tiny houses within the community through a well thought out implementation process.”

A few respondents also turned their attention to “overcrowding in residential areas” over the “last 15 years.” Furthermore, they talked about “needs for the . . . community” and “supportive services after placement in housing.” One respondent mentioned how there are “new housing developments without added community resources like jobs, parks, more teachers, and shopping stores.” Another respondent summed up well respondents’ concerns, saying that he/she talked about “community vitality and stability.”

Community Engagement
Similarly, 2% of respondents brought up an issue around community engagement. One respondent asked how might “the people in this room maintain their civic engagement?” Other respondents noted a connection between “housing and community involvement.” For one, residents could “advocate for companies to concurrently build housing alongside their hiring,” as mentioned by one respondent. Additionally, another respondent brought up that “activism is essential to push back against expulsion by market forces.”

Food Access
Food access was mentioned least frequently in conversation, as only 0.2% of respondents brought up a
topic related to this theme. The few respondents who did mention a food access topic talked about “food insecurity” and “food deserts.”

**Solutions Generated**

*On the Table* is rooted in the idea that dialogue can spur new ideas for action. In addition to the discussion and dissection of issues in conversations, 58% of respondents said their conversation generated a specific solution. A total of 664 respondents provided a solution. We randomly selected a number of solutions to share for illustrative purposes only. These demonstrate the range respondents put forward—from high-level and complex ideas to simple actions that impact everyday life. Solutions submitted via the *On the Table* survey are available for viewing in the data exploration tool (ipce.shinyapps.io/OTTSV17).

Several randomly selected solutions focus on political and community involvement as it relates to housing and homelessness. One respondent proposed that individuals become more involved in elections while also putting more pro-housing supporters in City Council. Another respondent suggested taking issues to their representatives, who can then create more legislation around said issues. Other respondents put forward solutions around speaking with housing developers, as well as learning about what housing options exist and becoming more informed. Finally, one respondent had an idea to begin a public campaign called “The Face of Homelessness” to fight NIMBYism.

Other respondents focused on housing-development-specific solutions. One respondent suggested creating more housing units, and another respondent mentioned increasing housing density. A third respondent said to offer below-market housing, and a fourth respondent proposed creating incentives for developers to build needed housing. According to another respondent, corporations should build employee housing (whether single occupant dorms or condos for those with roommates or families) that is within walking, biking, or public transit distance.

**Social Media**

Social media provided an opportunity to deepen engagement efforts with *On the Table* and expand participation in the initiative. SVCF launched its social media campaign in September 2017 as a method of promoting *On the Table* and creating a virtual space where conversations could begin or continue. The campaign served as a useful tool in capturing live content from conversations as they occurred and providing opportunities for online engagement by those who were not able to participate in physical conversations.

---

28 The mention of a specific solution does not indicate an endorsement from IPCE or SVCF. Furthermore, SVCF should not be assumed to take responsibility for a solution mentioned in this report. We randomly selected the ideas referenced above in order to show the types of solutions that respondents proposed.

29 The responses in the data exploration tool have been scrubbed of all identifying information.
We used the social media monitoring platform Meltwater Buzz to analyze social media activity and understand the influence of this initiative in the digital realm.30 We tracked the hashtag #OnTheTableSV. In total, #OnTheTableSV saw more than 800 public mentions; these mentions were amplified, generating 2.4 million total impressions. The month of November saw the highest number of mentions, which not surprisingly, peaked on the day of the On the Table initiative.

Social media captured the enthusiasm surrounding the initiative through an array of posts and picture-sharing on various platforms, including Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook; of these, Twitter was the most popular medium used throughout the social media campaign. Twitter saw 192 unique influencers. In breaking down the levels of engagement on Twitter, 37% of tweets were original tweets, 61% were retweets, and 2% were @message tweets. Furthermore, 38% of tweets featured links, and 8% contained media. In terms of tweeters’ platforms, 65% used a mobile device, 31% used a desktop, and 2% are unknown.

Social connections went beyond advertising the initiative and spreading the word. Many offered commentary on what social media users were thinking about in the context of On the Table or what they had discussed in conversations. Some comments from social media users include: "When love for humanity is on the table it's worth fighting for housing for all"; "Lack of housing and inefficient transit affect job readiness. One can’t be competitive in the workforce when experiencing these barriers"; “We need to change the narrative around affordable housing”; “It’s not just a low-income issue. It’s an all-income issue”; and "Think about your home. That’s your warm place. That’s your safe place. Imagine not knowing where you're going to stay. It really messes with your head. You can lose hope."

**How Did the Conversations Impact Respondents**

The short-term impact On the Table conversations had on respondents demonstrates the significance and value of these types of civic conversations. This section brings together data regarding the outcomes of these conversations, including new connections forged and an understanding of how to address community issues. Additionally, it includes the reported likelihood of a respondent taking action following their conversation and the actions that respondents indicated they are most likely to take.

**Conversation Outcomes and Future Actions**

Nearly two-thirds (61%) of respondents reported connecting with others at their conversation by speaking with one or more attendees they did not already know before and/or after the conversation. Additionally, 27% exchanged contact information with one or more attendees they did not already know, and 18% made specific plans to work with one or more attendees. Conversely, 24% indicated not connecting with other conversation attendees in any of the ways listed in the response options (see Figure B.36).

After participating in their conversation, 66% of respondents said they have a little-to-somewhat better understanding of how they, personally, can help address the issues facing their community. Additionally,
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30 See Appendix F for a visual summary of key findings from the social media analysis.
while 16% of respondents reported having a much better understanding, 18% of respondents indicated no change (see Figure B.37). In terms of how likely they are to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed, 81% of respondents indicated they are somewhat-to-very likely to take action (see Figure B.38). Of the actions or next steps respondents are likely to take, 63% said they are interested in raising awareness and educating others, 58% said they want to build relationships and collaborate, and 54% said they hope to get more involved in community (see Figure B.39).

**ANALYSIS**

We conducted a set of analyses that go beyond the original guiding questions of this study. These analyses help deepen understanding of the survey response summary data and are useful in identifying areas of opportunity for further investigation or action. These additional analyses include an exploration of subgroup comparisons for groups such as gender, age, education level, race, homeownership status, and geography across responses to a variety of questions. They also include a disparity analysis between the social issues respondents reported are most important to them and the social issues to which they said they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources. Additionally, this section features comparisons between questions of interest to SVCF.

**Subgroup Comparisons**

Each question analyzed in this section contains comparisons between various subgroups based on gender, age, level of education, race, homeownership status, housing and homelessness contribution, neighborhood fixers, and geographic groups. If a subgroup comparison based on these categories is not included in any of the below sections, that indicates that no notable differences between subgroups were found with regard to that question.

**Gender**

Regarding gender, we conducted analyses between male- and female-identifying respondents. While the survey provided an “Other” gender option, too few respondents selected this option for inclusion in subgroup analyses.

**Age**

Based on the survey question asking in what year respondents were born, we created five age groups: the youngest age group (made up of respondents between 18 to 29 years old), the 30s age group, the 40s age group, the 50s age group, and the oldest age group (made up of respondents who were 60 years old and older).

**Education Level**

Though we obtained specific information regarding respondents’ educational background, we
dichotomized responses for the purpose of analysis. Respondents were divided into categories: respondents with a college degree (made up of respondents with a college degree or higher) and respondents without a college degree (made up of respondents with some college or less).

Race and Ethnicity
For an analysis by race, we created four racial and ethnic subgroups: Whites (consisting of respondents indicating White), Latinos (consisting of respondents indicating Hispanic or Latino/a), Asians (consisting of respondents indicating Asian), and Blacks (consisting of respondents indicating Black or African American).

Homeownership Status
We split respondents into two groups by their indicated homeownership status: homeowner versus renter. Respondents who responded “Other” to this question were not included in the analysis, as there were too few of such responses.

Housing and Homelessness Contribution
Based on responses to the survey question asking to what social issues do you primarily contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources, we split respondents into two groups: respondents who selected housing and homelessness as a cause to which they contribute and respondents who did not select housing and homelessness as a cause to which they contribute.

Neighborhood Fixers
Using responses to the question, “Since November 2016, have you worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something?” we split respondents into “Neighborhood Fixers” and “Non-Neighborhood Fixers”

Geographic Groups
For purposes of geographic analysis, respondents from San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties were split into three groups: San Mateo County, Santa Clara County (not San Jose), and San Jose. In this analysis section, Santa Clara County respondents will refer to all respondents who live in Santa Clara County, but not the respondents who live in San Jose. This analysis incorporates response data from the 87% of all On the Table respondents who reported living in San Mateo or Santa Clara Counties.

Housing Struggle
Respondents were asked to respond to a close-ended, multiple choice question asking what actions, if any, they have personally had to do in the past three years because they were struggling to pay their rent or mortgage.

Analyses by age group revealed the same pattern of the highest proportions for the youngest age group and decreasing proportions for every increasing age group for the following responses: take on an additional job or work more at your current job, cut back on healthy, nutritious food, and accept help
from family and friends. While an average of 44% of respondents in the youngest three age groups (respondents 18 to 29 years old, in their 30s, and in their 40s) indicated that they have taken on an additional job or worked more at their current job, an average of 28% of respondents in the two oldest age groups (respondents in their 50s and 60 years old and up) said the same. The youngest respondents (18 to 29 years old) were more than three times as likely (41%) to indicate that they have cut back on healthy, nutritious food in response to housing costs, compared to 13% of respondents 60 years old or older. Finally, the youngest two age groups were significantly more likely to indicate having accepted help from family and friends. Whereas an average of 31% of respondents 18 to 29 years old and in their 30s indicated they have accepted help from family and friends in the last year, only an average of 3% of respondents in their 40s, 50s, and 60 years old and up said the same.

With regard to racial and ethnic groups, White and Black respondents were more likely to say they have stopped saving for retirement and accumulated credit card debt, while Latino respondents were most likely to say they have cut back on healthy, nutritious food in response to housing costs. An average of 44% of White and Black respondents selected stop saving for retirement, compared to an average of 28% of Asian and Latino respondents. Additionally, 42% of Black respondents reported accumulating credit card debt in response to expensive housing, as compared to 35% of White respondents, 29% of Latino respondents, and 21% of Asian respondents. At 34%, Latino respondents were the most likely to report cutting back on healthy, nutritious food in response to high housing costs, with 28% of Asian respondents, 27% of Black respondents, and 18% of White respondents indicating that they have taken the same action.

In terms of homeownership, renters were more than twice as likely (34%) to report cutting back on healthy, nutritious food than the 15% of homeowners who indicated the same. At 15%, renters were also more likely to report moving to a neighborhood that they feel is less safe than the 6% of homeowners who did so.

When analyzed by geography, San Jose respondents were more than twice as likely (17%) to report having moved to a neighborhood that feels less safe than the average of 8% of other respondents who indicated the same.

**Optimism about Housing Affordability**

Respondents were asked to respond to the following closed-response question: Realistically, how much do you think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability?

The youngest respondents (18 to 29 year olds) had the greatest proportion of respondents indicating that they felt a great deal could be done to solve housing affordability at 43%. This proportion decreased with every increasing age group, and only 26% of respondents ages 60 years old and up made this selection.

In terms of racial and ethnic groups, Latino and Black respondents were the most likely to indicate that
they have a great deal of optimism about the region’s ability to solve housing affordability. An average of 38% of Latino and Black respondents indicated a great deal of optimism, compared to an average of 27% of Asian and White respondents who have the same degree of optimism. At 10%, Asian respondents were most likely to say they have no optimism at all that something can be done to solve the region’s housing issues, compared to an average of 1% of respondents in the three other racial and ethnic groups who said the same.

Housing Idea
Respondents were asked to respond to the following item: Please share one idea that could help address our region’s housing issues. Responses were then coded by themes.31

Analyses by educational background revealed that respondents with a college degree and respondents without a college degree came up with different ideas for housing solutions. Respondents with a college degree were more likely to focus on changing zoning density and land use laws (12% versus 2% respondents without a college degree) and improving public transit and addressing transportation issues (9% versus 0.5% respondents without a college degree). Conversely, respondents without a college degree spoke more about rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases (27% versus 11% respondents with a college degree).

With regard to race and ethnicity, White and Asian respondents were more likely to suggest an idea related to changing zoning, density and land use laws, Latino and Black respondents most frequently suggested rent control, cheaper rent and slower increases, and White respondents most frequently suggested improving public transit. An average of 13% of White and Asian respondents suggested an idea related to changing zoning, density, and land use laws, compared to an average of 2% of Black and Latino respondents. At 30%, Latino respondents were most likely to mention rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases, which was nearly twice as often as the 18% of Black respondents who said the same and much more than the 9% of White respondents and 4% of Asian respondents who also mentioned a rent-related idea. White respondents were much more likely (10%) to suggest improving public transit and the transportation network than the average of 2% of respondents of other racial and ethnic groups who mentioned a transportation-related idea.

Additionally, homeowners and renters shared different ideas on housing solutions. At 14%, homeowners more frequently wrote about changing zoning, density, and land use laws, compared to 4% of renters; meanwhile, renters more frequently spoke to rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases, compared to 9% of homeowners.

Geographic analyses showed that Santa Clara County respondents were more than twice as likely (16%) to mention an issue related to changing zoning, density and land use laws than the 8% of San Mateo County respondents and 6% of San Jose respondents who mentioned a similar issue. Conversely, Santa Clara County respondents were the least likely to mention rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases. San Mateo respondents were much more likely (22%) to write about an issue related to rent

31 See Appendix C for a complete list of codes and definitions in the Housing Ideas codebook.
control than the 7% of Santa Clara County respondents and 10% of San Jose respondents who did the same.

Like about Living in SV
Respondents were asked to respond to the question: What do you like most about living in Silicon Valley? Their responses were coded thematically using the Living and Working in SV codebook.  

Analyses by age group revealed that the older respondents were, the more likely they were to mention weather and climate as the reason they most like living in Silicon Valley. While only 14% of the youngest age group (18 to 29 year olds) cited weather and climate, 38% of respondents 60 years old and older said the same.

Regarding educational background, respondents with a college degree more frequently indicated liking the natural environment and liking the culture. At 17%, respondents with a college degree mentioned the natural environment more often than the 5% of respondents without a college degree who said the same. Respondents with a college degree were three times more likely (24%) to mention culture, compared to the 8% of respondents without a college degree who did the same.

With regard to race and ethnicity, at 19%, White respondents were more likely to say they like the natural environment than the average of 6% of respondents of other races and ethnicities who said the same. Similarly, White respondents were roughly twice as likely to say that culture was what they like most about living in Silicon Valley, compared to an average of 13% of respondents of other races and ethnicities. At 33%, Black respondents were the most likely to mention the location and accessibility as what they like most about living in Silicon Valley, compared to the average of 13% of respondents of other races and ethnicities.

Lastly, homeowners tended to mention the weather and climate more often than renters, with 36% of homeowners, but only 21% of renters, mentioning this theme.

Like about Working in SV
Respondents were asked to respond to the question: What do you like most about working in Silicon Valley? Their responses were coded thematically using the Living and Working in SV codebook.

With regard to race and ethnicity, Asian and White respondents were more likely to cite innovation and technology as the top reason they like working in Silicon Valley. An average of 18% of White and Asian respondents selected innovation and technology, compared to 9% of Black respondents and 2% of Latino respondents.
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32 See Appendix D for the full list of codes and definitions in the Living and Working in SV codebook.  
33 See Appendix D for the full list of codes and definitions in the Living and Working in SV codebook.
In terms of geography, respondents who live in Santa Clara County were more than twice as likely to say that innovation and the tech industry is a reason that they like working in Silicon Valley. Twenty-three percent of Santa Clara County respondents mentioned innovation and the tech industry, compared to 7% of San Mateo County respondents and 10% of San Jose respondents.

**Important Issues**
Respondents were asked to respond to the following closed-response question: Which of the following social issues are most important to you?

Gender analyses revealed that male respondents more frequently selected technology (7%) compared to their female counterparts (0.7%).

Educational-background analyses found that respondents with a college degree more often selected equity and social inclusion and transportation, while respondents without a college degree more frequently selected family. Over twice as many (38%) respondents with a college degree selected equity and social inclusion as respondents without a college degree (16%). The same was true for transportation, with 20% of respondents with a college degree and 9% of respondents without a college degree making this selection. Conversely, at 25%, respondents without a college degree more frequently selected family than the 13% of respondents with a college degree who also did so.

With regard to race and ethnicity, Black respondents were most likely to select equity and social inclusion, Latino respondents were most likely to choose immigration and migration, White respondents where most likely to select environment and parks, and Asian respondents were most likely to select transportation. One-half (50%) of Black respondents selected equity and social inclusion as an important issue, compared to 18% of Latino respondents and an average of 32% of White and Asian respondents. Latino respondents were much more likely to select immigration as an important issue, with 30% of Latino respondents selecting immigration, compared to an average of 9% of respondents in the other race and ethnicity groups. At 19%, White respondents selected environment and parks more frequently than the average of 5% of respondents of other races and ethnicities. At 23%, Asian respondents were most likely to select transportation, compared to 20% of White respondents and an average of 11% of Black and Latino respondents.

Analyses by homeownership revealed that renters more frequently (66%) selected housing and homelessness than the 55% of homeowners who made the same selection. Conversely, homeowners more frequently (22%) selected transportation than the 13% of renters who also did so.

**Important Causes**
Respondents were asked to respond to the following closed-response question: To which of the following social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent (knowledge or skills), and/or financial resources?
With regard to gender, at 11%, male respondents much more frequently selected technology as a cause to which they contribute, compared to the 3% of female respondents who did the same.

Age group analyses revealed that, compared to younger age groups, the oldest age group was more than twice as likely as the youngest respondents to indicate contributing to economic issues and poverty, environment and parks, religion and morals, and government. Thirty percent of respondents 60 years old and older selected economic issues and poverty, compared to 15% of respondents 18 to 29 years old. Twenty percent (20%) of the oldest respondents selected environment and parks, compared to 7% of respondents in the youngest age group. While only 7% of the youngest respondents reported contributing to religion and morals, 19% of respondents aged 60 years old or older made this selection. Finally, 15% of the oldest respondents reported contributing to government, though only 6% of the youngest respondents did the same. Conversely, the oldest age group was the least likely (17%) to select family compared to the average of 34% of all other respondent age groups who reported contributing to family.

Analyses by educational background found that respondents without a college degree were more than twice as likely to select family, but less likely to select education and youth development or equity and social inclusion than respondents with a college degree. Respondents without a college degree selected family at a rate more than double (47%) that of the 21% of respondents with a college degree who did the same. Respondents with a college degree, however, more frequently chose education and youth development (41%) and equity and social inclusion (28%) than respondents without a college degree (27% and 14%, respectively).

Analyses by race and ethnicity revealed that Black respondents most frequently reported contributing to equity and social inclusion, Latino respondents most frequently reported contributing to family and immigration and migration, Asian respondents most frequently reported contributing to technology, and White respondents were most likely to report contributing to environment and parks and government. At 41%, Black respondents were more than twice as likely to report contributing to equity and social inclusion than the average of 20% of respondents of other races and ethnicities who also did so. Nearly one-half (48%) of Latino respondents reported contributing to family, compared to an average of 24% of respondents in the other race and ethnicity groups, and Latino respondents were more than twice as likely (19%) to report contributing to immigration migration than the average of 7% of respondents of other races and ethnicities who indicated the same. At 14%, Asian respondents were much more likely to select technology than the average of 5% of respondents in the other race and ethnicity groups who also did so. Compared to other respondents, White respondents were more than twice as likely to select environment (20% versus 7% average) and government (14% versus 6% average), Looking at neighborhood fixers, those respondents who indicated working to fix something in their community more frequently chose equity and social inclusion as an important cause to which they contribute (30%), compared to those who did not work to fix something (20%).

With regard to geographic groups, San Mateo County respondents were more likely to indicate that they
contribute to family issues than respondents in other geographic groups. Over one-third (35%) of San Mateo County respondents indicated that they contribute to family issues, compared to 28% of San Jose respondents and 21% of Santa Clara County respondents.

**Community Involvement**

Respondents were asked to respond to the question: How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live? Response options included: Very involved, Somewhat involved, Not too involved, and Not at all involved.

The proportion of respondents per age group who reported being very involved increased as respondents got older. The oldest age group had 31% of respondents selecting this option, compared to only half of the youngest group (15%) and an average of 23% of respondents in other age groups.

Based on analyses by educational background, respondents with a college degree reported being more involved. Compared to 16% of respondents without a college degree, 29% of respondents with a college degree indicated that they were very involved. Conversely, 12% of respondents without a college degree selected not at all involved, compared to only 5% of respondents with a college degree.

Analysis by race and ethnicity revealed that, compared to respondents of other races and ethnicities, Latino respondents were most likely to report no involvement at all (13% versus 6% average) and least likely to report being very involved in their communities (17% versus 29% average).

Homeowners tended to be more involved than renters. While only 4% of homeowners indicated being not at all involved, 9% of renters did the same, and while 29% of homeowners indicated being very involved, 20% of renters did the same.

Nearly one-half (45%) of neighborhood fixers rated themselves as being very involved, compared to only 13% of non-community fixers. Supporting this finding, 12% of non-neighborhood fixers indicated being not at all involved, compared to less than 1% of neighborhood fixers.

**Engagement**

Subgroup analyses were conducted based on participant responses to the question, “Since November 2016, have you . . . ” ‘Select all that apply’ response options included: worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something; donated money, assets, or property with a combined value of more than $25 to charitable or religious organizations; done any volunteer activities through or for an organization; attended any public meetings in which there are discussion of community affairs; and none of the above.

Regarding age groups, older age groups were more involved in donating, volunteering, and attending public meetings. The oldest age group had 86% of respondents indicating that they donated in the past year, compared to less than one-half (45%) of the youngest age group. The 30s age group had the lowest
proportion of respondents who volunteered (53%), compared to 63% of the youngest age group and 81% of the 60 and up age group. The proportion of respondents attending public meetings increased by age group, from 47% of respondents 18 to 29 years old up to 74% of those respondents ages 60 years old and up.

Many differences were found between respondents with a college degree and respondents without a college degree regarding levels of engagement. Respondents with a college degree more frequently indicated than did respondents without a college degree that they worked to fix or improve something (41% versus 28%), donated (84% versus 37%), volunteered (77% versus 45%), and attended public meetings (68% versus 52%).

With regard to race and ethnicity, White respondents were most likely to report donating and volunteering, Black respondents were most likely to report attending public meetings, and Latino respondents were least likely to report being “neighborhood fixers.” At 87%, White respondents were most likely to report having donated, compared to 75% of Asian respondents, 66% of Black respondents, and 35% of Latino respondents. At 81%, White respondents were also the most likely to report having volunteered, compared to an average of 69% of Black and Asian respondents and 41% of Latino respondents. An average of 71% of Black and White respondents were most likely to report having attended a public meeting, compared to an average of 51% of Asian and Latino respondents. At 29%, Latino respondents were less likely to report working with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something, compared to the average of 40% of respondents of other races and ethnicities who reported being neighborhood fixers.

Homeownership analyses revealed that, across several items, homeowners reported higher levels of involvement than renters. Slightly less than one-half (44%) of homeowners reported having fixed or improved something in their community, compared to 32% of renters. Regarding donations, 87% of homeowners reported donating in the past year, compared to 52% of renters. Similarly, 78% of homeowners reported having volunteered, compared to 56% of renters.

Respondents designated as “neighborhood fixers” tended to be more involved than non-neighborhood fixers. Compared to those who did not work to fix or improve something in their community in the past year, neighborhood fixers more frequently donated (79% versus 63%), volunteered (81% versus 59%), and attended public meetings (83% versus 51%).

Geographic analyses revealed that Santa Clara County respondents were more likely to indicate that they have donated and volunteered in the past year than other respondents. While 83% of Santa Clara County respondents reported donating in the last year, an average of 65% of San Mateo County and San Jose residents also did so. Eighty percent of Santa Clara County respondents reported volunteering in the previous year, which was more than the average of 63% of San Mateo and San Jose respondents who said the same.
Vote in Local Elections
For the following item, respondents were asked to respond to the question: How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board? Response options included: always vote, sometimes vote, rarely vote, never vote, and prefer not to answer/not eligible.

Age group analyses revealed very large variations in respondents who always vote, with the proportion of respondents who always vote increasing in each age group. Compared to only 29% of respondents in the youngest age group, 89% of respondents who are 60 years old or older indicated that they always vote. Almost one-fifth of the youngest age group indicated that they never vote (19%), compared to the average of 6% of respondents in the other age groups who reported never voting. The greatest proportion of respondents indicating that they prefer not to answer/not eligible was from the 40s age group (20%) and the lowest proportion was from the 60 years old and up age group (2%).

Respondents with a college degree tended to vote more often than respondents without a college degree. Nearly three-fourth (72%) of respondents with a college degree always vote (compared to 34% of respondents without a college degree) and only 2% never vote (compared to 19% of respondents without a college degree). Additionally, almost one-quarter (24%) of respondents without a college degree selected that they prefer not to answer or are not eligible, compared to only 5% of respondents with a college degree.

As compared to respondents from other racial and ethnic groups, Black and White respondents were most likely to say they always vote (average 78% versus 42% average of Latino and Asian respondents). Asian respondents were most likely to say they sometimes vote (28% versus 12% average of other racial and ethnic groups) or rarely vote (11% versus 4% average of other racial and ethnic group), and Latino respondents were most likely to say they never vote (19% versus 6% average of other racial and ethnic groups).

Analysis by geographic group revealed that Santa Clara respondents more frequently (72%) reported always voting than the 59% of San Mateo respondents and 57% of San Jose respondents who said the same.

Issues Raised During Conversation
The following analyses are based on the issues that respondents reported raising during the conversations.
Analyses by educational background revealed that respondents with a college degree more frequently brought up issues regarding equity and social inclusion (55%) compared to the 39% of respondents without a college degree who also mentioned this theme. Conversely, respondents without a college degree were nearly twice as likely (25%) to mention family issues than the 13% of respondents with a college degree who said the same.

With regard to race and ethnicity, Asian respondents were most likely to raise issues related to
economic issues and poverty and equity and social inclusion, Black respondents were most likely to raise an issue related to media and awareness, and White respondents were most likely to raise an issue related to transportation. At 68%, Asian respondents mentioned economic issues and poverty most frequently, followed by 54% of White respondents, 48% of Latino respondents, and 38% of Black respondents. Similarly, at 59%, Asian respondents mentioned equity and social inclusion most frequently, followed by 53% of White respondents, 43% of Latino respondents, and 38% of Black respondents. At 12%, Black respondents were much more likely to raise an issue related to media and awareness than the average of 3% of respondents in the other racial and ethnic groups who also did so. Finally, at 18%, White respondents were most likely to mention transportation, followed by 13% of Asian respondents, and an average of 6% of Black and Latino respondents.

**Likelihood to Take Action**

Respondents were asked to respond to the following closed-response question: How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed? Response options included: very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, and not at all likely.

Analyses by race and ethnicity revealed that, at 62%, Black respondents were much more likely to say they are very likely to take action than the average of 34% of respondents of other races and ethnicities who said the same.

Respondents who chose housing and homelessness as an important issue to which they contribute more frequently indicated that they were very likely to take action (50%), compared to those who did not select housing and homelessness as an issue to which they contribute (32%).

Neighborhood fixers more frequently selected very likely (52% versus 25%) compared to non-fixers, and those who had not fixed anything in their community in the past year more often selected not too likely (18% versus 11%).

**Actions/Next Steps**

Respondents were asked to respond to the following closed-response, multiple-choice question: Please select the actions or next steps you are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed.

In general, younger respondents indicated being more likely to take action. Regarding getting involved in the community, the youngest age group had the highest proportion of respondents selecting this option (70%), and the proportions decreased with every subsequent age group down to 44% of the 60 years old and up age group. A similar pattern was seen for personal development, with 57% of the youngest age group indicating plans to pursue personal development, but only 7% of respondents 60 years old and over making this selection. Actions related to family support followed the same pattern, with the 18 to 29 year old age group having 33% of respondents select this item and the 60 years old and up age group having only 7% make the same selection. For job-related action, the youngest respondents again had the highest proportion of respondents selecting this option (39%), compared to the oldest group of
respondents (13%).

With regard to educational background, compared to respondents without a college degree, respondents with a college degree more frequently indicated being likely to engage in building relationships and collaborating (63% versus 48%), raising awareness and educating others (67% versus 55%), political involvement (44% versus 26%), and job-related action (36% versus 20%). Conversely, respondents without a college degree more frequently indicated that they were likely to get involved in the community (64% versus 50%) and act through family support (32% versus 12%).

Analyses by race and ethnicity revealed considerable differences between racial and ethnic groups with regard to actions and next steps. With an average of 62%, White and Asian respondents were more likely than Black respondents (54%) or Latino respondents (48%) to indicate wanting to build relationships and collaborate. Over two-thirds (68%) of Latino respondents said they plan to get more involved in their communities, more than the average of 51% of respondents of other races and ethnicities. Latino respondents were also twice as likely (35%) to take action by supporting family than the average of 15% of other respondents who indicated the same. Over one-half (52%) of Black respondents said they plan to pursue personal development, compared to 46% of Asian respondents, 37% of Latino respondents, and 31% of White respondents who said the same. Finally, at 45%, White respondents were most likely to plan to become more politically involved, followed by an average of 38% of Black and Asian respondents and 27% of Latino respondents.

Regarding homeownership, compared to homeowners, renters more frequently indicated an intention to get involved in the community (63% versus 45%), improve themselves through personal development (40% versus 29%), and provide family support (25% versus 12%).

Geographic analysis showed that respondents who live in San Mateo County and San Jose were more than twice as likely (21%) to indicate that they will take action to support their family than the 10% of Santa Clara County respondents who said the same.

**Disparity between Important Issues and Contributions**

When considering the social issues that were most important to respondents (important issues) and the social issues to which they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources (contributions), the data reveal disparities between these two variables (see Figure G.1). These disparities can be useful indicators of social issues where greater contribution of time, talent, and financial resources are needed. Public safety and the judicial system resulted in the greatest issues-to-contributions disparity. Among the respondents who mentioned public safety and the judicial as a social issue, only 20% also reported that they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources to this cause. Transportation featured the next greatest disparity, with 22% of those concerned with this social issue also contributing toward it. Notably, housing and homelessness had by far the highest number of respondents considering it the most important social issue (n=608), and 50% of respondents reported contributing their time, talent, and financial resources to it. Religion and morals and education and youth development were the two
issues with the least amount of disparity. Over two-thirds (67%) of respondents who were concerned with these issues also reported contributing to them.

Question Comparisons
We conducted comparative analyses on certain pairs of questions that were of interest to SVCF. These comparisons include the relationship between: 1) how optimistic respondents reported being about the region’s ability to solve the housing challenge, and the housing ideas that respondents raised; 2) how involved in their community respondents reported being, and the housing ideas that they raised; and 3) how involved in their community that respondents reported being, and to which issues they reported contributing their time, talent and/or financial resources. All results include only respondents who answered both questions being compared.

Relationship between Housing Optimism and Housing Ideas
Of respondents who think ‘nothing at all’ can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability or those who are ‘not sure’ about what can be done, 19% mentioned rent control, cheaper rent, and slower increases, as compared to the 14% of other respondents who also mentioned this issue. The more optimistic about housing that respondents reported being, the more likely they were to mention a solution related to government policies, support, and regulation. Of respondents who said they have a great deal of optimism that something can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability, 19% mentioned a solution related to government policies, support, and regulation, as compared to 10% of ‘nothing at all’ respondents. Of respondents who said ‘nothing at all’ can be done to solve the region’s housing affordability issues, 14% mentioned a housing idea related to build more housing, especially affordable housing. This was far less than the average of 31% of more optimistic respondents who mentioned an idea related to build more housing, especially affordable housing. Conversely, at 19%, respondents who were not optimistic at all mentioned an idea related to corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions more than twice as often as the 8% of more optimistic respondents (see Figure H.1).

Relationship between Community Involvement and Housing Ideas
Respondents who said they are not at all involved in their community were much more likely to mention issues related to rent control and increasing wages than more involved respondents. Of respondents who reported being not at all involved, 26% mentioned a housing idea related to rent control, cheaper rent, and slower increases, and 12% mentioned a housing idea related to increasing wages. Respondents who reported more involvement, however, were less likely to mention these ideas, with an average of 14% mentioning an issue related to rent control and 4% mentioning increasing wages. Conversely, respondents who reported being somewhat-to-very involved were more likely to mention an idea related to government policies, support, and regulation, with 17% of these respondents mentioning such an issue as compared to 8% of less involved respondents (see Figure H.2).

Relationship between Community Involvement and Contributions
The more involved in the community that respondents reported being, the less likely they were to say they contribute to family issues. Of respondents who reported being very involved in their community,
only 14% reported contributing to family issues, which was far less than the average of 36% of respondents who mentioned contributing to family issues, but reported lower community involvement.

Of respondents who said they were very involved, 17% said that they contribute to government issues, which was over two times as often as other respondents who reported the same. The more involved in the community respondents reported being, the more likely they were to say that they contribute to issues related to equity and social inclusion. Of respondents who said they were very involved, 32% reported contributing to equity and social inclusion, which was nearly three times as many as the 11% respondents who said they were not at all involved in their local communities (see Figure H.3).

CONCLUSION

This report was an exploratory study examining the content of On the Table conversations and information about all survey respondents. While results cannot be generalized to the broader Silicon Valley population, this study reveals important insights that are worth highlighting.

First, On the Table respondents were a highly engaged group across all measures considered, especially when comparing respondents to national data. The majority of respondents said they are involved in community and neighborhood activities, with notable proportions of respondents reporting having donated and volunteered this past year. Slightly smaller but still noteworthy percentages were seen for respondents who have been involved in less common but highly impactful engagement activities, such as attending a public meeting about community affairs and working with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something.

Second, given Silicon Valley’s focus on housing for the On the Table conversations, it is no surprise that the majority of respondents raised an issue in conversation related to housing and homelessness. However, respondents touched on a wide range of topics with regard to housing and homelessness, which help illuminate what the respondent pool overall considers to be problematic in their communities regarding housing. Respondents primarily reported talking about affordable housing in their conversations, particularly the need for more affordable housing. They discussed the challenges to building more affordable housing, how the lack of affordable housing has affected them, and specific populations and community members who could benefit from affordable housing. Respondents also talked about high rent and continuously increasing rent, the high cost of living, and homelessness.

Third, a number of respondents reported that they have had to stop saving for retirement and have had to take on an additional job or work more at their current job, among other actions, because they were struggling to pay their rent or mortgage. However, respondents were largely optimistic about how much they think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability. Many even provided an idea for how to help address the region’s housing issues, with the number one idea proposing that the region build more housing, especially affordable housing. Respondents also suggested rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases; government policies, support, and regulation; changing zoning, density,
and land use laws; corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions; community involvement, organizing, and advocacy; and raising awareness, sharing information, and educating others. While the first five ideas have to do with organization and institutional support, the last two ideas propose community and individual action.

Fourth, although the housing challenge was an issue that permeated the conversations and was top of mind for respondents, those respondents who live in Silicon Valley and those respondents who work in Silicon Valley indicated that there are many aspects of their region that are favorable. For example, respondents who live in Silicon Valley said they like living there mainly because of the region’s diversity, weather and climate, and culture. Additionally, respondents who work in Silicon Valley said they like working there primarily because of the work and job opportunities, the community and the people, and the diversity in the region.

*On the Table* was an opportunity for residents of Silicon Valley to get together with old friends and new acquaintances to have conversations about the issues that they care about the most. In doing so, many people came together to share their experiences about life in Silicon Valley and how they would like to see it become an even better region that serves all of its residents. Conversations served as a catalyst for generating ideas and potential actions and created a space for participants to make personal connections so that they might find ways to ignite change with fellow residents.

**APPENDICES**

Appendix A: *On the Table* 2017 Survey
Welcome, and thank you for taking part in this survey!

The purpose of this research is to understand who participated in On the Table and the nature and quality of the conversation event in which you participated on November 15, 2017, coordinated by Silicon Valley Community Foundation. The University of Illinois at Chicago’s Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) is administering the survey.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Completion of this survey is voluntary, you may skip any question, and there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept confidential. Collected data will be stored in locked offices in a locked suite, and data with direct identifiers will be password protected. Data will be kept throughout the research study period and will be deleted after five years. No personally identifiable data will be reported, and confidentiality will be protected to the fullest extent possible. IPCE and Silicon Valley Community Foundation will have access to your e-mail address, but Silicon Valley Community Foundation will not have access to your individual responses. Results of this study will be publicly available at www.ipce.uic.edu and www.siliconvalleycf.org/onthetable.

The principal investigator of this research is IPCE Director Joseph Hoereth. If you have any questions about the survey, you may contact IPCE by phone at 312-355-0088 or by e-mail at jhoereth@uic.edu. You may also contact the Office for the Protection of Human Subjects (OPRS) by phone at 312-996-1711 or by e-mail at uicirb@uic.edu.

By responding to the survey, you acknowledge the following:

- You have read the above information
- You voluntarily agree to participate in this study
- You are at least 18 years of age

Please mark your answers like this: ⬜ not like this: ✗ ☑

Begin here

1. Please provide the e-mail address used to register you for On the Table. If you DID NOT register online, please provide your e-mail address below.

   E-mail Address: ________________________________

2. Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in On the Table? (Select all that apply)

- ☑ To discuss and address important issues in my community
- ☑ To learn from and listen to others
- ☑ To meet and build relationships with new people
- ☑ To get more involved in my community
- ☑ To support the organizer of the conversation
- ☑ Other (please specify): _____________________________

   If you participated in MORE THAN ONE On the Table conversation, please refer to only one of your conversations for the next two questions.

3. Where did your conversation take place?

   County: ________________________________

   City or Town: ________________________________

   Neighborhood: ________________________________

4. The other people at my conversation were:

- ☑ Mostly people I did NOT know before the conversation
- ☑ Mostly people I knew before the conversation
- ☑ An equal mix of both

5. Did you raise an issue of concern regarding your community?

- ☑ Yes
- ☑ No

If yes, please provide examples:

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
6. Did your conversation(s) generate any specific solutions?

○ Yes
○ No

If yes, please provide examples:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)? (Select all that apply)

○ I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know before and/or after the conversation(s)
○ I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know
○ I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees to address a new idea, issue, or project in the future
○ None of the above

8. After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?

○ Much better
○ Somewhat better
○ A little better
○ No change

9. How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?

○ Very likely
○ Somewhat likely
○ Not too likely
○ Not at all likely

If you answered NOT TOO LIKELY or NOT AT ALL LIKELY, please skip to Question 11.

10. Please select the actions or next steps you are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed. (Select all that apply)

○ Build relationships and collaborate
○ Get more involved in community
○ Improve myself through personal development and learning
○ Raise awareness and educate others
○ Become more politically involved
○ Donate
○ Volunteer
○ Provide support for my family
○ Take action through my job
○ Mentor or motivate others
○ Other (please specify): ______________________

11. How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?

○ A big impact
○ A moderate impact
○ A small impact
○ No impact at all

12. In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?

○ Very attached
○ Somewhat attached
○ Not very attached
○ Not at all attached

13. Which of the following social issues are most important to you? (CHOOSE UP TO THREE)

○ Arts and Culture
○ Economic Issues and Poverty
○ Education and Youth Development
○ Environment and Parks
○ Religion and Morals
○ Equity and Social Inclusion
○ Family
○ Food Access
○ Government
○ Health
○ Housing and Homelessness
○ Immigration and Migration
○ Public Safety and Judicial System
○ The Media
○ Technology
○ Transportation
○ Other (please specify): ______________________
○ Other (please specify): ______________________
○ Other (please specify): ______________________
14. To which of the following social issues do you primarily contribute your time, talent (knowledge or skills), and/or financial resources? 
(Choose up to three)
- Arts and Culture
- Economic Issues and Poverty
- Education and Youth Development
- Environment and Parks
- Religion and Morals
- Equity and Social Inclusion
- Family
- Food Access
- Government
- Health
- Housing and Homelessness
- Immigration and Migration
- Public Safety and Judicial System
- The Media
- Technology
- Transportation
- Other (please specify):
- Other (please specify):
- Other (please specify):

15. How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?
- Very involved
- Somewhat involved
- Not too involved
- Not at all involved

16. Since November 2016, have you: 
(Select all that apply)
- Worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something?
- Donated money, assets, or property with a combined value of more than $25 to charitable or religious organizations?
- Done any volunteer activities through or for an organization?
- Attended any public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs?
- None of the above

17. How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board? Across the nation, these elections have about 20% voter turnout.
- Always vote
- Sometimes vote
- Rarely vote
- Never vote
- Prefer not to answer / Not eligible to vote

18. Where do you like to connect with others? 
(Select all that apply)
- Parks
- Library
- Community rec center
- Schools
- Public squares
- Religious institution, such as a church
- Community garden
- Shopping centers
- Other (please specify):

19. How often, if ever, do you get information about your local community from each of the following sources, whether online or offline?
- Local newspaper
- Local television news
- Local radio
- A blog about your local community
- A person or organization you follow on a social networking site
- A newsletter or e-mail listerv about your local community
- Word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors

To help us better understand who participated in On the Table, please respond to the following demographic questions. Your responses are confidential.

20. Where do you currently live?
County: __________________________
City or Town: ______________________
Neighborhood: ______________________
Zip Code: ______________________

21. About how many years have you lived in your local community?
Number of Years: ________________
22. Do you own or rent your primary residence?
   - Own
   - Rent
   - Other (please specify): ____________________________

23. What is your current gender identity?
    (Select all that apply)
   - Male
   - Female
   - A gender identity not listed here (please specify): ____________________________

24. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   - Less than high school
   - High school diploma or GED
   - Some college
   - Associate/Vocational degree
   - Bachelor’s degree
   - Graduate degree

25. In what year were you born? Year: __________

26. How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity? (Select all that apply)
   - American Indian/Alaska Native
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic or Latino/a
   - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Other (please specify): ____________________________

27. What is your relationship to Silicon Valley Community Foundation? (Select all that apply)
   - Funder
   - Grantee (my organization has received funds from them)
   - I have volunteered with them
   - I work there
   - I’ve attended one of their events
   - I had not heard of Silicon Valley Community Foundation before On the Table
   - Other (please specify): ____________________________

28. Do you live in Silicon Valley (includes San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Francisco counties)?
   - No
   - Yes
   If yes, what do you like most about living in Silicon Valley?

29. Do you work in Silicon Valley (includes San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Francisco counties)?
   - No
   - Yes
   If yes, what do you like most about working in Silicon Valley?

30. Which of the following actions, if any, have you personally had to do in the past three years because you were struggling to be able to pay your rent or mortgage? (Select all that apply)
   - Take on an additional job or work more at your current job
   - Stop saving for retirement
   - Accumulate credit card debt
   - Cut back on healthy, nutritious food
   - Cut back on healthcare
   - Move to a neighborhood that you feel is less safe
   - Move to a place where the schools are not as good
   - Not sure
   - Other (please specify): ____________________________

31. Please share one idea that could help address our region’s housing issues.

32. Realistically, how much do you think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability?
   - A great deal
   - A fair amount
   - Just some
   - Nothing at all
   - Not sure
On the Table 2017
Summary of Results for All Respondents

Following On the Table, 305 participants responded to the survey by clicking on an e-mail link, 173 responded by clicking on the web link, 249 responded by web link via SMS, and 664 responded by submitting a print survey.

In total, 1,391 On the Table participants fully or partially responded to the survey. This document provides a summary of responses by question. The 'n' provided in each question is the number of respondents for that question.

Section 1: Who Participated?

Respondent Demographics

Figure B.1: What is your current gender identity?
% of respondents (n = 1,285)
Figure B.2: Age of Respondents by Decade

% of respondents (n = 1,192)

- 18 to 29: 16%
- 30s: 20%
- 40s: 17%
- 50s: 20%
- 60s and up: 28%

Figure B.3: Age of Respondents by Decade, Comparison

% of Silicon Valley RESPONDENTS (n = 1,071) compared to Silicon Valley RESIDENTS

Figure B.4: What is the highest level of education you have completed?

% of respondents (n = 1,283)

- Graduate degree: 38%
- Bachelor's degree: 31%
- Associate/Vocational degree: 5%
- Some college: 11%
- High school diploma or GED: 9%
- Less than high school: 6%

Figure B.5: Highest Level of Education, Comparison

% of Silicon Valley RESPONDENTS ages 25+ (n = 976) compared to Silicon Valley RESIDENTS ages 25+

**Figure B.6: How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity?**

% of respondents (n = 1,269)

- White: 47%
- Hispanic or Latino/a: 27%
- Asian: 11%
- Multiracial: 7%
- Black or African American: 4%
- Other: 3%
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 0.6%
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.2%

---

**Figure B.7: Racial and/or Ethnic Identity, Comparison**

% of Silicon Valley RESPONDENTS (n = 1,098) compared to Silicon Valley RESIDENTS


- White: 51% ( RESPONDENTS ) - 40% ( RESIDENTS )
- Hispanic or Latino/a: 27% ( RESPONDENTS ) - 21% ( RESIDENTS )
- Asian: 11% ( RESPONDENTS ) - 33% ( RESIDENTS )
- Multiracial: 6% ( RESPONDENTS ) - 2% ( RESIDENTS )
- Black or African American: 4% ( RESPONDENTS ) - 3% ( RESIDENTS )
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 0.6% ( RESPONDENTS ) - 0.6% ( RESIDENTS )
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.1% ( RESPONDENTS ) - 0.2% ( RESIDENTS )

Siemln Valley RESPONDENTS  Siemln Valley RESIDENTS
Figure B.8: Where do you currently live? Top counties:
% of respondents (n = 1,305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa County</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.9: Where do you currently live? Top Zip Codes:
% of respondents (n = 1,263)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94303</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95112</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94025</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94306</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94019</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94063</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94061</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95123</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94301</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95111</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.10: Where do you currently live? Top cities:

% of respondents (n = 1,290)

- San Jose: 28%
- Palo Alto: 8%
- Redwood City: 7%
- San Francisco: 5%
- East Palo Alto: 5%
- Sunnyvale: 4%
- Menlo Park: 4%
- San Mateo: 3%
- Mountain View: 3%
- Half Moon Bay: 3%

Where Respondents LIVE

# of Respondents by Place
**Figure B.11**: About how many years have you lived in your local community?

% of respondents (n = 1,291) compared to National Rate


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 and up</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.12**: Do you own or rent your primary residence?

% of respondents (n = 1,290)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.13**: Homeownership Comparison

% of Silicon Valley RESPONDENTS (n = 1,076) compared to Silicon Valley RESIDENTS


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Silicon Valley RESIDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.14: What is your relationship to the Silicon Valley Community Foundation?
% of respondents (n = 1,207 // select all that apply)

- I had not heard of Silicon Valley Community Foundation: 38%
- I’ve attended one of their events: 34%
- Grantee: 19%
- Other: 13%
- I have volunteered with them: 5%
- I work there: 4%
- Funder: 3%

*‘Other’ response: NA (1.2%).
Civic Attitudes and Activities

Figure B.15: How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?

% of respondents (n = 1,321) compared to National Rate
SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

- A big impact: 42% (Respondents) vs. 32% (National Rate)
- A moderate impact: 34% (Respondents) vs. 37% (National Rate)
- A small impact: 22% (Respondents) vs. 23% (National Rate)
- No impact at all: 2% (Respondents) vs. 7% (National Rate)

Figure B.16: In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?

% of respondents (n = 1,323) compared to National Rate
SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

- Very attached: 45% (Respondents) vs. 19% (National Rate)
- Somewhat attached: 38% (Respondents) vs. 48% (National Rate)
- Not very attached: 15% (Respondents) vs. 25% (National Rate)
- Not at all attached: 3% (Respondents) vs. 8% (National Rate)
Figure B.17: Which of the following social issues are most important to you?

% of respondents (n = 1,111 // choose up to three)

- Housing and Homelessness: 59%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 39%
- Education and Youth Development: 35%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 31%
- Transportation: 17%
- Family: 16%
- Health: 15%
- Immigration and Migration: 15%
- Environment and Parks: 14%
- Food Access: 8%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 7%
- Government: 7%
- Arts and Culture: 7%
- Religion and Morals: 4%
- Technology: 2%
- The Media: 2%
- Other*: 1%

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Community Development (0.4%), Community Engagement (0.3%), and Collaboration (0.2%).
**Figure B.18:** To which social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?

% of respondents (n = 1,184 // choose up to three)

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Community Development (0.5%), Philanthropy (0.3%), and Collaboration (0.2%).*
Figure B.19: How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?

% of respondents (n = 1,307) compared to National Rate


Figure B.20: Engagement Activities in the Past Year, Comparison

% of respondents (n = 1,301) compared to National Rate

Figure B.21: How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board?  
% of respondents (n = 1,294)

- Always vote: 61%  
- Sometimes vote: 16%  
- Rarely vote: 5%  
- Never vote: 7%  
- Prefer not to answer / Not eligible: 11%

Figure B.22: Where do you like to connect with others?  
% of respondents (n = 1,267 // select all that apply)

- Schools: 45%  
- Religious institution: 39%  
- Community rec center: 33%  
- Parks: 30%  
- Library: 30%  
- Other*: 26%  
- Public squares: 24%  
- Community garden: 12%  
- Shopping centers: 11%

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Community Events and Meetings (7.6%), Community Service Activities (3.9%), and Restaurants (3.8%).
Figures B.23 through B.29 present results on how often respondents get information about their local community from each of the following sources, whether online or offline.

SOURCE of comparison data: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ’Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

**Figure B.23: Local Newspaper**
% of respondents (n = 1,082) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.24: Local television news**
% of respondents (n = 1,086) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.25: Local radio
% of respondents (n = 1,015) compared to National Rate

Figure B.26: A blog about your local community
% of respondents (n = 953) compared to National Rate

Figure B.27: A person or organization you follow on a social networking site
% of respondents (n = 1,043) compared to National Rate
**Figure B.28: A newsletter or e-mail listserv about your local community**

% of respondents (n = 1,056) compared to National Rate

![Chart showing the frequency of receiving a newsletter or e-mail listserv about local community.](image)

**Figure B.29: Word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors**

% of respondents (n = 1,146) compared to National Rate

![Chart showing the frequency of word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors.](image)
Section 2: Conversation Dynamics, Topics, and Impact

Conversation Dynamics and Topics

Figure B.30: Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in On the Table?

% of respondents (n = 1,373 // select all that apply)

- Discuss and address important issues in my community: 72%
- Learn from and listen to others: 56%
- Support the organizer of the conversation: 37%
- Get more involved in my community: 33%
- Meet and build relationships with new people: 28%
- Other: 5%

Figure B.31: 'The other people at my conversation were ...'

% of respondents (n = 1,333)

- Mostly people I did NOT know before the conversation: 36%
- Mostly people I knew before the conversation: 34%
- An equal mix of both: 30%
Figure B.32: Where did your conversation take place? Top counties:
% of respondents (n = 1,352)

- Santa Clara County: 58%
- San Mateo County: 36%
- San Francisco County: 3%
- Alameda County: 3%
- Placer County: 0.1%

Figure B.33: Where did your conversation take place? Top ZIP codes:
% of respondents (n = 931)

- 94040: 9%
- 95110: 9%
- 95112: 5%
- 94087: 5%
- 94019: 4%
- 94025: 4%
- 95116: 3%
- 95122: 3%
- 95125: 3%
- 94303: 3%
## Figure B.34: Where did your conversation take place? Top cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>% of Respondents (n = 1,344)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Where Respondents Attended On The Table Conversations

**# of Respondents by Place**

[Map showing the distribution of respondents by place, with color coding indicating the number of respondents, from 1-10 to 405.]
Figure B.35: Issues Raised During the Conversation
% of respondents (n = 1,001)

- Housing and Homelessness: 82%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 53%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 50%
- Transportation: 13%
- Education and Youth Development: 8%
- Government: 7%
- Family: 7%
- Community Development: 4%
- Immigration and Migration: 4%
- Media and Awareness: 3%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 2%
- Community Engagement: 2%
- Technology: 2%
- Philanthropy: 2%
- Health: 2%
- Collaboration: 2%
- Environment and Parks: 1%
- Religion and Morals: 1%
- Arts and Culture: 0.7%
- International: 0.4%
- Other: 0.3%
- Food Access: 0.2%
Impact of the Conversation

Figure B.36: How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)?
% of respondents (n = 1,319 // select all that apply)

- I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know: 61%
- I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know: 27%
- None of the above: 24%
- I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees: 18%

Figure B.37: After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?
% of respondents (n = 1,330)

- Much better: 16%
- Somewhat better: 34%
- A little better: 32%
- No change: 18%
Figure B.38: How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>% of Respondents (n = 1,331)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too likely</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.39: Actions or next steps respondents are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>% of Respondents (n = 1,063 // select all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness and educate others</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build relationships and collaborate</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get more involved in community</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more politically involved</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve myself through personal development and learning</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take action through my job</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor or motivate others</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support for my family</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Custom Questions

Figure B.40: Do you live in Silicon Valley (includes San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Francisco counties)?
% of respondents (n = 1,284)

- No: 11%
- Yes: 89%

Figure B.41: What do you like most about living in Silicon Valley?
% of respondents (n = 716)

- Diversity: 31%
- Weather & Climate: 29%
- Culture: 20%
- Community & People: 16%
- Natural Environment: 14%
- Other: 13%
- Work & Job Opportunities: 12%
- Location & Accessibility: 12%
- Activities: 9%
- Friends & Family: 7%
- Education & Schools: 5%
- Innovation & Tech Industry: 4%
- Resources & Services: 3%
Figure B.42: Do you work in Silicon Valley (includes San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Francisco counties)?
% of respondents (n = 1,259)

- No: 29%
- Yes: 71%

Figure B.43: What do you like most about working in Silicon Valley?
% of respondents (n = 507)

- Work & Job Opportunities: 34%
- Community & People: 21%
- Diversity: 17%
- Culture: 14%
- Location & Accessibility: 13%
- Innovation & Tech Industry: 12%
- Other: 8%
- Resources & Services: 3%
- Weather & Climate: 3%
- Natural Environment: 2%
- Friends & Family: 1.0%
- Education & Schools: 1.0%
- Activities: 1.0%
Figure B.44: Which of the following actions, if any, have you personally had to do in the past three years because you were struggling to be able to pay your rent or mortgage?

% of respondents (n = 846 // select all that apply)

- Stop saving for retirement: 38%
- Take on an additional job or work more at their current job: 38%
- Accumulate credit card debt: 32%
- Cut back on healthy, nutritious food: 28%
- Cut back on healthcare: 17%
- Other*: 16%
- Not sure: 14%
- Move to a neighborhood that you feel is less safe: 12%
- Move to a place where the schools are not as good: 7%

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Cut Back on Overall Spending (2.2%), Help From Family and Friends (2.1%), and Stop Saving (0.8%).

Figure B.45: Realistically, how much do you think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability?

% of respondents (n = 1,278) compared to National Rate

SOURCE: Hart Research Associated, April–May 2016, 'MacArthur Housing Matters Survey'
Figure B.46: Please share one idea that could help address our region’s housing issues.

% of respondents (n = 864)

- Build more housing, especially affordable housing: 31%
- Rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases: 15%
- Government policies, support, and regulation: 14%
- Change zoning, density, and land use laws: 9%
- Corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions: 8%
- Community involvement, organizing, and advocacy: 8%
- Raise awareness, share information, and educate: 8%
- Allow and encourage alternative housing types: 7%
- Improve public transit and address transportation issues: 6%
- Other: 6%
- Increase wages: 4%
- Increase social responsibility and inclusion: 4%
- Shared housing: 2%
- Improve long-term planning: 2%
- Housing subsidies: 2%
Appendix C: Housing Ideas Codebook—Defined

**Allow and encourage alternative housing types**
An allow and encourage alternative housing types code refers to respondents who would like to see more non-traditional housing types in their communities. In this code, respondents most frequently mentioned alternative dwelling units, ADUs, secondary units, granny units, and tiny housing.

**Build more housing, especially affordable housing**
A build more housing, especially affordable housing code refers to respondents’ strong desire for more housing units to be built in their communities. This code most frequently mentioned building or constructing more affordable housing units, apartments and homes. Many responses in this code were cross-coded with specific solutions that would lead to the creation of more affordable housing including changing zoning and density, corporate responsibility and other government policies and regulations.

**Change zoning, density, and land use laws**
A change zoning, density and land use laws code frequently refers to respondents who would like to see more density and looser building regulations so that more housing units can be built in their communities. This often included calls for increasing density in certain areas, such as near public transit.

**Community involvement, organizing, and advocacy**
A community involvement, organizing, and advocacy code refers to respondents mentioning the need for community members to work together in order to advocate for more affordable housing in their communities and confront corporations, government officials and developers.

**Corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions**
A corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions code often refers to some respondents’ position that corporations and private sector entities have a responsibility to contribute to solving the housing crisis. In particular, respondents noted that large technology companies that locate many jobs in Silicon Valley should be required to provide housing solutions for their workforces.

**Government policies, support, and regulation**
A government policies, support, and regulation code refers to responses that mention actions the government can take to promote affordable housing and mitigate against the negative impacts of the housing crisis. This code often includes providing a stronger social safety net for those under pressure or displaced by the housing crisis and confronting problem landlords, as well as enforcement of existing regulations and the creation of new regulations that will lead to more affordable housing.

**Housing subsidies**
A housing subsidies code often refers to respondents who would like to see an expansion of housing subsidies to help residents throughout the region.

**Improve long-term planning**
An improve long-term planning code commonly refers to respondents who would like their communities and the Silicon Valley region to prioritize long-term solutions and improve the planning process.
Improve public transit and address transportation issues
An improve public transit and address transportation issues code refers to respondents who would like to see the region improve its transportation problems. The most frequent suggestion was to invest in and expand the public transit system.

Increase social responsibility and inclusion
An increase social responsibility and inclusion code often refers to respondents’ belief that increasing equity through more individual and social responsibility will lead to greater community understanding and more effort to solve the housing crisis and take care of one’s neighbors.

Increase wages
An increase wages code refers to respondents who mentioned that increasing wages is an essential step in decreasing the housing affordability crisis.

Raise awareness, share information, and educate
A raise awareness, share information, and educate code refers to respondents who think that sharing information with and educating other community members is an essential component of confronting the housing crisis. This code also refers to some respondents’ desire for better information sharing by the government and the creation of a centralized source of housing resources.

Rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases
A rent control, cheaper rent, and slower increase code often refers to the need for housing options with less expensive rents in Silicon Valley. Rent control was the top priority in this code, with many respondents writing only “rent control.” Other frequent responses included rent stabilization and slowing down rent increases, as well as implementing rules to lower rent.

Shared housing
A shared housing code refers to respondents’ interest in expanding shared housing within their communities.
Appendix D: Living and Working in SV Codebook—Defined

Activities
An activities code refers to any recreational activities (such as the arts or sports); any programming organized by an individual, organization, or community; or non-specific cultural events throughout the region.

Community and People
A community and people code refers to individuals being connected to others around them, their neighborhood, and their community as a whole.

Culture
A culture code refers to shared attitudes, values, goals, and social practices.

Diversity
A diversity code refers to diversity in terms of activities, communities, people, or values.

Education and Schools
An education and school code refers primarily to schools (such as school system or curriculum and students). It is also inclusive of other related topics such as community relationships, parent involvement, and research.

Friends and Family
A family and friends code refers to family connections and friendships.

Innovation and Tech Industry
An innovation and tech industry code refers employment in the tech industry and the culture around innovation and creation.

Location and Accessibility
A location and accessibility code refers to accessibility to transit, schools, parks, work, restaurants, etc.

Natural Environment
A natural environment code refers to the natural occurring environments in the region. The code encompasses all naturally occurring environments that being beach, mountains, etc.

Resources and Services
A resources code refers to any initiative that works to better lives and communities, including both the services, supports, and information themselves, as well as the responsible organization or agency.

Weather and Climate
A weather and climate code refers to weather and climate throughout the region.

Work and Job Opportunities
A work and job opportunities code refers to job opportunities, overall job growth, employment, wages, and benefits.
Appendix E: Issues Codebook—Defined

Arts and Culture
An arts and culture code may refer to art initiatives such as art for social change as well as public art and art infrastructure, or it may acknowledge culture through cultural institutions (such as libraries) and city events (such as festivals) as well as through opportunities for ethnic cultural awareness.

Collaboration
A collaboration code refers to working together and building relationships to create partnerships and expand networks. It may function at the community or individual level and often involves crossing divides and building bridges while working toward collective impact. Sharing resources and holding dialogues/conversations are other indicators of collaboration.

Community Development
A community development code refers to identifying community assets and building up the community, particularly through local economic development, in order to improve quality of life. It also refers to building a sense of community and creating community for those who live there.

Community Engagement
A community engagement code refers to overall involvement and participation in one’s neighborhood or community in order to make a difference. Often there is an organizing element at the grassroots level as well as intentions for improved neighbor relations and opportunities for neighborhood gatherings.

Economic Issues and Poverty
An economic issues and poverty code refers to economic development on one end and economic insecurity, or poverty, on the other, covering in the intermediate unemployment and jobs as well as income inequality and wage issues.

Education and Youth Development
An education and youth development code refers primarily to schools (such as school system or curriculum) and students (often at the high school level) with additional focal points on mentoring and general youth development. It is also inclusive of other related topics such as community relationships, parent involvement, and research.

Environment and Parks
An environment and parks code refers to overall environmental sustainability efforts and clean up as well as recreational opportunities for all.

Equity and Social Inclusion
An equity and social inclusion code uses a social justice lens to account for forms of exclusion and issues of access and equality for underserved groups. Reference is largely made to youth access and engagement concerns as well as to issues of disparity as noted across income levels, racial groups, and neighborhoods.

Ethics and Religion
An ethics and religion code refers largely to personal attributes and attitudes, such as apathy or hope. It is also inclusive of faith-based community work.
Family
A family code refers to the overall functioning and behavior of the family unit, particularly through parent involvement and support (or lack thereof) and child concerns such as childcare.

Food Access
A food access code refers primarily to food insecurity, focusing on problems of hunger and food deserts and solutions regarding food assistance and urban agriculture.

Government
A government code refers to the governing habits of the state and regional municipalities, especially regarding fiscal issues and taxes, including pensions and cuts to social services, as well as transparency, accountability, and corruption. It also involves the function of government, particularly through elections, public engagement, and public policy.

Health
A health code refers to the wellbeing of both people and communities, considering in particular mental health issues and also taking into account public health, quality of life issues, nutrition and wellness, and health care.

Housing and Homelessness
A housing and homelessness code primarily refers to homelessness and issues around home ownership and renting responsibilities.

Immigration and Migration
An immigration and migration code refers to the displacement, movement, and integration of immigrant communities, including those who are undocumented.

International
An international code refers to world affairs and Chicago as positioned as a global city.

Judicial System and Public Safety
A judicial system and public safety code may refer to the criminal justice system as well as public safety and crime, including instances of gang violence, gun violence, drugs, and trafficking, and how officials such as police can better provide community security.

Media and Awareness
A media and awareness code refers to raising awareness around issues of importance and addressing ignorance, particularly through the media and social media. It includes improving communication and building new narratives, especially around persistent stigmas.

Philanthropy
A philanthropy code refers to increased funding and support for programs and nonprofit organizations and often incorporates a need for organizational capacity building, institutional community outreach, and corporate social responsibility. On the individual level, it refers to civic responsibility and volunteering, with individuals taking action for the greater good.
Technology
A technology code refers to technology in a general sense and includes references to access, training, and improvement.

Transportation
A transportation code refers to transportation access and transportation infrastructure.
Appendix F: Social Media Analysis

Prepared by Meltwater Buzz

On The Table 2017

Social Media Analysis Report
Bay Area

Hashtag Usage

803
Total mentions

2.37M
Total impressions

#onthetablesv

The event occurred on Nov 15.
Platform Breakdown

192 Unique Twitter Influencers

Hashtag Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Influencers</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@siliconvalleydf</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@RemyGoldsmith</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@akavatsavorska</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@pinkpoein</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Dilabadina</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@SVThomke</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@shreevsckono</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@mwalji</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Vpragelidon</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@patfynnessso</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twitter Insight

Tweeters Platform

Links
- Total: 292
- %: 38.4%

Media
- Total: 57
- %: 7.5%

Engagement
- Total: 277
- %: 36.5%
- Total: 20
- %: 2.6%
- Total: 463
- %: 60.9%

Top Sources
- Twitter for iPhone: 57.4%
- Twitter Web Client: 26.8%
- Twitter for Android: 6.7%
- Sprout Social: 2.1%
- TweetDeck: 1.7%
- Other: 3.4%
## Appendix G: Visualization of Disparity between Important Issues and Contributions

**Figure G.1**

Themes Disparity Between Important Issues and Contributions

For example, only 20% of respondents who mentioned Public Safety and Judicial System (n=77) as an important social issue also mentioned it as social issue to which they contribute their time, talent or financial resources. The 'n' represents the number of respondents who chose the corresponding variable as an important issue and also responded to the contribution question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Morals (n=46)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth Development (n=388)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture (n=69)</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n=167)</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (n=75)</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion (n=335)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks (n=147)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness (n=608)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (n=154)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media (n=21)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (n=25)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access (n=80)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration (n=158)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Poverty (n=402)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (n=180)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System (n=77)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Visualization for Question Comparisons

### Figure H.1

#### Relationship between Housing Optimism and Housing Ideas

Shows the relationship between how much respondents think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability and the ideas they feel could help address the regions housing issues. For example, 37% of respondents who are 'Not sure' about what can be done also mentioned an idea related to Build more housing, especially affordable housing. Note that these results include only respondents who answered both questions (n = 860).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Housing Idea</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>A fair amount</th>
<th>Just some</th>
<th>Nothing at all</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared housing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness, share information, and educate</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase wages</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase social responsibility and inclusion</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve public transit and address transportation issues</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve long-term planning</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing subsidies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policies, support, and regulation</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement, organizing, and advocacy</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change zoning, density, and land use laws</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build more housing, especially affordable housing</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow and encourage alternative housing types</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much respondents feel can be done to address housing affordability
### Relationship between Community Involvement and Housing Ideas

Shows the relationship between how involved respondents are in neighborhood and community activities and the ideas they feel could help address the region's housing issues. For example, 34% of respondents who are ‘Not too involved’ also mentioned an idea related to Build more housing, especially affordable housing. Note that these results include only respondents who answered both questions (n = 852).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Housing Idea</th>
<th>Very involved</th>
<th>Somewhat involved</th>
<th>Not too involved</th>
<th>Not at all involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared housing</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent control, cheaper rent, and slower rent increases</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness, share information, and educate</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase wages</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase social responsibility and inclusion</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve public transit and address transportation issues</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve long-term planning</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing subsidies</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policies, support, and regulation</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate and private sector responsibility and solutions</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement, organizing, and advocacy</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change zoning, density, and land use laws</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build more housing, especially affordable housing</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow and encourage alternative housing types</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How involved respondents are in community activities
**Figure H.3**

**Relationship between Community Involvement and Contributions**

Shows the relationship between how involved respondents are in neighborhood and community activities and the issues to which they contribute their time, talent or financial resources. For example, 43.2% of respondents who are "Very involved" also contribute to Housing and Homelessness. Note that these results include only respondents who answered both questions (n = 1167).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issue to which respondents contribute time, talent or resources</th>
<th>Very involved</th>
<th>Somewhat involved</th>
<th>Not too involved</th>
<th>Not at all involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Morals</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth Development</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Poverty</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How involved respondents are in community activities